

# **OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN**

## **PART 1 – CORE STRATEGY**

**SUBMISSION DOCUMENT**

**Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)  
(England) Regulations 2012**

**Regulation 22 (1) (c)**

**Statement on Consultation and  
Representations  
(Main Report)**

**December 2015**

## Contents

Section	Content	Page
<b>Report</b>		
1	Introduction	4
2	Statement of Community Involvement	5
3	Bodies and Persons Consulted	6
4	Preparation of the Core Strategy up to October 2012	8
5.	Local Aggregate Assessment 2013	10
6.	Preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft February 2014	11
7	Consultation on Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft February 2014	12
8.	Local Aggregate Assessment 2014	14
9	Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	15
10.	Habitats Regulations Assessment	16
11.	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	17
12.	Duty to Co-operate	18
13.	Publication of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 (Core Strategy) Proposed Submission Document August 2015	19
<b>Appendices</b>		
Appendix 1	Consultation Bodies	39
Appendix 2	Report to County Council 9 July 2013	47
Appendix 3	Report to County Council Cabinet 26 November 2013	56
Appendix 4	Report to County Council Cabinet 28 January 2014	65

Appendix 5	Report to County Council Cabinet 25 November 2014	74
Appendix 6	Respondents to Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, Consultation Draft February 2014 and Summary of Issues Raised	91
Appendix 7	Report to County Council 24 March 2015	103
Appendix 8	Consultation on and Responses to Draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014	112
Appendix 9	Summary representations on Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document	116
<b>Annex Reports (Separate)</b>		
Annex 1	Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document Consultation Statement (May 2012)	
	Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Submission Document Statement on Consultation and Representations (Oct 2012)	
Annex 2	Summary of Comments made in response to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft (Feb 2014) and County Council Responses	

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 - Regulation 22 (1). The Regulation sets out the documents that must be submitted to the Secretary of State alongside the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy (the Core Strategy). Amongst these are a statement setting out:
- (i) with regard to the preparation of the Core Strategy:
    - a. the bodies and persons the Council invited to make representations in the preparation of the plan;
    - b. how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations;
    - c. a summary of the main issues raised by representations; and,
    - d. how representations have been taken into account;
  - (ii) with regard to the published Core Strategy:
    - a. The number of representations made when the Council published the plan that it intended to submit to the Secretary of State; and
    - b. A summary of the main issues raised in the representations.
- 1.2 This statement on consultation and representations has been prepared by the Council to meet the requirements of Regulation 22 (1) (c). Reference is made to a number of reports that have been considered by the Council's Cabinet or the County Council during preparation of the plan and these are attached as Appendices to this statement.
- 1.3 Also attached to the statement, and following the Appendices, are two Annex documents prepared at earlier stages in plan preparation but which help to provide context to the various stages of plan preparation and comments received on earlier drafts of the Core Strategy.

## **2. Statement of Community Involvement**

- 2.1 A Revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement was adopted by the County Council in March 2015. This replaced the Statement of Community Involvement previously adopted in 2006.
- 2.2 The Statement of Community Involvement sets out the County Council's policy, and standards it will seek to achieve, to ensure meaningful and effective consultation, engagement and involvement of consultees, stakeholders and other interested members of the community in the preparation of documents that make up the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and in the consideration of planning applications that are determined by the County Council.
- 2.3 The adopted Revised Statement of Community Involvement 2015 is available on the County Council website at:  
<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/new-minerals-and-waste-plan>

### **3. Bodies and Persons Consulted**

- 3.1 Opportunity for statutory bodies, other organisations and local residents and businesses to be involved in the preparation of the Core Strategy is provided by Regulation 18 of the 2012 Regulations.
- 3.2 Regulation 18 (2) (a) provides that ‘specific consultation bodies’ that the Council consider may have an interest in the content of the Core Strategy be notified of its intended preparation and invited to make representations on what it ought to contain. The ‘specific consultation bodies’ that were notified and invited to make comment on the Core Strategy are identified in Appendix 1. These bodies are included on the County Council’s minerals and waste plan local consultation database that has been maintained since work commenced on the preparation of a plan to replace the existing Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan<sup>1</sup>.
- 3.3 Regulation 18 (2) (b) provides that other ‘general consultation bodies’ that the Council consider appropriate be notified of the subject of the Core Strategy and invited to make representations on what it ought to contain. These are defined in the 2012 Regulations as:
- a) voluntary bodies;
  - b) bodies representing the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups;
  - c) bodies representing the interests of different religious groups;
  - d) bodies representing the interests of disabled persons;
  - e) bodies representing the interests of businesses.
- 3.4 The various ‘general consultation bodies’ on the minerals and waste plan consultation database are also listed in Appendix 1..
- 3.5 Regulation 18 (2) (c) requires the Council to consider which residents and persons carrying on business in the county are appropriate to be notified of the subject of the Core Strategy and invited to make representations on what it ought to contain. The Core Strategy is the first part of a two-part plan and does not allocate specific sites for minerals or waste development so specific residents have not been identified for consultation. However, a large number of individuals have expressed an interest and made comment during its preparation and they have been added to the minerals and waste plan consultation data base. Each individual has then been notified of subsequent consultations. There are over 1000 individuals on the consultation database.
- 3.6 The Council has identified appropriate businesses including, in particular, companies involved in mineral working and supply and waste management in Oxfordshire. They have been notified and invited to make representations at each relevant stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy.

---

<sup>1</sup> The existing Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted in July 1996 and various policies saved by the Secretary of State in September 2007.

3.7 Bodies and persons on the minerals and waste plan consultation database have been notified and invited to comment on draft documents published at particular stages of plan preparation – as detailed in subsequent sections. The method of notification has been by email or letter, as preferred. In some cases a copy of the relevant consultation document has been sent directly with the notification. More recently, with increased access to the internet, copies of documents have not been provided with the notification as a matter of course, but the notification has advised:

- where documents can be viewed and downloaded from the Council's website;
- where paper copies of documents can be viewed (county council offices, district council offices and county libraries as appropriate);and
- email, telephone and postal contact details to obtain further information and a paper copy if required.

#### **4. Preparation of the Core Strategy up to October 2012**

- 4.1 Preparation of a Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (MWCS) began in 2005 and included public consultation on Issues and Options in June 2006<sup>2</sup> and a set of Preferred Options in February 2007<sup>3</sup>. Progress on preparation of a Proposed Submission Document, however, did not follow immediately as advice from the Government Office for the South East was to the effect that the Preferred Options consultation paper did not take a sufficiently spatial approach in meeting the government's aims for the recently changed plan making system.
- 4.2 Following further work, in September 2011 separate consultations were undertaken on draft planning strategies for Minerals and Waste respectively<sup>4</sup>, and the responses received informed preparation of a Proposed Submission Document that was published in May 2012<sup>5</sup>. Responses were submitted by 104 bodies and members of the public and in all some 400 separate representations were made. Following due consideration of these representations the MWCS was submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration in October 2012.
- 4.3 The process of involvement and consultation, and the outcomes, over the period from 2005 to 2012, up to the submission of the (previous and subsequently withdrawn) Minerals and Waste Core Strategy is set out in the Consultation Statement May 2012 and the Statement on Consultation and Representations October 2012 that were produced for the publication and submission respectively of that plan. In view of the relevance of the involvement and consultation carried out between 2005 and 2009 to the preparation of the current Core Strategy proposed submission document, these two documents are included as a separate Annex 1 to this consultation statement and form part of this statement.
- 4.4 The Inspector appointed to carry out an independent examination of the MWCS raised issues over the adequacy of the evidence base relative to the recently published National Planning Policy Framework<sup>6</sup>. He also raised questions over the adequacy of the work undertaken in terms of the newly introduced Duty to Cooperate<sup>7</sup>. Examination of the MWCS was thus suspended in February 2013 whilst the County Council gave consideration to the issues raised by the Inspector. On 9 July 2013 the County Council considered a report on the position that had been reached (attached at Appendix 2) and accepted the recommendation made. The MWCS was accordingly withdrawn by letter to the Inspector dated 13 July 2013.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper (June 2006)

<sup>3</sup> The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – Preferred Options Consultation Paper (July 2007)

<sup>4</sup> The Minerals Planning Strategy Consultation Draft (September 2011) and the Waste Planning Strategy Consultation Draft (September 2011)

<sup>5</sup> The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document (May 2012)

<sup>6</sup> The National Planning Policy Framework was introduced in March 2012

<sup>7</sup> The Duty to Cooperate was introduced through Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 and detailed provisions in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012



- 4.5 At its meeting on 9 July the County Council also resolved to prepare a revised Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan in accordance with a new Minerals and Waste Development Scheme. Preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) duly commenced on the withdrawal of MWCS in July 2013. The ‘new’ Core Strategy is very much founded on the work that was carried out in the preparation of the previous, withdrawn plan, including the evidence base for that plan and the consultation and other involvement with consultation bodies and the public.

## **5. Local Aggregate Assessment 2013**

- 5.1 Preparation of a Local Aggregate Assessment 2013 for Oxfordshire overlapped with the withdrawal of MWCS. In January 2013 the County Council had appointed consultants (Atkins) to prepare a Local Aggregate Assessment for Oxfordshire. The consultants produced a draft Local Aggregate Assessment 2013 in June 2013. This proposed adjusted aggregate provision figures, at a level higher than the average of the sales over the previous 10 years. Engagement and consultation on this draft was carried out between July and October 2013 with the Aggregate Working Parties (which include representatives of mineral planning authorities and the minerals industry) for South East England and the adjoining regions; adjoining and other relevant mineral planning authorities; the Oxfordshire district councils; the Environment Agency; the minerals industry (nationally and locally); and local environmental groups through the umbrella grouping OXAGE (representing CPRE, AGGROW, OUTRAGE, BACHPORT, PAGE, CAGE, SEAG and Eynsham Parish). This was undertaken by meetings and/or email correspondence.
- 5.2 The outcome of this engagement and consultation was reported to the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group on 23 October 2013 and then to the Council's Cabinet on 26 November 2013. The report to the Cabinet is included at Appendix 3. Paragraphs 10 – 12 summarise the engagement and consultation undertaken and the outcomes from this. Details of meetings and correspondence with other authorities, bodies and organisations are set out in annex 1 to the report. The Cabinet resolved that in the light of the consultation the provision figures in the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2013 should be set at the 10 year sales average rather than the adjusted figures recommended by the consultants, and that this should be used as the basis for the provision for mineral working made in a consultation draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan Core Strategy.

## **6. Preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft February 2014**

- 6.1 Preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft was undertaken between July 2013 and February 2014. The consultation, engagement and involvement that had been carried out in the preparation of the MWCS was used to inform the Consultation Draft. In particular, the representations made on the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document (May 2012) were taken into consideration in deciding how the plan should be changed, especially with regard to meeting the tests of soundness and legal compliance (Annex 1).
- 6.2 In addition, preparation of the revised draft Core Strategy was informed by the engagement under the duty to co-operate that was undertaken with other local authorities and bodies during the period July to October 2013. This engagement was on both the preparation of the Local Aggregate Assessment 2013 (see section 5 above) and the emerging revised Core Strategy. The authorities and bodies engaged with included: all adjoining mineral planning authorities, other mineral planning authorities in the South East and in other adjoining regions, either directly or through the Aggregate Working Parties; the Oxfordshire district councils; the Environment Agency; local environmental groups through the umbrella grouping OXAGE (representing CPRE, AGGROW, OUTRAGE, BACHPORT, PAGE, CAGE, SEAG and Eynsham Parish); and the minerals industry (both nationally and locally).
- 6.3 The revision of the Core Strategy was considered by the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group on 19 December 2013 and a draft revised Core Strategy was recommended to the Council's Cabinet on 28 January 2014. The report to the Cabinet is included at Appendix 4. Paragraph 7 notes factors taken into account in reviewing the previous version of the plan, including: the representations made on the proposed submission document May 2012; and the views of other authorities, statutory bodies and organisations engaged with under the duty to co-operate and through informal consultation. The main changes to the Core Strategy from the previous (withdrawn) version are set out in paragraphs 9 – 36 of the Cabinet Report. The Cabinet agreed the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft for public consultation.

## **7. Consultation on Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft February 2014**

- 7.1 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation Draft was published in February 2014. The consultation period ran for six weeks, from 24 February 2014 to 7 April 2014. All of the bodies and persons included on the consultation database were notified by email or post and invited to comment. The consultation document was published on the Council's website and was available at the Council's offices; and paper copies were provided on request. A form for making comments was provided on the website and paper copies were provided on request.
- 7.2 Council officers were available to meet stakeholders and local groups on request. A meeting held in Eynsham on 28 March 2014, called by Eynsham Parish Council, was attended by an officer in order to provide information about the consultation draft plan and answer questions. An officer also attended a meeting with representatives of the minerals industry, organised by the Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group, on 28 March 2014.
- 7.3 The consultation generated considerable interest, particularly within areas proposed as locations for sand and gravel extraction, although the number of responses was significantly less than for the previous draft plan consultation in 2011, possibly reflecting that locations for mineral working proposed in 2014 were less specific in terms of location. Individual responses were received from 155 organisations and individuals making a total of 806 separate comments on the draft plan. (The number of comments is higher than recorded in reports to Cabinet and Council as some have subsequently been subdivided.) The majority of these comments were on the minerals strategy section of the plan, particularly on policies M2 – M4, on provision for working aggregate minerals, locations for working aggregate minerals and working of aggregate minerals.
- 7.4 The responses to the consultation and the main issues raised in them were reported to and considered by the Council's Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group at meeting held on 23 May, 16 June and 16 July 2014. Possible changes to the Core Strategy in the light of the responses were considered at these meetings and at further meetings of the Group held on 11 September and 16 October 2014.
- 7.5 Following the series of meetings of the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group, the responses to the consultation and the main issues raised in them were reported to and considered by the Council's Cabinet, together with a recommended draft amended version of the Core Strategy, on 25 November 2014. The report set out the key issues raised in the responses to the consultation and set out the main changes that should be made to the Core Strategy in the light of the comments made. The main report to the Cabinet is included at Appendix 5. Paragraphs 22 – 54 set out the key issues raised and recommended amendments to the plan. A list of the respondents to the consultation and a summary of the issues raised in the responses were included (as annex 2) in the Cabinet report and these are included separately

as Appendix 6 to this statement. A draft amended version of the Core Strategy including these changes was included as annex 3 to the Cabinet report (this is not included in the appendices).

- 7.6 The Cabinet agreed the amended Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy in principle as the basis of a complete amended version of the Plan for recommendation to Council for publication and submission.
- 7.7 The recommendation of the Cabinet was reported to the meeting of the full County Council on 24 March 2015 (copy main report attached at Appendix 7), with an amended version of the Core Strategy and a summary of changes made from the version agreed in principle by the Cabinet (annexes 3 and 4 to the main report). Council resolved to approve the amended Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy for publication and submission.
- 7.8 A summary of the comments made by each respondent to the February 2014 Consultation Draft Core Strategy (in plan order) is included for completeness in Annex 2 to this statement. This also provides the County Council's response to each comment and, where relevant, the way in which the plan has been amended in the light of the comment.

## **8. Local Aggregate Assessment 2014**

- 8.1 In August 2014 the County Council appointed consultants (LUC and Cuesta Consulting) to prepare an updated Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment for 2014. Drafts of the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 were considered by the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group on 11 September and 16 October 2014. The consultants advised that, taking into account other relevant local information, the LAA should set provision figures adjusted to be higher than the average of sales over the previous ten years.
- 8.2 Following the meeting of the Cabinet Advisory Group on 16 October 2014, consultation on a draft Local Aggregate Assessment was carried out with the South East England Aggregate Working Party (which includes representatives of mineral planning authorities and the minerals industry), as required by the NPPF. As part of the Council's engagement under the duty to co-operate, consultation was also carried out with the Aggregate Working Parties for adjoining regions; adjoining and other relevant mineral planning authorities; the Oxfordshire district councils; the Marine Management Organisation; the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership; and the Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group. More information on this is included in the Statement on Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.
- 8.3 The draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 was reported to the Council's Cabinet on 25 November 2014. The Cabinet report is at Appendix 5; this explains why the methodology used to assess future demand for aggregate takes into account other relevant local information to produce adjusted provision levels that are higher than the previous 10 years sales average. An update to the report to Cabinet detailed the consultation carried out on the draft and the responses received; this is included at Appendix 8.

## **9. Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment**

- 9.1 In November 2013 the County Council appointed consultants (TRL) to carry out sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment in relation to preparation of the Core Strategy. The consultants have produced a Sustainability Appraisal Report August 2015, which has been published on the Council's website with the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy proposed submission document August 2015, as one of the proposed submission documents. Appendix B of their report sets out the consultations that were carried out as part of the sustainability appraisal and how consultation responses have been taken into account, as outlined in the following paragraphs.
- 9.2 The consultants reviewed the responses that had been received on the sustainability appraisal report which had been published alongside the previous (and subsequently withdrawn) Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document May 2012. They took those responses into account in the revised sustainability appraisal that they prepared for the February 2014 Consultation Draft Core Strategy. This is documented in Appendix B.1 to the Sustainability Appraisal Report August 2015.
- 9.3 In December 2013 the statutory consultation bodies – Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage – were consulted on revision of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The consultation responses and how they were taken into account is documented in Appendix B.2 to the Sustainability Appraisal Report August 2015.
- 9.4 A Sustainability Appraisal Report was published alongside the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Consultation Draft February 2014. The comments received on the SA report in responses to this consultation and how these comments have been taken into account is documented in Appendix B.3 to the Sustainability Appraisal Report August 2015.
- 9.5 Objection to the Sustainability Appraisal Report August 2015 has been lodged on behalf of four local waste operators (see section 13).

## **10. Habitats Regulations Assessment**

- 10.1 A meeting was held with Natural England in August 2014 at which the need for an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report to be prepared, to support the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy, was discussed. In February and March 2015 there was further discussion and correspondence with Natural England on the scope of this update, following which Natural England were formally consulted on a draft HRA Screening Report in May 2015. The Screening Report reached a conclusion that the Core Strategy would have no likely significant effect on any European Sites (i.e. Special Conservation Areas – SACs)
- 10.2 Natural England responded in June 2015 raising some issues that they considered needed to be addressed before they could support a conclusion of no likely significant effect. A further meeting was held with Natural England following which additional information on traffic impacts was included in the Screening Report and other amendments were made. These amendments were in particular to clarify that the Core Strategy had been amended to exclude from the strategic mineral resource areas and the waste strategy areas specified water catchment areas relating to the Oxford Meadows and Cothill Fen SACs and dust impact buffer areas around all SACs. This reflected the conclusions of the Technical Supplement to the HRA report that was produced for the Council by consultants (LUC and Maslen Environmental) in January 2012.
- 10.3 An amended HRA Screening Report was sent to Natural England in July 2015. Natural England agreed with the conclusion that the plan would have no likely significant effect on any European Sites. The final HRA Screening Report was published alongside the proposed submission version of the plan in August 2015.



## **11. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment**

- 11.1 The County Council holds regular, approximately bi-monthly, meetings with the Environment Agency on minerals and waste planning issues, including the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The need to review or update the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy was discussed at meetings in 2014 and early 2015.
- 11.2 In view of uncertainty over the extent of updating or revision of the previous SFRA that was required, in March 2015 the County Council appointed consultants (AECOM) to carry out an initial review of the SFRA undertaken in 2009 and 2010. The purpose of this review was to establish the significance for the plan of subsequently updated flooding data.
- 11.3 The consultant's findings<sup>8</sup> were discussed with the Environment Agency at a meeting in April 2015. Although these indicated that the changes since the previous SFRA did not significantly affect the strategy and proposals in the Core Strategy, it was agreed that the SFRA needed to be updated to reflect the most recent information and to relate to the revised Core Strategy. The Environment Agency considered that this should be done by way of preparation of a new SFRA document rather than an addendum to the previous SFRA.
- 11.4 In April 2014 the County Council appointed the consultants (AECOM) to prepare an updated Minerals and Waste Level 1 SFRA for Oxfordshire. The Environment Agency were consulted on the consultants' project brief and made comments on it, which were taken on board. The Environment Agency were consulted on the draft SFRA report and provided comments on it in June 2015. A final SFRA<sup>9</sup> has been produced which takes on board the comments of the Environment Agency. Preparation of the updated SFRA also involved liaison with and input from the section of the County Council that acts as the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 11.5 The Environment Agency has made a minor comment on the final SFRA (see section 13).

---

<sup>8</sup> Report by AECOM Water for OCC March 2015: Oxfordshire County Council Minerals and Waste SFRA GIS Inspection

<sup>9</sup> Report by AECOM Water for OCC August 2015: Oxfordshire County Council Minerals and Waste Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

## **12. Duty to Co-operate**

- 12.1 Consultation overlaps with engagement and liaison under the Duty to Co-operate. Except where specifically mentioned, this statement does not cover the County Council's engagement, liaison and working with other local authorities and bodies under the duty to co-operate.
- 12.2 An initial statement on the Duty to Cooperate<sup>10</sup> was published on the County Council web site during the period within which representations could be made on the proposed submission Core Strategy. Representations have been made that the County Council has not complied with the necessary requirements (see section 13).
- 12.3 An updated and final statement<sup>11</sup> of the County Council's position on compliance with the duty to cooperate is published alongside this report as a document supporting the submission of the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.

---

<sup>10</sup> Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy. Statement on Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate (September 2015)

<sup>11</sup> Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy. Statement on Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate (December 2015)

### **13. Publication of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 (Core Strategy) Proposed Submission Document August 2015**

#### **Background**

- 13.1 Preparation of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document began in March 2014 with an analysis of the comments received on the Consultation Draft Plan (see paragraphs 7.4 – 7.7). The Proposed Submission Document was published on 19 August 2015 for representations to be made by 30 September 2015 (a 6-week period) under Regulation 19 of the 2012 Regulations. Also published with the document were:
- A Statement about Consultation in the preparation of the plan;
  - Sustainability Appraisal Report of the plan;
  - Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening report;
  - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment;
  - Topic Paper on the Water Environment;
  - Local Aggregate Assessment; and
  - Waste Needs Assessment.
- 13.2 All of the bodies and persons included on the consultation database were notified and afforded an opportunity to make representations; and a notice was published in the local press. The documents were published on the Council's website and made available for inspection at the Council's offices in Oxford. The Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document was also made available at District Council Offices and Public Libraries.
- 13.3 The Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document was actually made available for inspection on the Council's website on 22 July 2015, four weeks prior to commencement of the official consultation period. Persons and bodies on the consultation database were notified of this in advance.
- 13.4 During the official consultation period a draft Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate was also published on the Council website (the final version is published alongside this report) but this was not one of the proposed submission documents.

#### **Representations**

- 13.5 Responses were made by 157 persons and bodies. Five responses were received after the prescribed date but the Council has decided to accept these as representations on the published plan. Most responses make representation on more than one part of the plan and a total of 636 separate representations have been registered. The level of support for and opposition to the different parts of the plan is shown in table 1.
- 13.6 Interested persons and bodies were asked to make representations on a standard form designed to make clear which part(s) of the plan each comment referred. Not all responses were submitted on the standard form and in these

cases officers have determined the part(s) of the plan to which each representation relates. In some cases it is not clear whether an objection is being made to part(s) of the plan on the grounds of it being unsound, legally non-compliant or both and again judgements have been made by officers in such cases in preparing the assessment tables that follow. Some responses advise that the intention is not necessarily to challenge the soundness of the plan but to improve its content: these have nevertheless still been counted as concerns as to soundness.

- 13.7 A summary of the various representations, in plan order, is attached at Appendix 9 and a complete version of each representation, in plan order, is being made available on the Council website. The full response from each respondent is also being made available on the Council’s website.

Table 1  
Summary of representations

Comment	Support	Unsound	Legal and Unsound	Total
General Issues	24	57	109	190
Minerals Strategy	38	248	12	298
Waste Strategy	29	48	24	101
Core Policies	20	26	1	47
Total	111	379	146	636
Percentage	17%	60%	23%	

### **General issues**

- 13.8 Table 2 summarises the issues that have been raised in relation to the introductory and implementation sections of the plan. Some 69 individual respondents have expressed support for a detailed response submitted by one of several groups that have objected to the impact of mineral extraction on one or more local communities, and these are shown in table 2 as ‘Support for points made by a local amenity group’. Representations are otherwise grouped into a number of main issues as shown in table 2. These are explained further in the paragraphs that follow.

**Table 2**  
**Summary of representations on general issues**

Comment	Support	Unsound	Legal + Unsound	Total
General support for plan	12			12
Compliance with DtC	11		1	12
Adequacy of the evidence base	1	8	6	15
Failure to follow SCI			25	25
General lack of consultation			3	3
Preparation of a two-part plan		10		10
Support for points made by a local amenity group			69	69
Omissions/Corrections		19	2	21
Background information to support specific issue		10	3	13
Site Specific Issue		5		5
Other		5		5
Total	24	57	109	190
Percentage	13%	30%	57%	

### Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate

- 13.9 A number of local authorities have commented favourably on the level of engagement that has taken place in the preparation of the plan. However, concern has been raised by one of the local amenity groups opposed to the mineral strategy (OXAGE) that the Council has failed to satisfactorily comply with the requirements of the Localism Act and that the plan is, as a result, legally flawed.
- 13.10 Part of the concern is based on the fact that a statement on the work undertaken by the Council to satisfy the requirements of the Localism Act was not published at the same time as the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document. OXAGE believes that the Council is required to publish such a statement at the commencement of the period within which representations can be made on the plan i.e. 15 August 2015. As previously stated (para 12.2) the Council published an initial Statement on Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate mid-way through the period within which representations could be made.
- 13.11 OXAGE further alleges that the Council has failed to demonstrate adequate liaison with the South East England Aggregates Working Party (SEEAWP) in the preparation of the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 (LAA 2014). Because LAA 2014 is a key part of the Plan's evidence base (effectively setting the level of provision that should be made for the supply of aggregate) it is alleged that the failure to adequately demonstrate active

liaison with SEEAWP in the preparation of LAA 2014 also results in a legally flawed plan.

- 13.12 The Council's final Statement on Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate is published alongside this report and addresses both of the concerns raised.

### **Adequacy of the evidence base**

- 13.13 There are concerns that the supporting documents published with the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document do not adequately provide all of the evidence required to support a sound plan. As a result it is alleged that the public have been denied the opportunity to properly understand the basis for the policies that are being put forward in the plan. These concerns also extend to the documents that supported publication of the Draft Plan in February 2014 and which were also considered inadequate.

- 13.14 In support of the expectation that all necessary evidence base documents should have been published at an early stage, reference has been made to paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework which refers to the need for "early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses" and to paragraph 014 of the National Planning Policy Guidance on Local Plan preparation which says:

*"Local planning authorities should publish documents that form part of the evidence base as they are completed, rather than waiting until options are published or a Local Plan is published for representations. This will help local communities and other interests consider the issues and engage with the authority at an early stage in developing the Local Plan."*

Reference is also made to Regulation 35 of the 2012 Regulations and that this requires evidence to be presented before, not after, the consultation process and that it should be available for a minimum period of six weeks.

- 13.15 Attention has also been drawn to statements made previously on the Council's website regarding an intention to publish various Topic Papers and that these do not appear amongst the evidence base documents published.
- 13.16 Particular concern has been raised at the absence of any assessment of the suitability of sites put forward by operators and landowners for possible mineral or waste development, and that without such assessment the deliverability of the plan cannot be assumed. Comment has also been made that the Council did not publish its responses to the representations that were made on the Draft Plan before the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document was published, and this is seen as evidence that the Council did not adequately consider those responses when preparing the plan.

13.17 With specific reference to the Sustainability Appraisal Report, representations have been made on behalf of four local waste operators that it is legally flawed in so far as it fails to:

- Adequately appraise likely environmental effects;
- Properly evaluate reasonable alternatives; and
- Outline reasons why the proposals being put forward have been selected.

13.18 Finally the Environment Agency has made comment on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Environment Agency has been fully involved in its preparation but has noted that the final report contains some duplicate information in three of the Appendices. It has also been noted that the need for a more detailed Level 2 SFRA may need to be considered when the Part 2 Plan is prepared.

### **Failure to follow the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement**

13.19 Concerns have been raised at the process followed in the preparation of the 2014 Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA 2014) that supports policy M2 – Provision for Working Aggregate Minerals (see also section 8). Although wide consultation took place in the preparation of the 2013 Local Aggregate Assessment, it has been noted that consultation on LAA 2014 was less extensive and did not extend to community groups and individual residents.

13.20 The process followed in the preparation of LAA 2014 is therefore said to be inconsistent with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and in particular the commitments made regarding public consultation in plan preparation. In support of these concerns reference has been made to paragraph 4.3<sup>12</sup> of the SCI which states:

*“We will consult communities on the development of plan documents at the earliest possible stage to allow meaningful engagement in the process.”*

Reference has also been made to paragraph 4.6<sup>13</sup> which states:

*“Where appropriate we will go beyond the requirements of the Regulations. We will seek to involve all individuals, groups, organisations and bodies that we think have an interest in the minerals and waste development documents being prepared or who have expressed an interest in being involved or consulted.”*

13.22 Other references are made, including to paragraph 4.11 of the SCI (“We will seek to involve people throughout the process of preparing minerals and waste plan documents, including in the early, informal stages of plan

---

<sup>12</sup> The reference is to the Review of the Statement of Community Involvement that was adopted in March 2015 and not to the Statement of Community Involvement adopted in November 2006

<sup>13</sup> As footnote 13, although the quoted wording also appeared in para 4.3 of the Statement of Community Involvement adopted in November 2006

preparation...”) and to paragraph 4.13 (“Make consultation documents and other relevant material available for inspection on and downloading from the County Council website throughout the consultation period”).

- 13.21 With particular reference to LAA 2014 it is alleged that the Council has failed to follow its own procedures and objectors ask that the Inspector examining the plan considers whether the plan fails the test of legal compliance as a result. The Council’s failure to publish further Topic Papers (see paragraphs 13.13 – 13.18) is also seen by some as further evidence of the Council failing to comply with its own procedures.

### **Preparation of a two-part plan**

- 13.22 Some believe that the intention to produce a two-part plan (reserving the identification of specific sites for development until a later stage) no longer accords with government policy. Particular reference has been made to paragraph 008 of National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) “How should Mineral Planning Authorities plan for minerals extraction?” and the stated preference for a plan to designate specific sites for development over ‘Preferred Areas’ or (of lesser preference) ‘Areas of Search’.

- 13.23 The NPPG advises that specific sites should be designated where:

- viable resources are known to exist;
- landowners are supportive of minerals development; and
- the proposal is likely to be acceptable in planning terms.

Objectors point out that all of these conditions are met in Oxfordshire, where operators have nominated many sites for mineral extraction and where previous site assessment has indicated that many are not faced with insurmountable planning objections.

- 13.24 There are therefore concerns that the Council’s intention to leave the designation of specific development sites until the Part 2 Plan is neither justified nor adequately explained, and that properties in the designated ‘Strategic Resource Areas’ are unnecessarily blighted - at least until the Part 2 Plan is adopted. There is a further concern at the period over which such uncertainty will extend – there being no timetable for the preparation of the Part 2 Plan.

- 13.25 Similar points have been raised in relation to the waste strategy, where operators have already put forward sites for consideration in response to earlier invitation by the Council. It is pointed out that preliminary assessment of the suitability of these sites has not been undertaken and that this represents a flaw in the plan’s preparation. Production of a two-part plan is said to be unnecessarily holding up decisions on the identification of much needed additional waste management capacity – especially for recycling.



## Main issues on Minerals

13.26 Table 3 provides a summary of the representations made on the Minerals Strategy, including the aims and objectives set out in section 3 of the Plan. More is said on the main issues that have been raised in the succeeding paragraphs.

**Table 3**  
**Summary of representations on minerals**

Comment	Support	Unsound	Legal and Unsound	Total
General		2		2
Aims and Objectives	5	25	1	31
Policy M1 (Recycled & Secondary Aggregate)	3	8	2	13
Policy M2 (Primary Aggregate – level of provision)	4	83	2	89
Policy M3 (Primary Aggregate – principal locations)	9	60	5	74
Policy M4 (Primary Aggregate – sites)	7	26		33
Policy M5 (Primary Aggregate – working)	1	5		6
Policy M6 (Aggregate Rail Depots)	1	4	1	6
Policy M7 (Non-aggregate working)	4	6		10
Policy M8 (Mineral safeguarding)	2	6		8
Policy M9 (Infrastructure)		4	1	5
Policy M10 (Restoration)	2	19		21
Total	38	248	12	298
Percentage	13%	83%	4%	

### Policy M1 (Recycled and Secondary Aggregate)

13.27 There is some support for the approach taken by this policy, but there are also concerns that it sets no target for the amount of recycled and secondary aggregate (R&SA) that should be produced annually and that this is inferior to the approach taken in earlier versions of the plan. Representations made on behalf of four local operators suggest that the plan should set a target in the order of 0.926 million tonnes per annum and that this would be in line with national and regional guidelines. But there is also a question as to whether or not it is helpful to adopt a specific figure which will be subject to economic and market pressures throughout the plan period.

- 13.28 Those who favour adopting a R&SA target point to the fact that this would allow better account to be taken of the contribution that R&SA can make to the level of provision required for primary aggregate (policy M2). The point has been made that modern technology (in particular the introduction of washing facilities in recycling plant) allows R&SA to be produced that is in many respects capable of matching the specification required in concrete products.
- 13.29 One respondent proposes that much, if not all, of Oxfordshire's aggregate needs could be met by processing China Clay waste brought into the county from Cornwall by rail – adding to the R&SA already produced locally. This is put forward as a more sustainable option to the extraction of primary aggregate from green field locations and its transport to local markets by road. This view is not, however, universally shared – some operators suggesting that this would actually be a less sustainable option.

### **Policy M2 (Primary Aggregate – level of provision)**

- 13.30 The provision to be made for primary aggregate has generated much interest, with opinion divided on the methodology that should be used to assess the level of need. There is broad agreement that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) provides the basis for assessment and that this should be based on the previous 10 years sales average. There is, however, disagreement on the extent to which other 'local factors' should also be taken into account.
- 13.31 Local communities that could be affected by future extraction (see policy M3) point to the fact that aggregate sales are generally falling and that future provision should therefore be no higher than the previous 10-year sales average. But others, including operators and nearby Mineral Planning Authorities, point to the fact that the NPPF calls on local authorities to take into account "other relevant local information" when assessing future levels of provision and that Oxfordshire is currently an importer of aggregate where historically it has been a net 'exporter'<sup>14</sup>.
- 13.32 The Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA 2014) takes 'other relevant local information' into account in assessing future needs and many are concerned that this is the wrong approach<sup>15</sup>. Many feel that the 'other relevant local information' (that has led to a higher level of need being assessed) should not have been used and is not supported by credible evidence – for example work by the British Marine Aggregate Producers Association is cited to indicate that the type of growth envisaged in Oxfordshire need not lead to an exponential increase in demand for aggregate. It is being suggested the Plan is therefore providing for a higher level of need than required and that is necessitating the release of land for future extraction that would not be required were need to

---

<sup>14</sup> LAA 2014 points out that the mothballing of local quarries during the economic downturn appears to have been a major factor in this change.

<sup>15</sup> Opponents are also concerned that LAA 2014 was not subject to appropriate consultation (see paras 13.19 – 13.21)

be assessed solely on the basis of the previous 10-year sales average (as was the case in the Draft Plan).

- 13.33 With regard to the level of provision that is finally decided, some believe this should be included in the policy and not left to be determined by the LAA and therefore possibly varied in response to future monitoring. An alternative suggestion is that the finally preferred methodology should be confirmed by being included in the policy itself.
- 13.34 Finally, some operators have pointed out that in order for the Plan to make provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate (as required by the NPPF) productive capacity needs to be taken into account as well as future land banks/reserves. The Plan's intention to make provision for the amount of aggregate needed up to (but not beyond) 2031 is also considered by some (including the MPA) to be inadequate. The NPPF requirement that provision be made for a 7 year land bank is said by some to require the plan to make provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate to at least 2038 (i.e. 7 years beyond the plan period).

### **Policy M3 (Primary Aggregate – principal locations)**

- 13.35 Many of those making representations against the intention to produce a two-part plan (with site allocations left to the Part 2 Plan) are also opposed to this policy. In particular it is pointed out that the principal locations identified for sand and gravel are very broad and will blight a substantial number of properties: this could be avoided if sites were also identified in a single plan. Despite this, some are satisfied with the approach being taken, albeit they seek reassurance that a clearer timetable be put in place for the Part 2 Plan.
- 13.36 Attention has been drawn to the broad nature of the locations identified for sand and gravel and that they are more extensive than those identified in the Draft Plan – this despite the fact that the need now identified for primary aggregate is lower than before. Others (albeit far fewer and less local in nature) support the fact that broader areas have been identified. But of equal concern is a perception that there is a lack of clarity in how some areas have been selected (e.g. Sonning Eye) over others (e.g. Bampton/Clanfield) and, in particular, how the boundaries of the selected areas have been finalised. It has also been pointed out that the scale of the Key Diagram – the only plan on which the preferred areas for sand and gravel are shown - makes it impossible to identify whether a particular property is in a selected area or not.
- 13.37 Related to this point, a number of suggestions have been made for why the boundaries of the areas should be changed, mostly to exclude certain locations or properties, including:
- That part of Area 6 north of the A40;
  - That part of Area 6 that comprises the Lower Evenlode Valley;
  - That part of Area 5 north of Wallingford;
  - That part of Area 5 between Cholsey and Wallingford;

- Any areas covered by Green Belt;

#### **Policy M4 (Primary Aggregate – sites)**

- 13.38 Much exception has been taken to criterion (b) which seeks to achieve a change over the plan period in the relative amounts of sand and gravel to be produced from areas in west Oxfordshire and south Oxfordshire.
- 13.39 Communities in south Oxfordshire allege that this aspiration is not supported by adequate evidence and that, in particular, if it is not intended to undertake environmental assessment of preferred sites until the Part 2 Plan, it is too early to express a preference for new sites being opened in this part of Oxfordshire as opposed to any other. Conversely, communities in west Oxfordshire point out that greater clarity is required as to the proportion of the overall requirement that should be met from south Oxfordshire if the aim of the policy is to be achieved. It has been pointed out that the reserves now in place (including a substantial new permission granted at Gill Mill in west Oxfordshire) only require new sites to be opened up in the period 2027-2031 and that much more should be done to prevent further permissions being granted in west Oxfordshire prior to 2027.
- 13.40 Those who support clause (b) point out that the intention behind the policy is not adequately reflected in the overall Vision and Plan Objectives and that this should be rectified.
- 13.41 Comment has also been made to other criteria included in the policy, and in particular:
- There is general support for the preference given to meeting the need for soft sand from extensions to existing quarries (criteria c);
  - The approach to AONB (criteria h) and SSSI (criteria i) is too restrictive;
  - The approach to 'cumulative impact' (criteria l) is not NPPF compliant;
  - There is no reference to Green Belt issues.

#### **Policy M5 (Primary Aggregate – working)**

- 13.42 It has been suggested that the provisions of this policy, in so far as it relates to primary aggregate, are superfluous and adequately covered in other policies; the provisions relating to ironstone working are nonetheless supported.
- 13.43 Some operators repeat a point made in relation to policy M2, namely that references to the need to maintain a 7 year land bank for sand and gravel needs to be expanded to also refer to the importance of maintaining productive capacity - both being considered relevant to the NPPF requirement to make provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate.

- 13.44 Conversely concern has been expressed that the policy allows for further planning permissions to be granted prior to the adoption of the Part 2 Plan, notwithstanding that there are now sufficient reserves to 2027. Further, concern has been expressed that the policy places no bar on the number of permissions that could be granted for aggregate extraction from the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3, i.e. there is no bar on unnecessary extraction at the expense of the local environment.

### **Policy M6 (Aggregate Rail Depots)**

- 13.45 It has been pointed out that the NPPF expects plans to safeguard 'potential' as well as existing and planned aggregate rail depots against alternative forms of development. It has also been suggested that the policy is confused in so far as it intends that sites be safeguarded in the Part 2 Plan whilst also safeguarding specific (named) sites in the Part 1 Plan.
- 13.46 It is recognised that existing rail heads will continue to be needed as Oxfordshire is dependent on other areas to supply certain forms of hard aggregate not available locally. It has also been suggested that encouragement be given to expanding the capacity currently available, including through the development of a new facility at Bicester, to reduce the need for indigenous sources of sand and gravel.

### **Policy M7 (Non-aggregate mineral)**

- 13.47 Although this policy is generally supported there are some concerns. In particular, it has been pointed out that the term 'small-scale' – which is expected to limit the scale of proposals for the extraction of building stone – is neither defined nor required.
- 13.48 Comment has also been made that the provisions for oil and gas are not particularly comprehensive and that more detailed criteria should be included against which proposals can be assessed - unless there is geological evidence to say this is unnecessary. There is also a concern that the provisions applying to proposals for the extraction of oil or gas in AONB are not in conformity with NPPF. One comment proposes the policy should be against fracking.

### **Policy M8 (Mineral Safeguarding)**

- 13.49 Some believe that the areas safeguarded in the Core Strategy are inadequately defined and that the delineation of boundaries should not be left to the Part 2 Plan. Whilst acknowledging that the Strategic Resource Areas are defined, it is pointed out that they only comprise part of the areas being safeguarded. Also, that even the boundaries of the Strategic Resource Areas are difficult to interpret accurately. There is concern that this will lead to many properties being 'blighted' pending better definition of the safeguarded areas.

13.50 Some feel that the exceptions to safeguarding that apply to sites identified in District Local Plans should be even broader and there should be better opportunity for arguing that alternative forms of development could still be allowed on land in a Strategic Resource Area where mineral extraction can be shown to be uneconomic or unviable. Conversely there is concern that some sites already identified for other forms of development in District Local Plans may not have been adequately assessed in terms of the quality of the underlying mineral resource and the plan's safeguarding approach should be made stricter, requiring a proper assessment of the value of the mineral before a decision is made on whether to grant planning permission for other forms of development.

### **Policy M9 (Mineral Infrastructure)**

13.51 Concern has been raised that it is not clear what is being safeguarded under this policy, either in terms of type of facility or specific location. There is also concern that safeguarding should apply to sites identified for alternative development in District Local Plans only where it is clear that proper and adequate has been given to the economic consequence of the loss of the facility in question.

### **Policy M10 (Restoration)**

13.52 A diverse number of comments have been raised at the adequacy of this policy.

13.53 After Uses. Some feel that the approach to restoration places too much emphasis on bio-diversity and ignores the potential for some sites to be developed for economic and community benefit. Although the policy seeks a net gain in bio-diversity in all cases, it is also argued that the policy is not sufficiently clear in saying whether it seeks to promote a net gain in bio-diversity or a presumption in favour of a bio-diversity led approach to all restorations. Others have pointed out that objective 3.4 (x) seeks to promote and implement a bio-diversity led restoration strategy and that the policy is not sufficiently robust in seeking to deliver this.

13.54 Although the policy lists a number of criteria against which the acceptability of a future after-use can be assessed, there is a concern that it does not actually require that they be taken into account. It is also noted that there is no requirement for the public to be involved in strategy formulation. There is also concern that there is no requirement that the impact of a proposed after-use on the Green Belt be taken into account. In addition, there is concern that impact on landscape-scale, impact on best and most versatile agricultural land and impact on soil conservation should be taken into account.

13.55 Implementation. Although referred to in supporting text, the policy should make clear that 'longer term' (in the context of maintenance of planting and

habitat creation) should mean 25 years. Some feel that the plan should be made more robust in requiring that a financial bond should always be provided to ensure that a restoration strategy can be implemented in the event of financial default by an operator.

13.56 Flooding. Large areas of former workings in the flood plain have been restored to wet after-uses, and a suggestion has been made that all future restoration should be ‘dry’, with the benefit that this will allow for Palaeolithic remains to be shown. But it has also been pointed out that this form of restoration requires the import of significant amounts of fill and that the plan does not clarify the extent to which such restoration might conflict with national policy (which provides that landfill should not be permitted in the flood plain).

### Main Issues on Waste

13.57 Table 4 provides a summary of the representations made on the Waste Strategy, including the aims and objectives set out in section 3 of the Plan. More is said on the main issues in the succeeding paragraphs.

Table 4  
Summary of representations on waste

Comment	Support	Unsound	Legal and Unsound	Total
General	2			2
Aims and Objectives	7	8		15
Policy W1 (Waste to be managed)	2	2		4
Policy W2 (Waste management targets)	2	2	4	8
Policy W3 (waste management capacity)	1	12	5	18
Policy W4 (Locations for facilities)		4	5	9
Policy W5 (Siting of facilities)	1	7	5	13
Policy W6 (Landfill)	7	8	3	18
Policy W7 (Hazardous waste)				0
Policy W8 (Agricultural waste)	1			1
Policy W9 (Radioactive waste)	3	2	1	6
Policy W10 (Waste Water/sewage sludge)	2			2
Policy W11 (Waste site safeguarding)	1	3	1	5
Total	29	48	24	101
Percentage	29%	47%	24%	

## **Aims and Objectives**

13.58 There is a good measure of support for the Plan's waste vision and objectives: in particular the approach taken to landfill and the use of the county's landfills in taking waste from areas with fewer opportunities (although this is not unanimous). Other concerns have been raised as follows:

- Reference should be made to the importance of using recovered waste for quarry restoration;
- Clarify which 'other areas' the plan intends to encourage to become net self-sufficient;
- Giving priority to previously developed land and avoiding the unnecessary loss of green field land is not in accordance with NPPF.

### **Policy W1 (Waste to be managed)**

13.59 Two inaccuracies have been pointed out, in particular with reference to the forecast for construction, demolition and excavation waste. Greater concern has been raised at the waste forecasts and the view that there should be a commitment to planning for forecast amounts of waste in the policy itself rather than setting them out in supporting text and updating them as necessary in the Annual Monitoring Report. (A similar point is also raised in relation to policy M2 – para 13.33.)

### **Policy W2 (Waste management targets)**

13.60 Setting ambitious targets for recycling is generally welcomed, but there are some concerns that the recycling targets for commercial and industrial waste are over-ambitious and do not accord with recommendations made by the Council's consultants. A further concern relates to the recycling targets for construction, demolition and excavation waste which some operators believe to be too low.

### **Policy W3 (Waste management capacity)**

13.61 Publication of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy coincided with consultation on the Council's Strategy for the future management of Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs). Several felt that closure of any of the HWRCs would add unnecessarily to the need for further recycling sites and make more difficult the achievement of the plan's recycling targets.

13.62 Comment has been made that a more robust approach to the acceptance of 'out of county' waste would reduce the pressure for additional facilities. Others feel that recycling capacity needs for commercial and industrial waste and for construction, demolition and excavation waste have been underestimated due to waste forecasts being too low and the capacity provided by existing facilities being exaggerated.



- 13.63 Concern has been raised that the policy is not clear on how proposals for development on unallocated sites will be assessed. Some also feel that more encouragement should be given for the development of waste facilities at mineral extraction sites, and for facilities already in temporary use for waste management to be made permanent.
- 13.64 The plan seeks to make no further provision for additional residual waste treatment capacity, but attention has been drawn to the possibility of some waste from Somerset being brought to the Energy Resource Facility at Ardley – putting unnecessary pressure on Oxfordshire facilities to process more local waste. However, it has also been pointed out that there is an unimplemented planning permission for additional residual waste treatment capacity and that this should be included in the capacity gap calculations (plan table 7).

#### **Policy W4 (Locations for facilities)**

- 13.65 There appears to be support for seeking a balance in the capacity of recycling facilities around the county, although some criticism has been made at the plan's failure to assess site availability in Oxford notwithstanding its acknowledgement that suitable sites in the city are difficult to find.
- 13.66 There is some support for locating larger facilities closer to the main centres of waste arisings and limiting facilities in rural areas to be small in scale. However, views vary on which centres should be identified and how to define proximity to those urban areas. One District Council has drawn attention to the fact that Banbury (not identified as suitable for strategic facilities) is a key growth location as well as neighbouring Bicester (which is so identified).
- 13.67 With regard to the plan's proposal that strategic facilities should be sited no further than 10 km from the centre of Oxford and 5 km from other specified towns, a suggestion has been made that the specified 'hinterland' should not extend beyond the Green Belt; by contrast another suggests the hinterland should be double that specified i.e. 20 km (in the west this would extend the Oxford hinterland to Witney). For other towns the same respondent suggests the limit be extended to 10 km. Another operator believes the whole approach to be inflexible as it does not allow account to be taken of the benefits of some locations in rural areas that may be some distance from urban centres but that are nevertheless well connected in terms of road access.

#### **Policy W5 (Siting of waste facilities)**

- 13.68 One local community has commented that the policy does not provide adequate protection for residents against locally sited waste management facilities. Other concerns have been raised by local operators.
- 13.69 Some welcome the fact that mineral workings are identified as priority locations for facilities, but exception is taken to the fact the policy limits such

opportunities to ‘active’ workings. The point is made that some exhausted workings are well located relative to centres of waste arising and that facilities ought to be allowed to remain after mineral working where there is no obvious environmental impact.

- 13.70 Other operators believe the policy’s approach to the use of ‘previously developed’ and ‘green field’ land is inappropriate. In particular that it is not in accord with the NPPF which, it is said, does not necessarily preclude development on green field land. The policy is therefore alleged to set too strong a test for the release of such sites (i.e. only where it can be shown to be the most suitable and sustainable option). Irrespective of this, the operators in question believe that the required number of new facilities cannot be delivered without resort to green field sites and criticism is made of the fact that the plan presents no evidence to show otherwise. Further comment is made that the policy’s approach to the expansion of existing sites onto neighbouring green field land is not sufficiently clear.

### **Policy W6 (Landfill)**

- 13.71 Although there is a concern that the County should not encourage waste from other local authority areas to be landfilled in Oxfordshire (or extensions to existing facilities permitted) this is countered by the level of support from other local authority areas and operators.
- 13.72 The approach to inert waste and, in particular, the presumption against land raising is not welcomed by some operators who believe this is not justified by the presumed surplus of landfill capacity. It is suggested that available landfill capacity has been over-estimated because account has been taken of sites with unused planning permissions and that assessment should be made of only those sites that are operational. Further, the plan underestimates the amount of construction, demolition and excavation waste that will need to be ‘disposed’ anyway (see also comments on policies W2 and W3).

### **Policy W9 (Radioactive waste)**

- 13.73 The main producers of this waste are generally supportive of the policy’s approach subject mainly to minor corrections to terminology. Communities local to the main sites (Harwell and Culham) have made no comment on the locationally specific aspects of the policy, but the respective District Councils have commented that the policy does not make adequate provision for the disposal of higher level radioactive wastes in the event that a national disposal facility is not built.

### **Policy W11 (Waste site safeguarding)**

- 13.74 The principal issue is the question of whether or not safeguarding should extend automatically to sites that have a temporary, as opposed to a

permanent, planning permission. The current policy approach envisages that sites the subject of temporary planning permission are safeguarded in the Part 1 Plan and that this would continue on adoption of the Part 2 Plan if it was concluded that the site was suitable in planning terms for continued waste use throughout the plan period.

13.75 Objectors to this approach allege that this is contrary to the NPPF (para 143) and the National Planning Policy for Waste (para 8), both of which are said to encourage the safeguarding of ‘existing’ sites irrespective of their current planning status. It is also pointed out that the approach taken to safeguarding under this policy is not consistent with the approach taken to the safeguarding of mineral site infrastructure (policy M9) or temporary secondary and recycled aggregate sites (policy M1) and that this is confused and should be made more consistent.

### Main Issues on Core Policies

13.76 Table 5 provides a summary of the representations made on the Core Policies. The main issues are discussed below.

Table 5  
Summary of representations on Core Policies

Comment	Support	Unsound	Legal and Unsound	Total
General	3	2		5
Policy C1 (Sustainable Development)	1	1		2
Policy C2 (Climate Change)	1			1
Policy C3 (Flooding)	1	3		4
Policy C4 (Water Environment)	1	2		3
Policy C5 (Local environment/amenity/economy)	2	2		4
Policy C6 (Agricultural land/soils)		2		2
Policy C7 (Biodiversity/Geodiversity)		3		3
Policy C8 (Landscape)	4	6	1	11
Policy C9 (Historic Environment/Archaeology)	6			6
Policy C10 (Transport)	1	5		6
Policy C11 (Rights of Way)				0
Total	20	26	1	47
Percentage	43%	55%	2%	

## **General**

13.77 Comment has been made that the Core Policies should include provision for safeguarding the Oxford Green Belt from inappropriate development.

## **Policy C3 (Flooding)**

13.78 The Environment Agency has made no comment on this or other plan policies. However, others have commented on the absence of reference to adopting a sequential approach to site layout in the flood plain and to the need to apply the Exception Test in some cases.

13.79 It has also been pointed out that the NPPF provisions on flooding are different for minerals and waste development, and that it would be preferable for the policy to be in two parts to highlight and adequately address these differences.

## **Policy C4 (Water Environment)**

13.80 The main issue raised is that it does not make clear what is meant by the requirement to ‘adequately protect’ the River Thames.

## **Policy C5 (Local Environment/Amenity/Economy)**

13.81 The main issue raised concerns the absence of discussion in the supporting text on the issue(s) relating to the local economy. Indeed, it is pointed out, the supporting text advises that the policy only intends to cover local environment and amenity issues. It has been suggested that issues relating to the economy are adequately addressed in policy C1 (Sustainable Development) and that for them to be covered in this particular policy produces unnecessary conflict.

13.82 In representations made to other parts of the plan, passing reference has been made to the desirability of having set buffer zones around mineral sites: however, the only comment made directly on the approach to buffer zones suggested in this policy (that the need for and detail of them are assessed on a case by case basis) is that it is supported.

## **Policy C7 (Biodiversity/Geodiversity)**

13.83 It has been suggested that, taken literally, this policy would allow development that is likely to cause ‘significant harm’ to important habitat to be undertaken without any degree of mitigation or compensation. Although the policy does need to allow for development causing ‘significant harm’ to take place where the benefits outweigh any harm to the environment, to allow this without

consideration as to whether some level of mitigation might be appropriate appears to be an unfortunate oversight that needs to be corrected.

### **Policy C8 (Landscape)**

13.84 The main issue relates to the way this policy addresses development proposals in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). NPPF (para 116) includes a three part test for assessing the impact of major development in AONB and some believe that this is not accurately reflected in the policy wording.

13.85 Some representations consider the approach to development in AONB to be too restrictive (in so far as development is normally expected to be 'small-scale' to meet local need). Mineral operators are concerned that the supporting text indicates that this is likely to rule out most quarrying operations. They point out that there is no support for this line in the NPPF. Similarly one waste operator also believes that the qualification on 'small-scale' is too restrictive (in so far as it seeks to apply this term to facilities that handle no more than 25,000 tonnes of waste per annum).

### **Policy C10 (Transport)**

13.86 The main issues relate to the expectation that developers will be expected to fund necessary improvements to the transport network and in particular a reference in the supporting text to the problems caused by Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) in terms of their causing heavier wear and tear on highway surfaces. The Local Transport Plan's reference to costs of maintenance being met by commuted payments from developers is considered unfair as higher vehicle tax is already paid by HGVs at a level that takes into account heavier usage. The plan's reference to consideration being given to further payments being made direct to the Highways Authority is therefore said to be inappropriate.

13.87 Questions have also been raised as to the accuracy of the Lorry Route Map (Figure 13) and suggestions made to make it more up to date.

### **Conclusions on Main Issues**

13.88 The County Council has considered all of the issues raised and, whilst acknowledging that in certain respects the plan could be improved, it does not consider that the objections raise issues that should lead to the plan being found unsound.

13.89 Some representations allege that preparation of the plan has not complied with legal requirements but without making any reference to a relevant enactment or regulation. It would appear that these are really challenging the

soundness of the document (or parts of it). However, some representations do clearly challenge the plan on legal grounds as follows:

- The Council has failed to engage appropriately under the Duty to Cooperate;
- The Council has failed to follow its own procedures (in the Statement of Community Involvement) in preparing plan documents;
- The Council has failed to support the plan with an adequately prepared Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment.

13.90 The Council does not believe these allegations to be valid.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Consultation Bodies**

## **Appendix 1 – Consultation Bodies**

### **A. Specific Consultation Bodies**

#### **National Bodies**

The Coal Authority  
Environment Agency  
English Heritage (now Historic England)  
The Marine Management Organisation  
Natural England  
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited  
Highways Agency

#### **Relevant Authorities (Oxfordshire)**

##### District Councils:

Cherwell District Council  
Oxford City Council  
South Oxfordshire District Council  
Vale of White Horse District Council  
West Oxfordshire District Council

##### Parish Councils:

All Parish and Town Councils and Parish Meetings in Oxfordshire

##### Police and Crime Commissioner:

Thames Valley Police and Crime Commissioner

#### **Relevant Authorities (Adjoining Oxfordshire)**

##### County Councils:

Buckinghamshire County Council  
Gloucestershire County Council  
Northamptonshire County Council  
Warwickshire County Council

##### District Councils:

Aylesbury Vale District Council  
Cotswold District Council  
South Northamptonshire District Council  
Stratford-on-Avon District Council  
Wycombe District Council

##### Unitary Councils:

Reading Borough Council  
Swindon Borough Council  
West Berkshire Council  
Wokingham Borough Council



Adjoining Parish Councils:

Adlestrop Parish Meeting  
Aldworth Parish Council  
Barton Hartshorn Parish Council  
Bishopstone and Hinton Parva Parish Council  
Bledington Parish Council  
Boarstall Parish Council  
Boddington Parish Council  
Brill Parish Council  
Chaddleworth Parish Council  
Chaddleworth Parish Council  
Chetwode Parish Council  
Compton Parish Council  
Cottisford Parish Meeting  
Croughton Parish Council  
Earley Town Council  
East Garston Parish Council  
East Ilsley Parish Council  
Eastleach Parish Council  
Edgcote Parish Meeting  
Evenley Parish Council  
Evenlode Parish Council  
Great Rissington Parish Council  
Haddenham Parish Council  
Hambleton Parish Council  
Highworth Town Council  
Ibstone Parish Council  
Ickford Parish Council  
Icomb Parish Council  
Inglesham Parish Council  
Kingsey Parish Council  
Lambourn Parish Council  
Langford Parish Council  
Lechlade on Thames Town Council  
Little Compton Parish Council  
Long Compton Parish Council  
Long Crendon Parish Council  
Longwick cum Ilmer Parish Council  
Ludgershall Parish Council  
Moreton in Marsh Town Council  
Oakley Parish Council  
Pangbourne Parish Council  
Purley on Thames Parish Council  
Radnage Parish Council  
Shabbington Parish Council  
South Marston Parish Council  
Southrop Parish Council  
Stokenchurch Parish Council  
Tingewick Parish Council  
Turweston Parish Council, Clerk

Twyford Parish Council  
Tysoe Parish Council  
Wargrave Parish Council  
Water Stratford Parish Council  
West Ilsley Parish Council  
Westbury Parish Council

Adjoining Police and Crime Commissioners:  
Gloucestershire Police and Crime Commissioner  
Northamptonshire Police and Crime Commissioner  
Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner  
Wiltshire Police and Crime Commissioner

**National Health Service bodies**

Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group  
National Health Service Commissioning Board

**Licence holder under section 6 (1) (b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989**

RWE NPower

**Sewerage/Water Undertakers**

Anglian Water  
Severn Trent Water Ltd  
Thames Water Utilities

**Homes and Communities Agency**

## **B. General Consultation Bodies**

### **Voluntary Bodies**

Age Concern  
(AGGROW) Anti Gravel Group Residents in Oxfordshire West  
Burcot and Clifton Hampden Protection of the River Thames (BACHPORT)  
Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)  
Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust  
Bicester Friends of the Earth  
Burford Quarry Liaison Group  
Campaign for Sustainable Didcot  
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)  
Caversham & Districts Residents Association  
Caversham GLOBE Group  
Chinnor & Thame Friends of the Earth  
Cholsey 1000 Plus  
Cholsey Community Library  
Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE)  
Dorchester Historical Society  
Dorchester-on-Thames Society  
Earth Trust  
ENOUGH  
Eynsham and Cassington Gravel Committee  
Eynsham Society  
Eynsham Womens Institute  
Friends of the Earth  
Friends of South Hinksey  
Friends of South Hinksey & South Hinksey Flood Group  
Hardwick with Yelford and Ducklington Charity  
Hurst Water Meadow Trust  
Iffley Fields Residents' Association  
Inland Waterways Association  
Land not Sand Community Group  
Lower Windrush Garden Club  
Lower Windrush Valley Project  
National Federation of Womens Institutes  
Oxford Upper Thames Residents Against Gravel Extraction (OUTRAGE)  
Oxford Civic Society  
Oxford Community Foundation  
Open Spaces Society  
Oxford Council for Sport & Recreation  
Oxford Federation of Community Associations  
Oxford & District Trades Union Council  
Oxford Fieldpaths Society  
Oxford Friends of the Earth  
Oxford Green Belt Network  
Oxford Ornithological Society  
Oxford Preservation Trust  
Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society (OAHS)

Oxfordshire Federation of Women's Institutes  
Oxfordshire Gardens Trust  
Oxfordshire Geology Trust  
Oxfordshire Green Party  
Oxfordshire Nature Conservation Forum  
Oxfordshire Playing Fields Association  
Oxfordshire Ramblers Association  
Oxfordshire RIGS Group  
Oxfordshire Rural Community Council  
Oxfordshire Women's Institute  
Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE)  
River Thames Society  
River Users Society  
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)  
Shotover Preservation Society  
Sonning and Sonning Eye Society  
Sonning Eye Action Group  
The Bensington Society  
The British Association for Shooting & Conservation  
The Carter Institute  
The National Cyclists' Organisation  
The National Trust  
The Wallingford Historical & Archaeological Society  
The Warren and District Residents Association  
Transition Eynsham Area (Green Tea)  
Trust for Oxfordshire's Environment  
Tubney Wood Preservation Group  
Wallingford Museum  
Wilts & Berks Canal Trust  
Witney and District Historical and Archaeological Society  
Wolvercote Commoners Committee  
Woodland Trust  
Wroxton & Balscote Action Group

**Racial, Ethnic, National and Religious Groups**

Indian Union  
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups  
Traveller Law Reform Project  
Oxfordshire Ethnic Minorities Business Services  
Oxfordshire Chinese Community & Advice Centre  
Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance  
Oxford Mosque  
Asian Cultural Centre  
African Caribbean Community Action Network

**Business Groups**

Abingdon on Thames Chamber of Commerce  
ACTVaR  
Airport Operators Association  
Banbury & District Chamber of Commerce

Bicester & District Chamber of Commerce  
Carterton & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce  
CBI West Midlands  
Chemical Business Association  
Chipping Norton Guild of Commerce  
DB Schenker Rail (UK) Ltd  
Didcot Chamber of Commerce  
Didcot Development Agency Limited  
Direct Rail Services  
Environmental Services Association  
Faringdon Chamber of Commerce  
Farming & Wildlife Advisory Group  
Freight Transport Association  
Henley Chamber of Trade & Commerce  
Institute of Directors  
Mendip Rail Ltd  
Mineral Products Association  
National Farmers Union  
Oxfordshire Investment Opportunity Network  
Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group  
Rail Freight Group  
Road Haulage Association  
Summertown Trade & Business Association  
Thame Chamber of Trade & Commerce  
Thames Valley Chamber of Commerce  
Wallingford Business 2000  
Wantage & District Chamber of Commerce  
Witney & District Chamber of Commerce  
Woodstock Chamber of Commerce

**Government Departments/Agencies**

Civil Aviation Authority  
Defence Estates  
Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
Forestry Commission  
Health and Safety Executive  
High Speed Two (HS2) Ltd  
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority  
Office for Nuclear Regulation  
Office of Rail Regulation (now Office of Rail and Road)

**Non-Government Organisations**

British Geological Survey  
Canal & River Trust (formerly British Waterways)  
Centre for Ecology & Hydrology  
Chilterns Conservation Board  
Citizens Advice Bureau  
Cotswold Conservation Board  
Crown Estate Commissioners  
Equality and Human Rights Commission

General Aviation Awareness Council  
National Grid Company  
National Playing Fields Association  
North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
Post Office Property Holdings  
Southern and East England Tourist Board  
Sport England  
The National Trust

**Local Authorities/Associated Groups**

Bedfordshire County Council  
City of London  
Dorset County Council  
East London Waste Plan  
East Sussex County Council  
Hampshire County Council  
Hertfordshire County Council  
Isle of Wight Council  
Kent County Council  
Mayor of London  
Milton Keynes Council  
North London Waste Plan  
Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum  
Oxfordshire Association of Local Councils  
Oxfordshire Emergency Planning Unit  
Oxfordshire Fire & Rescue Service  
Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership  
Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead  
South East England Aggregates Working Party (SEEAWP)  
Slough Borough Council  
South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG)  
South London Waste Plan  
Surrey County Council  
West London Waste Plan  
West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit  
West Sussex County Council

## **Appendix 2**

### **Report to County Council**

**9 July 2013**

## **Appendix 2 – Report to County Council 9 July 2013**

**COUNCIL – 9 JULY 2013**

### **OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN: MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY**

**Report by Cabinet Member for Environment**

#### **Introduction and Context**

1. The County Council is responsible for preparing the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy will form the central part of this plan. The Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document was approved by full Council on 3 April 2012 for publication for representations to be made and subsequent submission to the Government for independent examination.
2. The Core Strategy sets out the vision, objectives, spatial strategy and core policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in Oxfordshire to 2030. Detailed site allocations are to be identified in a subsequent document.
3. Following approval by full Council, the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document was published on 25 May 2012.
4. The Core Strategy was submitted to the Government on 31 October 2012 and the Planning Inspectorate appointed Mr JG King as the Inspector to carry out the independent examination of the plan. All the Council's submitted documents and related evidence are on the examination webpage at: <http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/minerals-and-waste-core-strategy-examination>

#### **Current Position**

5. The Inspector sent four technical notes reflecting his initial observations on the Core Strategy to the County Council in November and December 2012. A series of written correspondence between the Inspector and the Council followed in January and February 2013. All of this material is also available for inspection on the County Council's website.
6. In his technical notes, the Inspector requested that the Council carry out the following work before the examination hearings are held:
  - a) Prepare a statement showing how the Council has complied with the duty to co-operate (a new duty brought in by the Localism Act in November 2011).
  - b) Provide answers to an initial set of questions about the plan's provision for aggregates supply and the Local Assessment of Aggregate Supply



Requirements which Atkins (consultants) prepared for the Council in January 2011.

- c) Review the background papers and update them to reflect current national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012; and to show how national policy and other evidence provide justification for the policies in the Core Strategy.
  - d) Provide a comprehensive schedule of all documents that comprise the evidence base for the Core Strategy, with links to the documents, on the examination webpage.
7. The Inspector subsequently raised questions in January this year over the Council's compliance with the duty to co-operate in the preparation of the Core Strategy, particularly whether the duty had been met in relation to a Local Aggregate Assessment that complied with the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. On 14 February 2013, with the authority's agreement, the Inspector suspended the examination until 31 May 2013. This was to provide sufficient time for officers to complete the requested work and further consider the issue of compliance with the new duty to co-operate and the implications for the examination of the Core Strategy. It was also to allow the Council to review the soundness of the Core Strategy, particularly in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework (which was published after the preparation of and immediately prior to the County Council's approval of the submission document) and the recent revocation of the South East Plan.
9. The Council wrote to the Inspector on 31 May giving an update on its position and on 4 June the Inspector continued the suspension of the examination until 19 July. This was to allow the Council to consider at this meeting how it wishes to proceed with the Core Strategy.

## **Key Issues**

### Local Aggregate Assessment

- 10. The National Planning Policy Framework brought in a new requirement for Mineral Planning Authorities to prepare an annual Local Aggregate Assessment, to establish the provision to be made in their minerals plans. The assessment is to be 'based on a rolling average of 10 years sales data and other relevant local information, and an assessment of all supply options'.
- 11. The January 2011 Assessment, on which the submitted Core Strategy is based, was prepared under previous national planning policies. Subsequent to the Plan's preparation, Government published the National Planning Policy Framework in March 2012 and related Guidance on minerals planning in October 2012.

12. Work is well underway in preparing a new Local Aggregates Assessment, again using Atkins to provide technical advice. It is a new requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework that the Council must engage with other Mineral Planning Authorities, the minerals industry and the Aggregate Working Parties for the South East and for those other areas that supply aggregates to Oxfordshire or receive aggregates from it, before the Assessment is finalised. A draft of the 2013 Assessment will have been considered by the South East England Aggregates Working Party (of which this Council is a member) on 3 July. Officer meetings with adjoining Mineral Planning Authorities and the minerals industry (as part of the duty to co-operate) are being held during July. Given the nature of the issues involved, it is expected that this part of the duty to co-operate will take until the autumn and that the Assessment will be finalised in November.

#### Duty to Co-operate and Soundness

13. The Localism Act 2011 requires the Council to co-operate with other authorities and prescribed bodies in preparing the Minerals and Waste Plan. In view of the crucial importance of this duty to co-operate to our plan-making activities – and having regard to the Inspector’s questioning of our compliance with the duty – the Council has obtained advice from Counsel in relation to this, with particular regard to the January 2011 Aggregate Assessment on which the plan was based.
14. Counsel has advised that the duty to co-operate came into force on 15 November 2011 and does not apply retrospectively, and therefore does not apply to the January 2011 Assessment. However, the Inspector is still required to assess whether the duty was met between 15 November 2011 and 31 October 2012, when the Core Strategy was submitted. There is no legal requirement that the Core Strategy has to be supported by an Assessment prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework but in assessing its soundness the Inspector will need to look at whether the Core Strategy complies with the new framework.
15. Counsel considers there is a very real risk that the Inspector will find the Core Strategy to be unsound on the ground that it is based on an Assessment which does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework. He advises that this risk could be reduced if:
- A revised Assessment is prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework;
  - The revised Assessment is the subject of engagement with other relevant bodies, including the Aggregates Working Party (i.e. the duty to co-operate is met); and
  - The policies in the Core Strategy are supported by and consistent with the revised Assessment (or can be modified to ensure they are).
16. Counsel has also advised on whether, in the light of the EU Waste Framework Directive, the Core Strategy should identify sites for waste management facilities (the current intention is that sites for waste facilities be identified in a separate Site Allocations Document.) Counsel’s advice is that there is no legal

or policy requirement for the Core Strategy to allocate sites and that non-inclusion of sites does not of itself make the Core Strategy unsound.

17. The Council has also obtained advice from Counsel on the soundness of the Core Strategy. Counsel's opinion is that the Core Strategy is unlikely to be found sound against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and that the deficiencies are too many and significant to have a realistic prospect of being remedied by modifications to the plan.
18. Counsel's view is that the time and resources that would be required to continue with the Examination would be better spent on revising the Core Strategy to comprehensively reflect the National Planning Policy Framework and the new Local Aggregates Assessment and therefore the Council should give serious consideration to withdrawing the Core Strategy.
19. In addition, we have sought technical advice from independent planning specialists on two specific issues:
  - a) The Duty to Co-operate – where the advice is that the Council has not demonstrated *de facto* conformity with the key principles set out in the duty to co-operate in relation to aggregates supply policy; but that it is probable that the duty to co-operate has been met on provision for the management of waste.
  - b) Soundness – a waste specialist has advised that there are some deficiencies in the waste data underpinning the Core Strategy which could affect its soundness; these require revisions to the evidence base but it is uncertain whether it would be possible to address any implications for policies in the Core Strategy through modifications.

#### Conclusions from Legal and Technical Advice – the Key Risks

20. The main conclusions to be drawn from the above matters are:
  - i. The Core Strategy is vulnerable to a finding of failure to meet the duty to co-operate in relation to aggregates supply and the Local Aggregates Assessment;
  - ii. Even if it meets the duty to co-operate, there is a very real risk that the Inspector will find the Core Strategy to be unsound on the ground that it is based on an Assessment which does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.
  - iii. The risk of unsoundness could be reduced by preparation of a new, National Planning Policy Framework-compliant Assessment, involving engagement with other relevant bodies, provided that the policies in the Core Strategy are supported by it.

- iv. There are deficiencies in the submitted Core Strategy that need to be addressed: these are too many and significant to have a realistic prospect of being remedied by modifications to the submitted plan.

### **Options Available to the County Council**

- 21. The Council needs to inform the Inspector after this meeting how it wishes to proceed with the Core Strategy – i.e. whether it wishes to continue with the examination of the submitted version or whether it wishes to withdraw the submitted document and re-submit a revised plan at a later date.

#### Continuation with the Examination

- 22. The option to continue with the examination of the submitted Core Strategy is considered to be extremely high risk; this is because:
  - a) The Inspector has indicated that he would first consider whether the duty to co-operate has been met. He has indicated that if the Council wished to continue with the current Core Strategy he would hold an advance hearing to consider this issue in the autumn. Counsel's opinion suggests that there is a significant risk that the Inspector would find that the Core Strategy does not meet the duty, in which case it would have to be withdrawn.
  - b) Even if the duty to co-operate test was passed, there is a very real risk that the Inspector would still find the Core Strategy unsound. This risk could be reduced by the Council preparing a new Local Aggregates Assessment in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, provided it is subject to engagement with other relevant bodies (including the South East England Aggregates Working Party, the minerals industry and other mineral planning authorities) and the policies in the Core Strategy are supported by it.
  - c) There is a significant risk that, through the duty to co-operate process associated with the new Assessment, there will be pressure from the other bodies to increase the level of provision made for sand and gravel in Oxfordshire. The significance of the duty to co-operate to the whole plan making process under the National Planning Policy Framework is such that the process of finalising the Assessment is unlikely to be straight forward.
  - d) If the new Assessment leads to a need to change significantly the strategy for mineral working, it is most unlikely that this could reasonably be done through modifications to the submitted Core Strategy. Unless then withdrawn, the Core Strategy would be very likely to be found unsound.
- 23. In addition to the above issues, the work undertaken during the suspension of the Examination process has identified a significant number of areas of the Core Strategy that would need to be modified in order to make it sound. The

nature of the modifications is such that they would need to be subject to public consultation and sustainability appraisal as well as examination by the Inspector. This would further increase the risk attached to this approach as well as adding to the timescale.

### Withdrawal of the Core Strategy

24. Withdrawal of the Core Strategy would allow a new Local Aggregates Assessment to be prepared that is in full accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and fulfils the duty to co-operate. It would also provide the Council with the opportunity to consider afresh what changes might need to be made to the Core Strategy to ensure that it is sound, in particular that it is compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework and to reflect the revocation of the South East Plan.
25. It would also allow further engagement with other authorities and bodies to ensure that the duty to co-operate has been met before a revised plan is submitted for examination. In addition, it would enable objections to the current plan to be explored further with objectors, with a view to overcoming them in a revised plan.
26. Counsel's advice is clear: the time and resources required to continue with the examination would be better spent revising the Core Strategy to comprehensively reflect the National Planning Policy Framework and the new Local Aggregates Assessment.

### **Timing Issues**

27. An assessment of the implications of the two courses of action open to the County Council are as follows:

<b>Continue</b>		<b>Withdraw</b>	
New LAA finalised	Nov 13	Nov 13	New LAA finalised
		Feb 14	Draft revised Plan agreed by Cabinet
Examination Hearings	Feb 14	Feb/Mar 14	Consultation on revised Plan
Inspectors report – with modifications	Apr 14		
Consultation on modifications	Jun/Jul 14		
		Sept 14	Revised plan agreed by Council
Council agreement of modifications	Nov 14	Oct/Nov 14	Revised plan published for representations
Further hearings (if required)	Feb 15		
		Mar 15	Revised plan submitted for examination
Inspectors final report	Apr 15		
Core Strategy adopted by Council	Jul 15	Jul 15	Examination hearings
		Oct 15	Inspectors report
		Dec 15	Core Strategy adopted by Council

28. The timeline for the 'Continue' option assumes that the Inspector would find the current submitted Core Strategy both legally compliant (i.e. the duty to co-operate has been met) and sound, which on the basis of the advice we have

received is highly doubtful. The timeline for the ‘Withdraw’ option assumes that no fundamental changes to the plan would be required; if fundamental changes to the strategy proved to be necessary, additional time would be required for further technical work and consultation.

29. Withdrawal of the Core Strategy and submission of a revised plan would require revision of the existing timetable for preparation of the Core Strategy, as contained in the Council’s Minerals and Waste Development Scheme. This Scheme sets out the documents the Council proposes to prepare to make up the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, their subject matter and the timetable for preparing them. A revised Development Scheme reflecting the revised timetable in the above table would need be approved by Cabinet and published on the Council’s website.

### **Financial Implications**

30. The Minerals and Waste Plan is included within the work priorities of the Economy and Environment Directorate and funding provision for this project and the associated costs of the Examination is held in the Minerals & Waste Project earmarked Reserve.
31. Withdrawal of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the preparation of a revised plan could create additional financial and staffing implications because part of the plan-preparation process would need to be repeated. Any additional project costs arising from this work, which cannot be funded through the earmarked Reserve, will be managed through existing budget provision within the Directorate.
32. It should also be noted that continuation with the current Core Strategy would not necessarily be a less costly option. With the high risk of this plan being found unsound if it were to proceed to Examination, there would be a need to completely repeat the Examination process in due course, following the revision of the plan. With Examination costs likely to account for a significant proportion of the total project costs, this could actually prove to be the more expensive option to pursue.

### **Conclusion**

33. If the current Core Strategy is not withdrawn and consequently proceeds to the Examination hearing sessions there is a significant risk that it will be found not to have met the duty to co-operate. Even if the duty was found to have been met, there is a high risk that the document will still be found unsound. This risk could be reduced by a new Local Aggregates Assessment being prepared, but there would still be a significant risk of unsoundness on other aspects of the Core Strategy.
34. Allowing time for a new Assessment to be prepared (without the Core Strategy being withdrawn) would require the Inspector to agree to a further delay to the examination. This would extend the uncertainty over the current plan proposals, cause further inconvenience to other participants in the

examination process and may not be acceptable to the Inspector. Also, there would be a significant risk that the plan would still be found unsound and that significant time and resources had been expended unnecessarily.

35. Withdrawal of the Core Strategy and the preparation of a revised plan would put back the time when there would be a National Planning Policy Framework-compliant adopted minerals and waste plan in place. This would extend the period during which there is no up to date development plan against which planning applications could be considered and these applications would then fall to be determined principally in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, this disadvantage would be outweighed by the considerable risks involved in continuing with the Examination and it is likely that withdrawal of the current Core Strategy would more quickly lead to a new Minerals and Waste Plan for Oxfordshire being adopted.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

36. **The Council is RECOMMENDED to:**
- i. withdraw the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy;**
  - ii. prepare a revised Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan in accordance with a new Minerals and Waste Development Scheme.**

Martin Tugwell  
Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)

Contact Officer: Chris Kenneford, Tel 01865 815615

June 2013

## **Appendix 3**

### **Report to County Council Cabinet**

**26 November 2013**



## **Appendix 3 – Report to County Council Cabinet 26 November 2013**

### **CABINET – 26 NOVEMBER 2013**

#### **OXFORDSHIRE LOCAL AGGREGATE ASSESSMENT 2013**

##### **Report by Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)**

### **Introduction**

1. The County Council has a statutory duty to prepare a new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan, to provide an effective planning strategy and policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in the county, consistent with environmental, social and economic needs. The programme for preparing the plan is the subject of a separate report to this meeting.
2. Under the Government's National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (NPPF), the County Council must prepare a Local Aggregate Assessment annually. In addition, the duty to co-operate introduced by the Localism Act 2011 applies to the preparation of a local aggregate assessment since this is an activity supporting the preparation of a local plan relating to a strategic matter.
3. The Local Aggregate Assessment is a key part of the evidence base for the plan. It will establish the amount of provision for mineral working that should be made in the plan for the period to 2030. It will also be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. This report recommends a Local Aggregate Assessment for Oxfordshire for 2013.

### **Local Aggregate Assessment**

4. The Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) provides a foundation for the development of the minerals strategy and associated policies in the Minerals and Waste Plan. Government policy in the NPPF is that the starting point for the LAA is the 10-year sales average (of minerals extracted in the county); but it goes on to say that authorities also need to consider other relevant local information.

#### *Sales of minerals over the last 10 years*

5. An important local consideration is that Oxfordshire's mineral resources, particularly sand and gravel, are of strategic importance and that moving forward it is expected that they will continue to serve not only local but wider markets. However, over the last 10 years sales of minerals from Oxfordshire's quarries have fallen. In particular, sales of sharp sand and gravel have fallen nearly 60%, from 1.37 million tonnes in 2003 to 0.56 million tonnes in 2012.

6. The decline in sales over this period reflects the situation nationally and to a large extent is due to the reduction in demand for construction materials resulting from the recession; but it has also been influenced by commercial decisions by mineral producers to concentrate production at quarries in other locations, particularly Gloucestershire. Oxfordshire has moved from being a net exporter of sand and gravel to a net importer. In 2009 the net import of sharp sand and gravel into Oxfordshire was 0.13 million tonnes, 17% of total consumption in the county.
7. Sales of sharp sand and gravel in Oxfordshire have increased slightly since 2010, but the 2012 figure of 0.56 million tonnes is well below the 10 year sales average of 0.81 million tonnes. If annual sales were to increase further, to around the 10-year average level, it is likely the County would once again become a net exporter of sharp sand and gravel, reflecting the strategic significance of Oxfordshire’s mineral resources.

### *Draft Local Aggregate Assessment*

8. Supported by consultants Atkins, we produced a draft LAA in June 2013. This set out a proposed methodology that applied an adjustment factor to the 10-year average sales figure that sought to offset the impact of local circumstances that, arguably, have seen Oxfordshire’s sales in the last 10 years suppressed more than has been the case nationally. This methodology was based on applying national consumption per head figures to Oxfordshire’s population forecasts, to produce estimates of quantities of minerals consumed in Oxfordshire; and then applying an adjustment for the ratio of sales to consumption over the last 10 years to reflect the average net import or export position.
9. This adjustment methodology produced figures somewhat higher than the 10 year sales averages, as shown in the following table. The draft LAA (June 2013) presented these as options.

Mineral type	10 year Past Sales Average (million tonnes per annum)	Adjusted LAA Method (million tonnes per annum)
Sharp sand & gravel	0.81	0.96
Soft sand	0.19	0.24
Total sand & gravel	1.00	1.20
Crushed rock (limestone & ironstone)	0.47	0.58

10. Engagement and discussions on the draft LAA took place over the course of the summer and into early autumn with the South East England Aggregate Working Party and adjoining mineral planning authorities, as required by the

NPPF and under the ‘duty to co-operate’, and also with the minerals industry and local environmental groups opposed to new mineral working. The bodies concerned and details of meetings and correspondence are listed in Annex 1.

11. Feedback from this engagement was variable and highlighted the challenge associated with developing an approach that is easy to understand and apply but which takes into account local circumstances. Key themes in responses were:
  - i. support for Oxfordshire recognising the strategic importance of its mineral resources and that continued net import of sand and gravel is not a sustainable supply strategy in the medium to longer term;
  - ii. concern that the proposed adjustment methodology is not necessarily transparent and may not be robust, and consequently may not be defensible at the plan examination;
  - iii. questioning why Oxfordshire is not just using the 10 year sales average, as proposed in most other LAAs; and
  - iv. a mix of views on the level of provision, particularly for sharp sand and gravel, ranging from too low through to too high.
  
12. The South East England Aggregates Working Party was generally supportive of the adjusted methodology approach. The minerals industry expressed support for an LAA approach that results in figures above the 10 year sales average. Gloucestershire and Wiltshire Councils had concerns about the methodology but welcomed an approach that would meet future demand and remove the need for imports of sand and gravel from those counties. Other adjoining and South East authorities were less concerned about the level of provision but some had concerns about the robustness of the methodology and inconsistency with the approach used by other authorities. The local environmental groups thought there was no need for an adjusted methodology and that the 10 year sales average adequately took into account fluctuations in supply and demand over the period.

### *Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group*

13. A Cabinet Advisory Group (chaired by Cllr David Nimmo Smith with Cllr Anne Purse as deputy chairman) has been established. This Group is already considering work on the new Minerals and Waste Plan and will advise the Cabinet on key issues at the appropriate decision points.
  
14. The Cabinet Advisory Group considered the draft LAA and the feedback from the engagement with other authorities, organisations and interest groups at its meeting on 23 October.
  
15. The Group’s discussion highlighted concerns that the adjustment methodology proposed in the LAA was unclear and not easy to understand. Members were concerned that the Council’s evidence would be hard to defend at later stages in the process. In addition, the members on the Group emphasised the fact that based on the 10-year sales average there would already exist scope for sharp sand and gravel production within Oxfordshire to increase substantially above the current level; and they questioned the need

for setting a figure that is higher than the 10-year sales average. On this point, members questioned why Oxfordshire should adopt a different approach from that apparently being taken by other mineral planning authorities.

16. The Cabinet Advisory Group asked the Officers to look again at the LAA methodology.

*Further consideration*

17. Within the South East, the draft Oxfordshire LAA is the only one that has proposed an adjustment to the 10 year sales average. All other LAAs are based on a 10 year sales average, unless the authority already has an adopted plan with a different figure, except for one case where the average of the last 3 years sales has been used because there were no sales during the first part of the 10 year period. Outside the South East, all LAAs that we are aware of use the 10 year sales average.
18. The adjusted methodology proposed in the draft LAA relies on certain assumptions and relationships which are open to challenge and may be difficult to explain and defend; and there is a risk that the approach would be found unsound at examination. These include the use of population as a proxy for demand; the application of national consumption per head figures to Oxfordshire; the use of the ratio of sales to estimated consumption as the net import or export position in Oxfordshire over the last 10 years; and the use of an average of those figures as a net import or export factor as an adjustment factor applied to the level of provision in future years.
19. Having looked at the LAA methodology in the light of these factors and the responses to the June 2013 draft LAA, I am not convinced of the need for an adjustment to be made to the 10 year sales average. There is significant headroom between the 10 year average figures and the position in 2012, as shown in the table below, which would enable sales to increase such that Oxfordshire could move from being a net importer to a net exporter of sharp sand and gravel.

Mineral type	10 year Past Sales Average (million tonnes per annum)	Sales in 2012 (million tonnes per annum)
Sharp sand & gravel	0.81	0.56
Soft sand	0.19	0.16
Total sand & gravel	1.00	0.72
Crushed rock (limestone & ironstone)	0.47	0.24

20. The NPPF requires the LAA to be updated annually. This updating should include an assessment for each mineral of the current 10-year sales average as the basic indicator of demand; the reserves of minerals already with permission (the landbank); and the additional provision that will need to be made in order to meet expected demand. Given that these figures will change annually, this points to an approach in the revised Minerals and Waste Plan whereby the minerals policies do not specify the exact amount of mineral to be provided through the plan but state that permissions will be granted as and when required in order to meet the level of need indicated by the most recent LAA and landbank position.
21. This reflects the fact that a fundamental part of any plan is the need to monitor and review it in light of changes in circumstances. But it would also help avoid the Minerals and Waste Plan becoming outdated too quickly and hence reduce the frequency with which policies would need to be fundamentally reviewed.
22. I consider that, in conjunction with this type of approach, it would be appropriate for the LAA to be based solely on the 10-year sales average. In addition to the headroom for an increase in sales that this would in any case provide, any increased requirement for mineral supply, as indicated by an increase in the 10-year sales average, could be accommodated through the flexibility provided by the plan policies. There would be therefore no need for the 10-year sales average to be adjusted through the use of a methodology using a proxy for actual demand (such as the population proxy proposed in the draft LAA).
23. The views of the South East England Aggregates Working Party, the minerals industry and key adjoining authorities on the use of a 10-year sales average for Oxfordshire rather than the adjusted methodology have been sought and will be reported at the meeting.
24. Subject to consideration of those views, I consider that the draft Oxfordshire LAA should now be finalised with a conclusion that, notwithstanding the fall in sales over the last 10 years, the appropriate LAA figures for Oxfordshire are the 10 year sales averages. These figures should then be used as the basis for the provision for mineral working to be made in the draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan that is produced for public consultation in February 2014. The LAA will be published alongside the draft plan, as one of the evidence documents, which will provide a further opportunity for comment to be made on it. These figures should also be used as the basis for calculating the Oxfordshire landbank, which will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

## **Financial and Staff Implications**

25. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan is included within the work priorities of the Environment and Economy Directorate and funding provision for this project is held in the Minerals and Waste Plan Project earmarked reserve. This report does not raise any additional financial or staffing implications.

## RECOMMENDATION

26. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**
- (a) approve the 10 year average sales figures set out in the table in paragraph 19 of the report as the provision figures in the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2013, for use as the basis for provision for mineral working in the consultation draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan and for calculating the Oxfordshire landbank;**
  - (b) authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to finalise the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2013 for publication.**

Martin Tugwell  
Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)

Background papers:

- i. Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment Final Draft Report June 2013.
- ii. Responses from consultees on the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment Final Draft Report June 2013.

All background papers are kept in the Minerals and Waste Policy Team at Speedwell House, Oxford.

Contact Officer: Peter Day, tel. Oxford 815544

November 2013

## Annex 1

**Meetings and Correspondence with Other Local Authorities and Organisations  
July – October 2013 on the Draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment  
June 2013**

Organisation	Meeting or Correspondence	Response
South East England Aggregate Working Party	Meeting 03.07.2013	Minutes of Meeting
South West Aggregate Working Party	Email exchange + follow-up phone call	Written response 19.08.2013
West Midlands Aggregate Working Party	Email sent 21.08.2013	No response *
East Midlands Aggregate Working Party	Email exchange	Email 23.09.2013
East of England Aggregate Working Party	Email exchange	Email 09.08.2013
Buckinghamshire CC	Meeting 25.07.2013	Email 30.08.2013
West Berkshire Council	Meeting 25.07.2013+ follow-up email	No written response **
Reading BC		No written response **
Wokingham BC		No written response **
Bracknell Forest Council		No written response **
Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead	Meeting 18.09.2013 + follow-up email	No written response **
Slough BC		No written response **
Hampshire CC	Meeting 05.07.2013 + follow-up email	No written response **
Surrey CC		No written response **
Kent CC	Email exchange	Email 08.07.2013
East Sussex CC	via SEEAWP + follow-up email 21.08.2103	No written response ***
West Sussex CC	via SEEAWP+ follow-up email	Email 30.08.2013
Isle of Wight Council	via SEEAWP	Email 02.07.2013
Wiltshire Council	Meeting 29.08.2013	Written officer response 12.09.2013
Swindon BC		
Gloucestershire CC	Meeting 05.07.2013	Email 06.08.2013
Warwickshire CC	Meeting 10.07.2013	Email 31.07.2013
Northamptonshire CC	Meeting 24.07.2013 + follow-up email	Email 21.08.2013
Milton Keynes Council		No written response **
Cherwell DC	Meeting of Oxfordshire Planning Policy Officers 20.09.2013	No written response **
Oxford City Council		No written response **
South Oxfordshire DC		Written officer response 04.10.2013
Vale of White Horse DC		No written response **
West Oxfordshire DC		Written officer response 20.09.2013
Environment Agency	Meeting 16.07.2013	Letter 06.09.2013
Mineral Products Association	Meetings 31.07.2013 +	Letter 27.08.2013

Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group	follow-up email and 01.10.2013	Written response from Hills Quarry Products Limited 31.07.2013
Local Environmental Groups (OXAGE): CPRE; AGGROW; OUTRAGE; Eynsham; BACHPORT; PAGE; CAGE; SEAG	Meetings 13.09.2013 and 04.10.2013	Written report prepared by consultants 03.10.2013

\* No response has been received from the West Midlands Aggregates Working Party despite a reminder being sent.

\*\* No written comments have been received following meetings with West Berkshire Council, Reading BC, Wokingham BC, Bracknell Forest Council, Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead, Slough BC, Hampshire CC, Surrey CC, Milton Keynes Council, Cherwell DC, Oxford City Council and Vale of White Horse DC. At the meetings with these authorities, no significant concerns were raised over the draft Local Aggregate Assessment with the exception of Windsor & Maidenhead, who expressed concerns over the complexity of the methodology (but not over the resultant provision figures). (These concerns are similar to those raised in the response by Buckinghamshire CC.) Windsor & Maidenhead were asked to provide written comments in a follow-up email, but none have been received.

\*\*\* No response has been received from East Sussex CC. (There is very little mineral supply relationship between Oxfordshire and East Sussex.)



## **Appendix 4**

### **Report to County Council Cabinet**

**28 January 2014**

## **Appendix 4 – Report to County Council Cabinet 28 January 2014**

### **CABINET – 28 JANUARY 2014**

## **OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY – CONSULTATION DRAFT**

### **Report by Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)**

#### **Introduction**

1. The County Council has a statutory duty to prepare a new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan, to provide an effective planning strategy and policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in the county, consistent with environmental, social and economic needs. The Plan must be prepared in accordance with current government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and having due regard to the emerging new National Planning Practice Guidance.
2. The Cabinet on 26 November 2013 approved a revised Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (Fifth Revision) 2013, setting out the following programme for preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:
  - Public consultation on draft revised Plan – Feb/March 2014;
  - Consultation on proposed submission document – Oct/Nov 2014;
  - Submit Plan to Secretary of State for examination – March 2015;
  - Examination hearings – July 2015;
  - Inspector’s report – October 2015;
  - Council adopts Plan – December 2015.
3. This report recommends a draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy for public consultation.

#### **Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy**

##### *General Principles*

4. Taking into account the context now provided by government policy and emerging new guidance, and the urgent need for a new plan to replace the out of date Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996), the new Minerals and Waste Development Scheme provides for a single new plan document to be prepared. This will focus on the provision that needs to be made for mineral working and waste management over the period to 2030; the strategic framework for delivering this, including the broad spatial strategy with areas of search for mineral working; and criteria based policies against which planning applications would be considered. This approach should provide an appropriate level of flexibility in the provision to be made for mineral working and waste management capacity to respond to assessed needs.

5. In particular, this approach enables us to prepare a plan that makes clear the strategic importance of Oxfordshire's mineral resources but manages the release and development of these resources in a way that both alleviates the concerns of local people about unnecessary and unacceptable mineral working and at the same time provides the minerals industry with the flexibility it needs to plan for and bring forward new proposals when and where they are required in order to meet the need for construction materials. It should provide a robust basis for decision making on planning applications, to ensure that mineral working takes place where it is needed in the County and takes place only in suitable locations and where the proposals involved are environmentally acceptable.
6. This approach will provide the quickest and most effective way for the Council to put in place an up to date local policy framework for decision making on planning applications for minerals and waste developments. At the same time it will avoid the plan-making process getting bogged down in detailed, site-specific issues that are more appropriately considered through the planning application process.
7. In preparing the draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy we have taken the previous Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (Submission Document October 2012) as a starting point. We have reviewed the policies and supporting text having regard to:
  - representations that were made on the Proposed Submission Document May 2012;
  - the National Planning Policy Framework March 2012;
  - current and emerging updated National Waste Planning Policy (PPS10);
  - emerging new National Planning Practice Guidance;
  - views of other authorities, statutory bodies and organisations that we have engaged with under the duty to co-operate and through informal consultation;
  - new information that is now available, in particular:
    - the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment agreed by the Cabinet on 26 November 2013;
    - a review of the Oxfordshire Waste Needs Assessment May 2012.
8. A draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy is at Annex 1. Following three initial sections setting out an introduction and background to the plan, and the Vision and Objectives of the plan, it is in three main policy sections: Minerals Planning Strategy; Waste Planning Strategy; and Core Policies. The policies are complete but some further updating of the supporting text is needed, as indicated in the document, specifically: maps of existing mineral and waste sites in section 2 (background); and quantities of waste arising and needing to be managed in Oxfordshire in section 5 (waste). These are factual updates that do not affect the policies. They will be made before the document is published for consultation. The main policy elements, focussing

on changes from the previous Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, are set out below.

### *Minerals Planning Strategy*

9. Policy M1 seeks to maximise the contribution to aggregate supply from recycled and secondary aggregates. The previous target has been omitted as the basis for that was the now revoked South East Plan, and inclusion of a target will not in itself deliver increased supply of this material and could be misconstrued as a maximum level to be achieved.
10. Policy M2 requires provision to be made for the supply of land-won aggregates (sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock), and for landbanks of permissions to be maintained, to meet the requirement in the most recent annual Local Aggregate Assessment. Since the Local Aggregate Assessment may change from year to year, the actual requirement figures are not included in the policy. A section has been added to the policy providing for a broad balance of sharp sand and gravel production capacity between western Oxfordshire and southern Oxfordshire, to enable local supply of aggregate to the county's main growth areas.
11. Policy M3 identifies the following areas of search where permission would be granted for the working of aggregate minerals provided certain criteria are met:
  - A. Sharp sand and gravel:  
Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton (including Lower Evenlode Valley)  
Lower Windrush Valley  
North East of Caversham  
Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap)
  - B. Soft sand  
The Corallian Ridge between Oxford and Faringdon  
Duns Tew
  - C. Crushed rock  
North West of Bicester  
South of the A40 near Burford  
East and south east of Faringdon

The main change from the areas included previously is that instead of a specific location being identified for a new working area to replace Sutton Courtenay, a wider area of search encompassing all the significant sharp sand and gravel resource areas in southern Oxfordshire (between Oxford and the Goring Gap) is included.

12. Policy M4 is a new policy that includes and adds to the criteria for granting permission for working aggregate minerals that were previously part of policy M3. These criteria would act to ensure that new working areas are only permitted when and where they are needed in order to meet the requirement in the Local Aggregate Assessment and to achieve a balance in supply of

sharp sand and gravel from western and southern Oxfordshire. The criteria include measures to limit the number of mineral working sites in western Oxfordshire and in the Caversham area; and to ensure any new working in southern Oxfordshire would only be in place of an existing quarry.

13. Policy M5 on aggregates rail depots is similar to the previous policy M4.
14. Policy M6 on non-aggregate minerals includes similar provisions for building stone and clay as in previous policy M5 and adds specific provisions for chalk, fuller's earth and oil and gas, in line with national policy and guidance. There are currently no licensed areas for oil or gas exploration or production in Oxfordshire but the specific inclusion of these minerals would provide the Council with a policy basis for the consideration of any planning applications that may be made in the event that the Government does issue oil and gas licences covering Oxfordshire.
15. Policy M7 on safeguarding mineral resources is similar to the previous policy M6 but the mineral safeguarding areas will need to be identified on a map in the draft plan. This map has not yet been prepared but the mineral safeguarding areas will be drawn from the published British Geological Survey maps. The identification of these areas will be for safeguarding purposes only and they will have no policy significance for the location of mineral workings or the consideration of planning applications for mineral working.
16. Policy M8 on restoration of mineral workings is a simplified version of the previous policy M7, setting out more clearly and succinctly the factors to be taken into account in considering restoration and removing overlap with the core policies.

### *Waste Planning Strategy*

17. Policy W1 reiterates the commitment to net self-sufficiency in provision for waste management from the previous policy, but the actual amounts of waste to be managed are not included since forecasts may change and up to date figures will be included in annual monitoring reports.
18. Policy W2 on management of waste from outside Oxfordshire expands the previous policy to distinguish between facilities for residual waste treatment and for recycling and composting, and broadens it to cover inert as well as non-hazardous waste.
19. Policy W3 on diversion of waste from landfill includes the same targets as in the previous policy but makes it clearer that proposals for waste management should demonstrate that they provide for waste management as far as reasonably possible up the waste hierarchy.
20. Policy W4 on waste management capacity requirements omits the waste requirement figures that were included in the previous policy and instead states that capacity requirements will be monitored and updated in the annual monitoring reports. In addition to generally providing for additional waste

management facilities to meet capacity requirements, it includes particular statements from previous policy W5 encouraging further recycling and composting facilities but saying further capacity for residual waste treatment will only be permitted if it would not impede the achievement of waste management targets.

21. Policy W5 on locations for waste management facilities is a simplified version of the previous policy but retains the same overall spatial strategy for strategic facilities within a core part of the county; non-strategic facilities near to the main towns; and only small scale facilities in more rural areas.
22. Policy W6 on siting of waste management facilities is similar to the previous policy but reference to sites within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is omitted as this is covered by the core policy on landscape.
23. Policy W7 on landfill is the same as the previous policy except for a change in the order of the sections.
24. Policy W8 on hazardous waste is the same as the previous policy but it now covers hazardous waste only and does not include radioactive waste.
25. Policy W9 on radioactive waste broadens the previous policy to cover the possibility of proposals being made for facilities for low level radioactive waste elsewhere in Oxfordshire, as well as making specific provision for managing radioactive wastes at Harwell and Culham. The provisions for Harwell and Culham are as in the previous policy, although the need to management of intermediate level radioactive waste has now been met by the recently permitted storage building. Elsewhere in the county, low level radioactive waste facilities would only be permitted if they are substantially required for the management of waste from Oxfordshire.
26. Policy W10 on waste water and sewage sludge is a new policy providing for additional capacity where it is needed to extend or replace existing facilities for the treatment and disposal of this waste.
27. Policy W11 on safeguarding waste management sites includes the previous policy W10 but expands it to include reference to specified sites to be safeguarded that are to be listed in an appendix to the plan and in annual monitoring reports.

### *Core Policies for Minerals and Waste*

28. Policies C1 and C2 on sustainable development and climate change are new policies. The former is a standard policy that planning inspectors have been requiring all plans to include, stating a presumption in favour of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. The latter responds to an apparent expectation by inspectors that plans will contain a policy on climate change and reflects what was previously included in supporting text.

29. Policy C3 on flooding is unchanged from the previous policy C1 but adds a section on increasing flood storage capacity in the flood plain (taken from previous policy M7 on restoration of mineral workings).
30. Policy C4 on water environment is unchanged from the previous policy C2.
31. Policy C5 on general environmental and amenity protection includes previous policy C3 but adds a list of relevant impacts to clarify what the policy covers.
32. Policy C6 on agricultural land and soils slightly amends but essentially has the same meaning as previous policy C4.
33. Policy C7 on biodiversity and geodiversity has been rewritten from the previous policy C5, to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. It includes a general requirement to conserve and, where possible, enhance biodiversity; and sets out more clearly the hierarchy of international, national and local designations and the approaches to be taken to considering development proposals that affect them.
34. Policy C8 on landscape soils slightly amends but essentially has the same meaning as previous policy C6.
35. Policy C9 on historic environment and archaeology has been rewritten from the previous policy C7, to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. It distinguishes between designated and non-designated heritage assets and the approaches to be taken to considering development proposals that affect them.
36. Policies C10 and C11 on transport and rights of way slightly amend but essentially have the same meaning as previous policies C8 and C9.

### *Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group*

37. The Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group (chaired by Cllr David Nimmo Smith with Cllr Anne Purse as deputy chairman) considered a draft set of objectives and policies at its meeting on 19 December and was broadly supportive of them as a basis for a consultation draft plan. The Group suggested some detailed amendments to policy wording and these have been taken into account in the draft plan at Annex 1.

### **Consultation**

38. Public consultation on the draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy is proposed to be undertaken in February/March 2014, over a period of at least six weeks. All organisations and individuals on the consultation list from the earlier Minerals and Waste Core Strategy will be notified and the plan and supporting documents will be published on the Council's website. Paper copies will be made available in the case of people without internet access.

39. The supporting documents will in particular include the Local Aggregate Assessment and the Waste Needs Assessment Review. In addition, sustainability appraisal incorporating strategic environmental assessment is being carried out as an integral part of preparation of the plan and an environmental report on the draft plan will be published.
40. Engagement with other councils and statutory bodies under the duty to co-operate will continue in parallel with the consultation and beyond, as part of an on-going process as required by the Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
41. The outcome from the consultation will be reported to the Cabinet in the summer and will be taken into account in shaping the proposed submission version of the plan. The plan will then be taken to full Council for approval, before being published for consultation in October / November 2014 and submitted to the government for independent examination in 2015.

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

42. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan is included within the work priorities of the Environment and Economy Directorate and funding provision for this project is held in the Minerals and Waste Plan Project earmarked reserve. This report does not raise any additional financial or staffing implications. The resources required and available to meet the programme for preparation of the plan will be kept under review as part of the management of the project.

### **Legal Implications**

43. The County Council is required to prepare a minerals and waste local plan under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). The effect of the European Waste Framework Directive, 2008 (2008/98/EC), as transposed through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, is to require waste planning authorities to put in place waste local plans.

### **Risk Management**

44. The complexity of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan process and the potential implications for major mineral working and waste management proposals emphasise the importance of good project management and regular reporting on risk management, which have been put in place.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

45. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**
  - (a) **agree the draft Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy at Annex 1, subject to final detailed amendment, updating and editing, as a draft for consultation;**



- (b) authorise the Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning) to:**
  - (i) carry out final detailed amendment, updating and editing of the draft Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment;**
  - (ii) publish the draft Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy for public consultation.**

Martin Tugwell  
Deputy Director for Environment & Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)

Contact Officer: Peter Day, tel. Oxford 815544

January 2014

## **Appendix 5**

### **Report to County Council Cabinet**

**25 November 2014**

## **Appendix 5 – Report to County Council Cabinet 25 November 2014**

### **CABINET – 25 NOVEMBER 2014**

- OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN:**
- A. OXFORDSHIRE LOCAL AGGREGATE ASSESSMENT 2014**
  - B. MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN, PART 1 – CORE STRATEGY – PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT**
  - C. REVIEW OF OXFORDSHIRE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**
  - D. OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS & WASTE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (SIXTH REVISION) 2014**

**Report by Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning**

#### **Introduction**

1. The County Council has a statutory duty to prepare a new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan, to provide an effective planning strategy and policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in the county, consistent with environmental, social and economic needs. The Plan must be prepared in accordance with current government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and the new National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014), and having due regard to the recent National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014).
2. This report covers four separate but connected documents that relate to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:
  - A. Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014
  - B. Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document
  - C. Review of Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement
  - D. Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Development Scheme (Sixth Revision) 2014

#### **A. Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014**

3. Under the Government's National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 (NPPF), the County Council must prepare a Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) annually. The LAA is a key part of the evidence base for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. It establishes the amount of provision for mineral working that should be made in the plan, thereby providing a foundation for the minerals strategy and associated policies. It will also be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. This report recommends an LAA for Oxfordshire for 2014.

## **Draft Local Aggregate Assessment**

4. Consultants LUC and Cuesta Consulting have provided technical support in the preparation of the LAA, the final draft of which is attached as Annex 1. Preparation of the LAA has been informed by discussion at meetings of the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group on 11 September and 16 October 2014 (with the consultants) as well detailed comments by members of the Group on a draft of the LAA.
5. Government policy in the NPPF is that the starting point for the LAA is the 10-year sales average (of minerals extracted in the county) but that other relevant local information must also be considered.
6. Oxfordshire's aggregate mineral resources – sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock (limestone) – are of strategic importance and have served not only local but wider markets. However, over the last 10 years sales of minerals from Oxfordshire's quarries have fallen. In particular, sales of sharp sand and gravel fell 66% from 2004 to 2013. Sales of soft sand declined much less sharply but there was also a significant fall in sales of crushed rock extracted in the county. The 10 years sales figures for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock are set out in Tables 3.1, 3.2 and 3.6 respectively in section 3 of the LAA at Annex 1.
7. The decline in sales over this period in part reflects the situation nationally, whereby there has been a general reduction in demand for construction materials resulting from the recession. But this effect has been compounded in Oxfordshire by temporary commercial decisions to concentrate production at quarries in other locations, particularly Gloucestershire (sharp sand and gravel) and Somerset (crushed rock). Consequently, Oxfordshire moved from being a net exporter of sand and gravel to a net importer; in 2009 the net import of sand and gravel into Oxfordshire was 0.13 million tonnes, 17% of total consumption in the county that year.
8. The LAA at Annex 1 sets out the position of Oxfordshire as a source and producer of aggregate minerals, including secondary and recycled materials; and provides a detailed analysis of the supply of aggregates in and to the county over the previous 10 years. It also considers a number of factors affecting supply and demand, which the consultants have identified as other relevant local information that should be taken into account. It assesses each of these factors in terms of whether they justify deviation from the 10 year sales average figures.
9. In addition to the commercial decisions of quarry operators, the LAA identifies the increased demand for aggregates that is expected to result from economic growth, population growth and housing construction, and major infrastructure projects and key developments as pointing to a need for future provision to be at a higher level than the 10 year sales average. The LAA therefore concludes that it would be unwise to rely on the 10 year sales average as a guide for future provision in Oxfordshire, notwithstanding that use of this average is intended to overcome the effects of short term variations in sales.

10. The consultants acknowledge that it is difficult to quantify the effect of future increased demand for aggregates on the levels of provision required, but they have calculated upward adjustments of the 2003 – 2012 average sales figures by relating past sales in Oxfordshire to those in England as a whole. (This 10 year period has been used because England figures for 2013 are not yet available.) The resultant figures compared with the 10 year sales averages are shown in the following table.

Mineral type	10 year Sales Average 2003 – 2012 (million tonnes per annum)	Adjusted 10 year Sales Average (million tonnes per annum)
Sharp sand & gravel	0.812	1.015
Soft sand	0.189	0.189
Crushed rock	0.470	0.584

11. The increased demand for aggregates from expected growth in Oxfordshire will at least to some extent be accommodated by these adjustments but it is possible that future demand could exceed these adjusted levels. The LAA therefore recommends that provision for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan period – to 2031 – is initially set at these adjusted levels but that actual sales are monitored annually and that, if new evidence indicates increased demand, these levels of provision be reviewed. This is in line with the NPPF requirement for LAAs to be prepared annually and with requirements for local plans to be monitored regularly and reviewed when necessary.
12. On the basis of these adjusted figures, and taking into account existing permitted reserves of minerals at the end of 2013, the LAA calculates the remaining supply requirement for the period to 2031 that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan needs to make provision for to be:  
 Sharp sand and gravel – 11.651 million tonnes;  
 Soft sand – 1.238 million tonnes;  
 Crushed rock – no requirement.  
 (Some of the sharp sand and gravel requirement will be met as a result of decisions on planning applications made in 2014, for extensions to Caversham Quarry – 1.86 million tonnes and Gill Mill Quarry – 5 million tonnes, although not all of the latter will be worked within the period to 2031.)

### **Consultation with Aggregate Working Party and Other Authorities**

13. The NPPF requires mineral planning authorities to participate in an Aggregate Working Party and to take the advice of that Party into account in preparing their LAA. The Council is a member of the South East Aggregate Working Party (SEEAWP), which includes all mineral planning authorities in the South East and representatives of the minerals industry. SEEAWP considered the draft Oxfordshire LAA at a meeting on 27 October and agreed it.

14. In addition, the duty to co-operate introduced by the Localism Act 2011 applies to the preparation of the LAA since it supports the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Engagement and discussions are taking place with adjoining mineral planning authorities and other, more distant authorities from which Oxfordshire imports significant quantities of aggregate, including engagement with adjoining Aggregate Working Parties. No significant strategic issues have been raised so far but the outcome of this engagement will be reported at the meeting.

### **Conclusion**

15. I consider the approach and methodology used by the consultants in the LAA to be robust and defensible; and that the LAA provides a realistic set of figures for aggregate minerals provision for use in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and also as the basis for calculating the Oxfordshire landbank, which will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
16. Subject to the consideration of any views received from other mineral planning authorities under the duty to co-operate, I consider that the draft LAA at Annex 1 should be agreed and published as the Oxfordshire LAA for 2014.

## **B. Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document**

17. The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy – Consultation Draft February 2014 was agreed by Cabinet on 28 January 2014. It was published for a 6 week period of consultation commencing on 24 February. The Consultation Draft Plan is on the Council's website at: <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/minerals-and-waste-core-strategy>
18. In the light of comments made on the consultation document and taking into account the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 and other technical work carried out over the past year, and also having due regard to current national planning policy and guidance, the plan now needs to be amended in certain respects. The amended plan will need to be approved by Full Council before it is published for a further round of consultation early in 2015 and then submitted to the Government for independent examination by a planning inspector.
19. Over the past six months the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group has met five times to consider the comments made on the draft plan and the changes that should be made to it. Work on amendments to the plan has not yet been completed but, taking into account the views of the Cabinet Advisory Group, the main changes required have now been established. This report recommends a draft amended version of the plan, as attached at Annex 3, including key changes to policies and supporting text but with more detailed amendments to be made before the plan goes to Full Council.

## **Responses to Consultation**

20. Responses to the Consultation Draft Plan were received from 155 organisations and individuals. These responses made a total of 644 separate comments on the draft plan. The respondents are listed, grouped by category of organisation, in Annex 2. A summary of issues raised in the consultation responses is also included in Annex 2.
21. A schedule of all the responses received, with a summary of the comments made by each respondent, grouped by section, policy and paragraph of the plan is available in the Members' Resources Centre. The full responses can be seen in the Minerals and Waste Policy Team at Speedwell House, Oxford. County Council responses to these comments are being prepared and will be reported to Full Council with the amended plan.

## **Key Issues and Amendments to the Plan**

### Structure of Plan

22. The consultation draft plan was prepared on the basis that only strategic 'areas of search' would be identified, within which planning applications for minerals and waste developments would be considered against criteria, and that specific sites for development would not be included in the plan. Consultation responses have criticised this approach as not giving sufficient certainty where new developments will be located, being likely to result in piecemeal development with a risk of over-provision, and not being in accordance with national policy and guidance.
23. New national planning guidance makes it clear that plans should as far as possible identify specific sites for development. It is therefore now proposed to change to a two-part plan (as was proposed in the 2012 version of the plan). The Core Strategy would become Part 1 of the plan, setting out broad strategies for the location of minerals and waste developments; and a Part 2 – Site Allocations would be prepared subsequently, identifying specific sites for development within the parameters set by the Core Strategy.
24. The government's preference is for single local plan documents, but the inclusion of sites in the Core Strategy would significantly delay its progress to adoption (by at least a year) because further technical assessment and consultation would be required. It is considered more important to get the Core Strategy adopted as quickly as possible, to provide an up to date local minerals and waste policy framework for the determination of planning applications. The two-stage plan approach has been endorsed in recently adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plans elsewhere in the country.

### Plan Period

25. Responses have suggested the plan should cover the period to the end of 2031, rather than 2030. This would tie in with the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and other forecasting data and with the periods

of other emerging new local plans. It will also ensure that the plan will have a life of at least 15 years when it is adopted (scheduled for December 2015), in line with national policy. The amended plan at Annex 3 includes this revised end date for the plan.

### Minerals Policies

26. The majority of responses on the consultation draft of the plan were made on the minerals section (section 4), particularly on the policy on provision for aggregate mineral working (policy M2) and the policies on locations for aggregate mineral working (policies M3 and M4).

### Level of Provision for Mineral Supply

27. Consultation responses have included comments that policy M1 on recycled and secondary aggregates should include targets for supply and that policy M2 on provision for working aggregate minerals should include the levels of provision to be planned for.
28. There is no requirement in national policy or guidance for such policies to include targets or levels of provision. To do so would make the policies inflexible and, in the case of recycled and secondary aggregates, could be misconstrued as maximum levels to be achieved. Under the NPPF, levels of provision for aggregate mineral working are to be determined through the annual Local Aggregate Assessment. This means that the provision figures are liable to change throughout the plan period, and their inclusion in policy could result in a need for frequent review of the plan.
29. Policy M1 is proposed to be amended: to state that as far as practicable demand for minerals should be met from recycled and secondary aggregate in preference to primary aggregate; to refer also to secondary aggregates from sources outside Oxfordshire; to state that where practicable aggregates from outside Oxfordshire should be transported by rail; and to state that sites for recycled and secondary aggregate supply will be identified in the Site Allocations document.
30. The only change proposed to policy M2 is to delete the paragraph about enabling a balance of sand and gravel production between western and southern Oxfordshire, as this can more effectively be achieved through policies M3 and M4 of the plan (see below).
31. The levels of provision for aggregate mineral working to be made through the plan have been revised in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014, as set out in part A of this report. These should now be included in the text of the plan, supporting policy M2, as being the most up to date figures available.

### Locational Strategy for Mineral Working

32. As referred to above, the amendments that are proposed to the plan in the light of comments on the consultation draft and national policy and guidance



include a change from the areas of search for mineral working that were identified in policy M3 and shown on maps in the draft plan. In line with a change to a two-part plan, it is now proposed that policy M3 should identify strategic resource areas as principle locations for working sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock (limestone) and that the locations of these areas be indicated on a key diagram. These strategic resource areas broadly cover the locations of the previous areas of search but are less defined, leaving the delineation of working areas to be determined through the identification of specific sites in the Site Allocations document.

33. Following on from this change, policy M4 is proposed to be changed to a set of criteria for the identification of specific sites for mineral working within the strategic resource areas, for inclusion in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations document. Currently the majority of Oxfordshire's sharp sand and gravel production and permitted reserves is in the western part of the county, whereas demand is more evenly spread. The proposed criteria in policy M4 include changing the balance of production capacity for sharp sand & gravel between the strategic resource areas in western & southern Oxfordshire over the plan period to one which more closely reflects the distribution of demand within the county. The inclusion of this as one of the criteria for identifying sites for mineral working will be a more effective way of achieving the objective of a more balanced pattern of supply in relation to demand than was the case through policy M2 (in the consultation draft plan).
34. The site criteria in policy M4 would also be used in the determination of planning applications for aggregate mineral working pending preparation of the Site Allocations document. A new policy M5 is proposed stating that permission will be granted within sites identified in accordance with the criteria in policy M4 provided the core policies of the plan (C1 to C11) are also met. This policy also sets out the exceptional circumstances in which permission may be granted for mineral working outside the identified sites, in particular where there is a need that cannot be met from the identified sites or where the mineral would otherwise be sterilised by other development.

#### Other Minerals Policies

35. Relatively few comments were made on the remaining minerals policies. Policies M5 on aggregates rail depots, M6 on non-aggregate minerals, M7 on safeguarding mineral resources and M8 on restoration of mineral workings in the consultation draft plan are renumbered as policies M6, M7, M8 and M10 respectively. Only relatively minor changes are proposed to these policies, made in the light of comments on the consultation draft plan and current national policy and guidance.
36. A new policy M9 on safeguarding mineral infrastructure is proposed to be included. This is in response to a requirement in the NPPF for certain mineral related facilities to be safeguarded. These include quarry processing and other ancillary plant and facilities; other bulk mineral transport facilities (including aggregate rail depots, as covered by policy M6); and industrial manufacturing plant using minerals, such as roadstone coating, concrete

batching and concrete product plants; as well as facilities for the production or supply of recycled or secondary aggregate materials and aggregate rail depots, as already covered by policies M1 and M6. Except where they are located at quarries or aggregate rail depots or involve waste, safeguarding of these types of facilities will rest largely with the district planning authority. This policy relates to safeguarding of sites and infrastructure for which the County Council is the planning authority.

### Waste Policies

37. Fewer comments were made in the consultation responses on the waste section of the plan (section 5) than on the minerals part. On the whole, the issues raised are detailed rather than fundamental but, coupled with an updating of the waste needs assessment for Oxfordshire and recent changes to national policy, with the publication of National Planning Policy for Waste and related planning guidance, extensive amendment of the waste section is required. The main changes proposed to the policies are set out below.
38. Policy W1 – management of Oxfordshire waste is amended to relate only to the three principal waste streams – local authority collected, commercial & industrial and construction, demolition & excavation wastes (the more specialised waste streams are covered in other policies); and also to include the estimated quantities of these wastes that will require management over the plan period to 2031. These estimates have been updated in the light of the more recent waste needs assessment from those included in the supporting text of the consultation draft plan.
39. Policy W2 – management of waste from other areas is deleted as the content of this policy is better covered within other policies with which this policy overlapped, in particular policy W4 on waste management capacity requirements and W7 on landfill.
40. In policy W3 – diversion of waste from landfill, the waste management targets are rolled forward to the new plan end date of 2031 and in some cases amended in the light of further technical work done in connection with the waste needs assessment on realistic levels of diversion of waste from landfill by recycling and other forms of waste treatment.
41. Policy W4 – waste management capacity requirements is extensively amended to make it clearer and more consistent with national policy and guidance; to cross-refer directly to the table of identified waste management needs in the supporting text; to state that sites for waste management facilities will be identified in the Site Allocations document; and to include reference to enabling the management of waste at the nearest appropriate installation (the proximity principle) in respect of any proposals for further capacity for treatment of residual waste.
42. The wording of policy W5 – locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams is amended only slightly but the policy title is changed to clarify

that it relates only to the principal waste streams (as in policy W1), not all waste streams.

43. Policy W6 – siting of waste management facilities is amended to remove duplication and make its meaning clearer, particularly in respect of temporary facilities but more significantly the final part of the policy relating to the green belt is amended to reflect the new National Planning Policy for Waste. Government policy is now clearly that proposals for waste facilities in the green belt should be treated in the same way as any other form of inappropriate development and should not be permitted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. This is a change from the previous national policy in PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management which stated that the particular locational requirements of some waste management facilities and the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management should be significant weight. Policy W6 is amended to reflect this stricter policy approach in the new national policy.
44. This change in policy on waste facilities in the green belt is likely to make it more difficult to find suitable sites for new facilities for waste arising in Oxford. However, this should not prevent the plan strategy for the location of facilities being delivered, and policy W5 should continue to require strategic waste management facilities to be located in the core Bicester – Oxford – Abingdon – Didcot area of the county.
45. Policy W7 – landfill is amended to include that part of deleted policy W2 that relates to landfill of waste from outside Oxfordshire. It is also amended to delete reference to husbanding of non-hazardous landfill capacity, as this is now considered undeliverable and unnecessary; and to signal a more cautious approach to any proposal to extend the life of a landfill. Other minor rewording is made to improve the clarity of the policy.
46. Policy W8 – hazardous waste is amended only slightly, to improve clarity, in particular to clarify that the policy covers landfill of hazardous waste as well as other forms of waste management.
47. A new policy WX – agricultural waste is inserted to fill a gap in the consultation draft plan. This policy covers on-farm treatment of agricultural and other organic waste and in principle encourages proposals for energy generation such as through anaerobic digestion.
48. Policy W9 – management of radioactive waste is reordered to make it clearer and more generally applicable and consistent with the policy on hazardous waste. The parts of the policy relating specifically to facilities at Harwell and Culham are amended to refer only to treatment and storage of radioactive waste, not disposal. This leaves any proposal for disposal to be considered against the general part of the policy, which sets a higher test of need.
49. Policy W10 – waste water and sewage sludge is amended to make it more generally applicable to any proposals that may come forward and to state that

proposals should meet the core policies of the plan unless there is an overriding need that cannot otherwise be met.

50. Policy W11 – safeguarding of waste management sites is simplified and states that all waste management sites will be safeguarded pending the preparation of the Site Allocations document.

#### Core Policies

51. The core policies section of the plan (section 6) includes 11 general policies to ensure that important environmental, amenity and transport factors are taken into consideration in both the identification of minerals and waste development sites for inclusion in the Site Allocations document and the determination of planning applications.
52. Amendment of this section of the plan is still in progress. It is clear that a number of largely minor changes need to be made to the policies and also the supporting text in the light of comments made on the consultation draft plan, including from statutory bodies such as English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency and to ensure that the plan is consistent with current national planning policy and guidance. These changes will be included in the final amended version of the plan that is reported to Council.

#### Other sections of the Plan

53. The introductory section 1 of the plan has been updated but section 2 – background has not yet been revised. This is largely a matter of factual updating but there are also some comments made on the consultation draft plan which are being considered.
54. Section 3 – vision and objectives has been partially amended in the light of comments made on the consultation draft plan and current national planning policy and guidance. In particular, amendments have been made to make the visions and objectives for minerals and waste more consistent, for example to include the impact of waste management facilities on communities, the environment and the road network in the waste vision. The minerals vision and objectives have been strengthened with regard to achieving biodiversity and other environmental and community benefits through restoration of mineral workings. Amendments have been made to the waste objectives to promote more clearly the provision of sufficient waste management facilities in line with the proximity principle and other aspects of national policy for waste.

#### **Conclusion**

55. I believe that as a result of considering the comments made in the responses to the consultation draft plan, in the light of current national planning policy and guidance, the Core Strategy has been significantly improved and strengthened. Whilst some further amendment is required, I consider that the Council will be in a position to publish a plan early in 2015 that should be

found sound when it is submitted for independent examination later in the year.

56. I consider that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy as amended at Annex 3 should now be agreed in principle and that, subject to the completion of amendments, it should be recommended to Council for publication early in 2015, for representations to be made on soundness, and subsequent submission to government for independent examination.

### **C. Review of Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement**

57. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is a statutory planning document that sets out how Oxfordshire County Council will involve the community (consultees, stakeholders and other interested parties) in:
- i. preparing and reviewing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan;
  - ii. making decisions on planning applications for minerals, waste and County Council developments.

The Council must comply with its SCI in preparing local plan documents.

58. The current SCI was adopted by the Council in November 2006. Since then there have been changes in legislative requirements for consultation and in the way the Council carries out consultation. The procedures for producing and consulting on local plans have been simplified and have been changed to take account of increased use of electronic communications. In addition, a statutory duty to co-operate has been introduced, which links to the SCI.
59. In view of these changes, a draft revised Oxfordshire SCI was agreed by Cabinet on 15 July 2014 for public consultation. The draft revised Oxfordshire SCI was published for public consultation between 1<sup>st</sup> September and 13<sup>th</sup> October 2014.
60. This report outlines the comments received during that consultation and proposes amendments to the revised SCI in the light of these comments. It puts forward an amended revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement for adoption by the Council.

#### **Consultation and amendments to the revised SCI**

61. 24 responses were received to the consultation draft revised SCI, of which 16 contained specific comments and 8 recorded that the consultee had no comments. The comments are recorded in Annex 4, accompanied by a proposed County Council response to each one, including any proposed amendment to the revised SCI or the reason why no change is considered necessary or appropriate. Annex 5 contains an amended version of the revised SCI, including the changes made in response to the consultation comments shown as insertions and ~~deletions~~.
62. The government's amendments to local plan procedures since 2006 have included changes to the way SCIs are prepared. It is no longer a requirement to include the SCI in the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme or to

submit the SCI to the Secretary of State for independent examination by an inspector. The Council can now adopt a SCI after carrying out consultation on it and considering any responses received.

63. The amended revised SCI at Annex 5 covers:
- i. What the SCI is and why it has been being revised;
  - ii. The Council's principles of community involvement;
  - iii. The Council's planning responsibilities;
  - iv. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan and how consultees and interested parties will be involved in the preparation of plan documents;
  - v. Planning applications and how consultees and interested parties will be involved in the determination of applications for minerals, waste and County Council developments;
  - vi. Monitoring and review of the SCI.
64. The revised SCI complements the Council's corporate policy on communicating and consulting with the public. Where appropriate, it goes beyond the minimum requirements of the relevant regulations in relation to community involvement in the planning processes, and it seeks to promote best practice and effective partnership working with community and other relevant interest groups.
65. I consider that the revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement as now proposed to be amended at Annex 4 should be adopted by the County Council to replace the SCI adopted in 2006. This will ensure that an up to date SCI is in place before the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy is published for further consultation and submitted to the Secretary of State for examination next year.

#### **D. Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Development Scheme (Sixth Revision) 2014**

66. The Council must prepare, maintain and publish a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, setting out the Council's programme for preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The original Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme came into effect in May 2005 and revisions were produced in 2006, 2007, 2009, 2012 and most recently in December 2013.
67. In line with the December 2013 Development Scheme, the revised Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy was published for public consultation in February 2014. In the light of responses received and having regard to current national planning policy and guidance, some changes are proposed to be made to the format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. There have also been minor changes to timetable for preparation of the plan. This report therefore puts forward a revised Development Scheme.

## **Revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2014**

68. A draft revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2014 is set out in Annex 6. This sets out a programme for preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The programme focuses on preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Core Strategy to a timetable that will see a new plan put in place at the earliest opportunity.
69. The 2013 Development Scheme did not include preparation of a Site Allocations document. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan must be prepared in accordance with current government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and having due regard to the new National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014). It is now clear that where possible minerals and waste local plans should include specific sites for the minerals and waste developments that will be needed over the period of the plan. I therefore now consider it necessary for the Development Scheme to be revised to include the preparation of a Site Allocations document, to form Part 2 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The Site Allocations part of the Plan would be prepared after the Core Strategy, which would now form Part 1 of the Plan. At this stage, it is not possible to provide a timetable for the Site Allocations document.
70. The principal target dates in the revised programme for the Plan are:
- Publish/consult on proposed submission document – February 2015;
  - Submit Plan to Secretary of State for examination – April 2015;
  - Examination hearings – July 2015;
  - Publish Inspector's report – October 2015;
  - Council adopts Plan – December 2015.
71. Previous versions of the Development Scheme have included preparation of supplementary planning documents on a Minerals and Waste Development Code of Practice and on Restoration and After-use of Minerals and Waste Sites. These are not priority documents and therefore are not included in the revised programme; but the possible future need for them should be kept under review.
72. I consider this revised programme for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Core Strategy to be realistic taking into account experience with preparing the earlier Minerals and Waste Core Strategy; the work required to prepare the necessary documentation and evidence base for the publication, submission and examination stages of the process; remaining requirements for engagement and consultation with stakeholders and the public, including under the duty to co-operate; sustainability appraisal, strategic environmental assessment and other technical assessment work; and available resources.
73. Approval of the revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2014 by the Cabinet is required before it can be brought into effect. The Scheme must then be published on the Council's website.

## **Financial and Staff Implications**

74. The new Minerals & Waste Plan is included within the work priorities of the Environment and Economy Directorate and is in part being progressed within the existing mainstream budget for the Council's minerals and waste policy function. In addition, a special reserve (£191,000) was created last year to help fund the abnormal costs of plan preparation (including the commissioning of specialist background technical studies) and the independent examination. By the end of this financial year, some £35,000 of that reserve will remain, creating a need for the reserve to be topped up by an estimated £100,000 in 2015/16.

## **Equalities Implications**

75. None specifically identified.

## **Legal Implications**

76. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the County Council is required to prepare a minerals and waste local plan and a statement of community involvement and to maintain an up to date minerals and waste development scheme. An annual local aggregate assessment, as required by the NPPF, is essential for the minerals and waste local plan to be "sound". The European Waste Framework Directive, 2008 (2008/98/EC), as transposed through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, require waste planning authorities to put in place waste local plans.

## **Risk Management**

77. If a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan is not adopted (for example, if it were abandoned, or found to be "unsound" following examination), the County Council would have no up to date and locally-determined land-use policy framework against which to regulate proposals for new mineral working and waste management in Oxfordshire. Such a diminution of local control over these operations would leave the authority with much less influence over the location of future minerals and waste operations and make it heavily reliant on the NPPF and National Planning Policy for Waste, which are considerably less comprehensive and detailed in their coverage of these matters. Having an up to date Statement of Community Involvement, Minerals and Waste Development Scheme and Local Aggregate Assessment in place will help the Council to demonstrate that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan is both legally compliant and "sound" when it is independently examined.



## **RECOMMENDATION**

**78. The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to**

**A.**

- i. approve the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 at Annex 1 for use as the basis for provision for mineral working in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan and for calculating the Oxfordshire landbank;**
- ii. authorise the Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to make any necessary minor corrections and amendments and publish the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 on the Council website.**

**B.**

- i. agree the amended Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy at Annex 3 in principle as the basis of a complete amended version of the Plan for recommendation to Council for publication and submission to the Secretary of State under Regulations 19 and 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and**
- ii. authorise the Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to finalise the Plan for recommendation to Council.**

**C. RECOMMEND to Council to**

- i. adopt the Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement with the amendments as shown in Annex 5 to replace the existing Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement adopted on 7 November 2006; and**
- ii. authorise the Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to make any further factual corrections or updating required and finalise the adopted Statement of Community Involvement for publication.**

**D.**

- i. approve the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (Sixth Revision) 2014 at Annex 6, subject to final detailed amendment and editing, to have effect from 23 December 2014;**

- ii. **authorise the Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning to:**
  - (a) **carry out final detailed amendment and editing of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment;**
  - (b) **take the necessary steps to bring the revised Scheme into effect from 23 December 2014 and publish the revised Scheme, in accordance with Sections 15 and 16 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).**

Bev Hindle  
Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning

Background papers:

- iii. Responses from South East England Aggregate Working Party and other Mineral Planning Authorities on the draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014.
- iv. Responses received to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, Consultation Draft February 2014
- v. Responses received to the Revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement, Consultation Draft September 2014.
- vi. Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (2005 – 2008), May 2005 and five subsequent revisions dated March 2006, March 2007, May 2009, May 2012 and December 2013.

All background papers are kept in the Minerals and Waste Policy Team at Speedwell House, Oxford.

Contact Officer: Peter Day, tel. Oxford 815544  
November 2014

## **Appendix 6**

### **Respondents to Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, Consultation Draft February 2014 and Summary of Issues Raised**

## **Appendix 6 – Respondents to Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, Consultation Draft February 2014 and Summary of Issues Raised**

### **A. Respondents to Consultation Draft Core Strategy February 2014 by Category (respondent number and name)**

#### **District / County / Unitary Councils**

0006 Milton Keynes Council  
0008 Northamptonshire County Council  
0010 City of London Corporation  
0018 Oxford City Council  
0024 Gloucestershire County Council  
0038 West Berkshire Council  
0045 Wokingham Borough Council  
0051 Cumbria County Council  
0056 Aylesbury Vale District Council  
0087 North London Waste Plan  
0089 South Oxfordshire District Council  
0095 Vale of White Horse District Council  
0098 Cherwell District Council  
0101 Surrey County Council  
0107 Cotswold District Council  
0122 Vale of White Horse District Council  
0124 Mayor of London  
0131 Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council  
0145 West Oxfordshire District Council  
0147 West London Waste Plan

#### **Parish and Town Councils**

0004 Berrick and Roke Parish Council  
0013 Marcham Parish Council  
0014 Pyrton Parish Council  
0017 Charlbury Town Council  
0019 Middleton Stoney Parish Council  
0021 Hanborough Parish Council  
0031 Drayton St Leonard Parish Council  
0035 Benson Parish Council  
0040 Warborough Parish Council  
0055 Dorchester Parish Council  
0069 Eynsham Parish Council  
0071 Aston, Cote, Shifford & Chimney Parish Council  
0085 Sutton Courtenay Parish Council  
0086 Stadhampton Parish Council  
0091 Hinton Waldrist Parish Council  
0100 Alvescot Parish Council  
0108 Caversfield Parish Council  
0115 Northmoor Parish Council  
0126 Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council  
0128 Stanton Harcourt Parish Council

- 0132 Wallingford Town Council
- 0143 Newington Parish Council
- 0149 Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council
- 0154 Shiplake Parish Council

**Other Statutory Consultees / Public Bodies**

- 0002 Police and Crime Commissioner Warwickshire
- 0007 North Wessex Downs AONB
- 0022 East Midlands AWP
- 0026 Highways Agency
- 0033 Natural England
- 0036 High Speed Two (Ltd)
- 0046 The Coal Authority
- 0057 The Chilterns Conservation Board
- 0063 English Heritage
- 0088 Environment Agency
- 0119 Thames Water
- 0134 Marine Management Organisation
- 0135 The Cotswolds Conservation Board
- 0144 Anglian Water

**Local Action Groups**

- 0023 AGGROW
- 0052 Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE)
- 0067 Sonning Eye Action Group (SEAG)
- 0092 OUTRAGE
- 0103 Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT)
- 0153 Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE)

**National or Local Environmental Organisations / Groups:**

- 0029 British Horse Society, Oxfordshire
- 0037 Oxford Green Belt Network
- 0044 CPRE
- 0059 Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society
- 0061 GreenTEA
- 0074 The Eynsham Society
- 0077 Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum
- 0121 RSPB
- 0146 Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

**Minerals or Waste Companies:**

- 0005 RWE Npower
- 0032 United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority
- 0039 Earthline Ltd
- 0041 Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd
- 0047 Grundon
- 0053 Hills Quarry Products Ltd
- 0054 FCC Environment Ltd
- 0090 Mineral Products Association

- 0094 Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group
- 0105 Lafarge Tarmac Ltd
- 0114 Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd
- 0136 Smith and Sons (Bletchington) Ltd
- 0138 Oxford Aggregates (a collaboration between Hanson and Smith & Sons)
- 0142 Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL)
- 0151 Hanson UK

**Other Businesses / Landowners:**

- 0001 David Wilson Homes South
- 0028 Eskmuir Properties Ltd (local business)
- 0049 Corpus Christi College
- 0070 Synergy Global Consulting
- 0072 Blenheim Estate
- 0109 Stanton Harcourt Estate
- 0111 Exeter College

**Local Residents.**

- 0003 Mr Partridge
- 0009 Mr and Mrs Buch
- 0011 Mrs Rosemary Parrinder
- 0012 Peter Cannon-Brookes
- 0015 Dr Stuart Brooks
- 0016 Dr Anne Thomson
- 0020 Sean Nicholson
- 0025 John and Christine Dowling
- 0027 Richard Wright
- 0030 Nick Hutton
- 0034 CRW Leonard
- 0042 W J Bannister
- 0043 Alan Briggs
- 0048 Graham Griffiths
- 0050 Dr Graham Shelton
- 0058 Prof Alan Atkinson
- 0060 Philip Rogers
- 0062 Susan Chapman
- 0064 Vincent Goodstadt
- 0065 Susan Eysackers
- 0066 Dr Don Chapman
- 0068 Neil Bailey
- 0073 Mr TD Henman
- 0075 Greta Rye
- 0076 Mrs Helen Sandhu
- 0078 Sally Rowley-Williams
- 0079 Mrs Wilkinson
- 0080 Mrs Mary Fletcher
- 0081 Dr Duncan Reed
- 0082 Robert Florey
- 0083 Jennifer Harland

0084 Mark Watson  
0093 Linda Barlow  
0096 Jane Thompson  
0097 Peter Winder  
0099 Richard Bakesef  
0102 Anne Wrapson  
0104 Lynda Hillyer  
0106 Henry Pavlovich  
0110 Robin Mitchell  
0112 Mrs Clare Simpson  
0113 Robin Draper  
0116 Charles Dickerson  
0117 Valerie Ryan  
0118 Alison Gomm  
0120 R H Atkinson  
0123 John Nagle  
0125 Dr Judith Webb  
0129 Iona Millwood and Simon Hall  
0130 Marshall Leopold  
0133 Peter Fry  
0139 Mr N Brading  
0140 Mr & Mrs RD Sharp  
0141 Toby G Marchant  
0150 Peter C Power  
0155 Mrs Justine Higgin

**Oxfordshire County Councillors**

0127 Cllr Charles Mathew  
0152 Cllr David Bartholomew

**Oxfordshire County Council Internal Consultees**

0137 Oxfordshire County Council Archaeologist  
0148 Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner

## **B. Summary of Issues Raised in Responses to Consultation Draft Core Strategy February 2014 by Policy**

### **Mineral Policies:**

#### **Policy M1: Recycled and secondary aggregates**

- General support for greater recycling of aggregates;
- Support the removal of a target for the amount of recycled and secondary materials and flexibility of policy;
- The policy is contrary to the NPPF as no target is set for the supply of recycled and secondary aggregates;
- Over-reliance on temporary recycled facilities at quarry and landfill sites may result in loss of capacity as host sites are completed;
- Well located temporary recycling facilities sites should be retained;
- Reliance on CDE waste to provide a quantified contribution to a steady and adequate supply of aggregates is risky.

#### **Policy M2: Provision for working aggregate minerals**

- Lack of provision figures is not in accordance with the NPPF and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) and provides no assistance to delivery of a steady and adequate supply of aggregates;
- The lack of quantified provision creates uncertainty and will make delivery and monitoring of the policy difficult;
- It is unclear whether the aggregate provision required in the plan is deliverable;
- The policy should not imply that permission will only be granted for new where the landbank is close to or below the 7 year minimum for sand and gravel;
- Reliance on landbank levels to determine the granting of planning permission ignores the need to maintain productive capacity to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates;
- There is no definition of 'balance in annual production capacity';
- It is unclear how a balance between western and southern Oxfordshire will be achieved and enforced;
- Rebalancing between west and south could constrain supply, limit the ability of the industry to respond to demand and increase travel distances – there should be at least 3 active quarries in each area to ensure continuity of supply and competition between operatorsThe South/West balance;
- Existing permissions mean western Oxfordshire will continue to be the main source of sand and gravel over the plan period;
- The cumulative effect of past sand and gravel extraction in western Oxfordshire has not been taken into account.

#### **Policy M3: Locations for working aggregate minerals**

- Areas of search do not accord with government guidance, which places priority on identifying specific sites for future mineral working;
- Areas of search will result in piecemeal development; the plans should provide a more detailed steer and not rely on broad areas of search;
- The areas of search exceed what is needed to meet supply requirements;



- Lack of site identification causes uncertainty about where mineral working will take place and consequently whether the interests of communities will be affected and whether the aims of the plan can be delivered;
- The methodology for selecting the areas of search is unclear and the selection of the areas of search has not been justified; important environmental and transport factors have not been considered;
- Object to the extraction of sand or gravel near Eynsham and Thames Valley;
- Concern about the impacts on residential areas, the environment, road network, health and flooding;
- Any proposal should consider the likely environmental and amenity impact and include a buffer zone to safeguard residential amenities;
- Some support for the Areas of Search approach;
- The Corallian Ridge area of search should be extended.

#### **Policy M4: Working of aggregate minerals**

- There is uncertainty over how the policy will work with policy M2 in delivering a steady and adequate supply of aggregates;
- The policy is too restrictive and doesn't give certainty or assist in the delivery of sufficient sites to meet demand; the policy should be flexible to allow for additional reserves and additional productive capacity;
- Restricting western Oxfordshire to 3 sand and gravel sites is anti-competitive and lacks justification;
- Concern about the south/west balance being unsettled by capping the number of sites in West Oxfordshire;
- There is capacity for more quarries in the Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap) area of search as it has significant workable reserves and good access to the road network and markets; provision should be made for two new quarries;
- The requirement that mineral workings shall not result in a change in water levels in the Oxford Meadows SAC is simplistic and unqualified;
- Prevention of working in AONBs is contrary to the NPPF and contradicts draft plan policy C8;
- Object to the extraction of sand or gravel near Eynsham;
- The Sutton Courtenay area of search should be deleted as it has limited remaining life;
- Priority should be given to extensions at Sutton Courtenay over new quarries in southern Oxfordshire;
- The Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap) area of search should be deleted due to environmental constraints;
- The policy should give specific protection to designated sites and areas, e.g. heritage designations;
- Concern about flooding, local road network and impact on nearby residential areas.

#### **Policy M5: Aggregate rail depots**

- New aggregate rail depots should be located close to source;
- Consideration should be aggregates available from china clay working in Cornwall;

- Appleford Sidings rail depot at the Sutton Courtenay landfill should not be safeguarded.

**Policy M6: Non-aggregate mineral working**

- With regards to clay extraction, the Lower Windrush Valley and Thames Valley areas should be protected.

**Policy M7: Safeguarding mineral resources**

- Lack of plans – without plans it is not possible to consider this matter and the Core Strategy deficient;
- Accompanying plans should cover both existing sites and potential resources.

**Policy M8: Restoration of mineral workings**

- The policy is open to interpretation;
- The policy needs to be strengthened to have stronger aspirations for biodiversity; all mineral sites should be required to deliver net gains in biodiversity;
- The policy provides limited coverage of social and community benefit.

**Waste Policies:**

**Policy W1: Management of Oxfordshire waste**

- The aim should be for self-sufficiency in all waste streams (including hazardous and radioactive wastes);
- It is not clear what is meant by the concept of self-sufficiency;
- Reliance should not be placed on facilities located elsewhere, existing or future, to manage Oxfordshire waste;
- Consider making a commitment to over-provide capacity for certain waste streams to compensate for expected deficiencies in others;
- The policy aims for self-sufficiency in agricultural waste but there is no policy to help achieve this;
- The forecast growth of 50% in construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste arisings between 2012 and 2020 is unlikely to be seen;
- Not clear whether waste generated by HS2 and Bicester Eco-Town has been considered in forecast waste arisings;
- Need to make sure that forecast waste arisings take account of population and household numbers.

**Policy W2: Management of waste from other areas**

- Acknowledgement that London has a shortage of landfill capacity is welcomed; Support for recognition of need to provide capacity for disposal of waste from London and elsewhere (consistent with NPPF para. 182); policy is consistent with the West London Waste Local Plan;
- Better explanation needed of what is meant by the intention to not make provision for ‘facilities which provide *substantially* for the treatment of residual non-hazardous waste from outside Oxfordshire’; the policy appears to preclude the provision of facilities for the treatment of waste from other areas;
- It is not possible for London to become self-sufficient in managing its waste needs in the period covered by the plan;

- Not clear where the forecasted waste import figures are derived: the adopted London Plan does not contain this information;
- The Further Alterations to the London Plan anticipate a 30% reduction in the amount of waste originally forecast for London in the period to 2031, and this should be reflected in Oxfordshire's waste policy ;
- Pleased to see that waste imported into the county is, in general, reducing year on year;
- Waste should be treated as close to its source as possible; allowing large amounts of waste to travel from London to Sutton Courtenay does not achieve this;
- The plan is contradictory in making provision for disposal of waste from London whilst saying (paragraph 5.17) that transporting waste from elsewhere for disposal in Oxfordshire is unsustainable; the policy should discourage the importation of waste from other areas for disposal in Oxfordshire
- Further discussion needed on options for meeting the unmet demand for disposal of non-hazardous waste from West Berkshire; concern that the policy may not allow for fulfilment of the contract for disposal of Central Berkshire waste in Oxfordshire;

#### **Policy W3: Diversion of waste from landfill**

- The plan fails to consider that the Vale and SODC are already close to the 70% recycling household waste levels.

#### **Policy W4: Waste management capacity requirements**

- The capacity requirements are expressed in vague terms and cannot be identified from the material provided; it is unclear what facilities are needed;
- It is difficult to establish how the waste capacity shortfalls will be met and whether the proposed strategy is capable of delivering the level of capacity required; as a result, the strategy may not be sound or consistent with PPS10 or compliant with the European Waste Framework Directive;
- The policy is inconsistent with PPS10;
- The apparent waste capacity shortfalls appear significant, and it may be challenging to progress the plan further without better clarification of how the shortfalls are to be met;
- Relying on the Annual Monitoring Report to identify capacity requirements is not appropriate as these reports cannot be challenged;
- The statistical basis for CDE forecasts for both recycling and landfill need to be thoroughly reviewed;
- Additional commercial and industrial (C&I) recycling and transfer capacity is definitely required;
- The majority of CDE recycling capacity is temporary and located in quarries and landfill and will be difficult to replace.

#### **Policy W5: Locations for waste management facilities**

- The general locational strategy is overcomplicated; the broad area approach is not specific, overcomplicated and does not accord with PPS10.
- Clarification is required for how the broad area for strategic waste facilities was defined;

- Greater clarity is required in locations for waste facilities: provision should be made for specific deliverable sites; identification of strategic waste sites should only be through the development plan process;
- Lack of provision for specific sites may increase pressure outside Oxfordshire;
- The broad area defined as appropriate for the location of strategic waste facilities should be re-defined to omit rural communities, include existing strategic sites; make better provision for facilities east of Oxford; acknowledge that significant parts are Green Belt; and better reflect the locational requirements of waste facilities;
- Concern about impact on AONBs;
- Banbury should be included as one of the growth areas better able to accommodate new waste facilities;
- The need for CDE waste recycling facilities should not be met in the Oxford Green Belt;
- Better household waste recycling centre (HWRC) facilities are required close to Bicester; Ardley HWRC should remain open until one can be provided.

#### **Policy W6: Siting of waste management facilities**

- Reliance on temporary recycling facilities at quarry and landfill sites results in loss of capacity when the host sites are completed; in some instances there may be a good case for retaining the recycling facilities.

#### **Policy W7: Landfill**

- The difficulties of protecting ('husbanding') non-hazardous landfill void (paragraph 5.62) are not reflected in the policy approach; clarity is needed over the term "husbanding";
- The plan should recognise that Sutton Courtenay landfill is a temporary site which should close in 2030 and no further extension of time be allowed;
- Bring forward the closure of Ardley landfill from 2019 to 2017;
- The recognition given to the importance of non-recyclable inert waste for the restoration of mineral workings is welcomed;
- In addition to the priorities listed, disposal of inert waste should be targeted at rail linked sites to avoid the harmful impact of road traffic.

#### **Policy W8: Hazardous waste**

- The policy conflicts with what paragraph 5.73 of the plan says about self-sufficiency in managing hazardous wastes;
- Sutton Courtenay should be protected from excessive hazardous waste;
- Consideration should be given to developing capacity which could meet a need for the management of hazardous wastes arising outside Oxfordshire;
- The second part of the policy does not make allowance for sustainable or environmentally preferable alternatives.

#### **Policy W9: Management of radioactive waste**

- General support for this policy.

**Policy W10: Waste water and sewage sludge**

- General support for this policy, in particular safeguarding existing waste management sites and the inclusion of a policy on waste water and sewage sludge.

**Policy W11: Safeguarding waste management sites**

- It should be specified that the Sutton Courtenay site will close in 2030.

**Core Policies:**

**Policy C1: Sustainable development**

- General support for this policy.

**Policy C2: Climate change**

- General support for this policy.

**Policy C3: Flooding**

- The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is outdated; and a level 2 study is required;
- The supporting appendix in the plan does not accurately reflect the NPPF in relation to water compatible use;
- Concern about impacts of mineral workings on local communities, associated economy and the environment; mineral developments should be restricted to areas which are not at risk from flooding;
- Concern about enforcement of the policy;

**Policy C4: water environment**

- General support for this policy.

**Policy C5: General environmental and amenity protection**

- Restrictions should be set to minimise pollution and further protect neighbourhoods and businesses.

**Policy C6: Agricultural land and soils**

- The policy provides an appropriate level of flexibility on the way in which mineral sites on best and most versatile agricultural land should be restored.

**Policy C7: Biodiversity and geodiversity**

- Support for the aspiration to conserve and enhance biodiversity;
- The policy should require all developments to deliver a net gain in biodiversity;
- Support for the level of protection given to international, national and local designations and to priority habitats and species;
- The policy uses confusing and inconsistent terminology;
- The wording in relation to SSSIs is inconsistent with the NPPF;
- The policy should be reworded to better reflect the mitigation hierarchy expressed in the NPPF.

**Policy C8: Landscape**

- The policy is not consistent with the paragraph 116 of the NPPF;
- The policy should not restrict mineral development in AONBs to that which is small scale and serves local needs;
- Development within the AONB should be considered in light of its potential effects on the purposes of the AONB, and whether these can be satisfactorily mitigated;
- Support for the protection of AONBs.

**Policy C9: Historic environment and archaeology**

- The policy does not fully accord with the NPPF.

**Policy C10: Transport**

- Further consideration should be given to the transport impact of minerals and waste movements by road.

**Policy C11: Rights of way**

- Consideration should be given to impacts on the amenity value of the public right of way;
- Working and restoration affecting equestrian rights of way should be undertaken with horses in mind;
- Sections of the rights of way network are not well maintained, e.g. at Sutton Courtenay.

## **Appendix 7**

### **Report to County Council**

**24 March 2015**

## **Appendix 7 – Report to Oxfordshire County Council 24 March 2015**

### **COUNCIL – 24 MARCH 2015**

#### **OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN:**

##### **A. MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN, PART 1 – CORE STRATEGY – PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT**

##### **B. REVIEW OF OXFORDSHIRE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

**Report by Deputy Director for Environment and Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)**

#### **Introduction**

1. The County Council has a statutory duty to prepare a new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, to provide an effective planning strategy and policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in the county, consistent with environmental, social and economic needs. The Plan must be prepared in accordance with current government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) and the National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014), and having due regard to the recent National Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014).

2. This report covers two separate but connected documents that relate to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan:

- A. Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document; and
- B. Review of Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement.

3. The Core Strategy will form the central part of the new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. It is a strategic policy document that requires full Council approval before it can be published for representations to be made and then submitted to the Government for independent examination. The Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement is also a policy document that requires a decision by full Council to be adopted.

4. A report to Cabinet on 25 November 2014 included a draft amended Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document and a revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement. This report to Cabinet, which also included the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 and the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (Sixth Revision) 2014, is at Annex 1.

5. Cabinet resolved to agree the draft Minerals and Waste Core Strategy in principle for recommendation to Council for publication and submission to the Secretary of State; and to recommend the revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement to Council



for adoption. Cabinet also resolved to approve the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 and the revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2014.

## **A. Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Part 1 – Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document**

### **Background and Consultation**

6. Part 1 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan – the Core Strategy – sets out the Council's vision, objectives, spatial strategy and core policies for the supply of minerals and management of waste in Oxfordshire to 2031. Detailed site proposals for mineral working and waste management facilities will be allocated in a follow-on Part 2 document – the Site Allocations Document.

7. A Consultation Draft Core Strategy was agreed by Cabinet on 28 January 2014 and was published for public consultation over a 6 week period commencing on 24 February. The Consultation Draft Plan is on the Council's website at:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/minerals-and-waste-core-strategy>.

8. Responses to the Consultation Draft were received from 155 organisations and individuals, making a total of 644 separate comments. A list of the respondents, grouped by category of organisation, and a summary of issues raised in the consultation responses are at Annex 2. The full responses are available in the Members' Resources Centre be seen in the Minerals and Waste Policy Team at Speedwell House, Oxford.

9. A schedule of all the responses received, with a summary of the comments made by each respondent, grouped by section, policy and paragraph of the plan, and the proposed County Council response to each comment has been drafted and is available in the Members' Resources Centre.

### **Amendment of Core Strategy and Recommendation of Cabinet**

10. The Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group met five times in 2014 to consider the comments made on the Consultation Draft Core Strategy and the changes that should be made to it. In the light of those comments and taking into account the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 and other technical work carried out over the past year, and also having due regard to current national planning policy and guidance, the Core Strategy has been amended.

11. The issues raised in the responses to the Consultation Draft and an amended version of the Core Strategy were reported to the Cabinet on 25 November 2014. The amended Core Strategy included the main changes that had been identified as necessary, taking into account the views of the Cabinet Advisory Group. This included key changes to policies and supporting text, but it was recognised that amendments to the plan had not been completed.

12. The key issues and amendments to the Core Strategy were outlined at paragraphs 22 – 54 of the report to Cabinet (at Annex 1). The report recommended a draft amended version of the Core Strategy, including key changes to policies and supporting text but with more detailed amendments to be made before it was put to Full Council.

13. The Cabinet resolved to:

- i. agree the amended Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy at Annex 3 in principle as the basis of a complete amended version of the Plan for recommendation to Council for publication and submission to the Secretary of State under Regulations 19 and 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012; and
- ii. authorise the Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to finalise the Plan for recommendation to Council.

### **Amended Core Strategy for Publication and Submission**

14. Further changes have been made to the draft of the Core Strategy that was agreed in principle by Cabinet, including amendments to update the document and to ensure it is in line with current national planning policy and guidance. As far as possible, the changes address the comments that were made on the Consultation Draft Core Strategy, February 2014. A summary of these changes is at Annex 3.

15. The amended Core Strategy has been informed by the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 (LAA), as approved by the Cabinet on 25 November 2014, and the County Council's Oxfordshire Waste Needs Assessment 2015. The Core Strategy (policy M2) does not include the provision level figures from the LAA because these are subject to review and potential change annually. Instead, policy M2 states that provision will be made in accordance with the most recent LAA and the figures from the LAA 2014 are included in the supporting text (paragraph 4.19 and Table 2).

16. A similar approach is taken for waste, since the Waste Needs Assessment is also subject to review and updating as waste production, forecasts and capacity are monitored and updated or new information becomes available. Therefore, policies W1 and W3 respectively do not include figures for the amounts of waste that need to be managed and the amounts of capacity that need to be provided. Instead, these policies refer to the figures in the most recent Oxfordshire Waste Needs Assessment or update in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. Current figures from the Waste Needs Assessment 2015 are included in the supporting text, in particular at Tables 4 to 7.

17. The amended version of the Core Strategy is at Annex 4. This has been sent to the Cabinet Member for Environment, in accordance with the Cabinet resolution, and his response will be reported at the Council meeting.

### **Sustainability Appraisal and Other Assessments**

18. It is a legal requirement that the Minerals and Waste Local Plan is subject to Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA). These have been carried out by consultants as a combined assessment, in a number of stages throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy. The assessment has informed the development of the Core Strategy as an iterative process.

19. The most recent SA/SEA report was prepared in February 2014, on the Consultation Draft Core Strategy, and is available on the Council's website. Following further work by the consultants on assessment of the amended Core Strategy, a revised SA/SEA report is now being prepared, to be available for publication when the Core Strategy is published. A summary of the main findings of the SA/SEA has been prepared by the consultants and is available in the Members' Resources Centre.

20. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening report also needs to be prepared because of the potential for minerals and waste developments proposed in the Plan to impact on Special Areas of Conservation. An HRA screening report was prepared in August 2011, with a Technical Supplement in January 2012, and these are available on the Council's website. That work is being updated, to relate to the amended Core Strategy, and a revised HRA screening report will be available for publication when the Core Strategy is published. A draft report is available in the Members' Resources Centre. This finds that the amended Core Strategy will not give rise to minerals or waste development that will have a likely significant effect on a Special Area of Conservation and that such likely significant effects are screened out.

21. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) must also be carried out. An SFRA was undertaken by consultants in 2009 and 2010 and is available on the Council's website. The SFRA is now being reviewed by the consultants to take into account updated mapping of and information on fluvial flooding, surface water flooding and groundwater flooding and to relate to the amended Core Strategy. The reviewed SFRA will be available for publication when the Core Strategy is published. The consultants are first carrying out an initial assessment for the review of the SFRA, to establish the significance of changes in the flooding information since the original SFRA work was undertaken, although after discussion with the Environment Agency the preliminary view of officers is that these changes are unlikely to be such that significant amendments need to be made to the Core Strategy. A draft report by the consultants will be available in the Members' Resources Centre prior to the meeting.

### **Duty to Co-operate**

22. The statutory duty to co-operate was brought in by the Localism Act 2011. Under this, the County Council must co-operate with other councils and with certain specified bodies in relation to strategic matters in preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Planning for minerals supply and waste management are both strategic matters in that they have cross-boundary implications.

23. In order to meet this duty, a programme of engagement with the relevant other councils and bodies has been undertaken, mainly through correspondence but where necessary through officer meetings, including through meetings of the South East England Aggregate Working Party and the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group. The Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group was kept informed of progress with this work. The duty to co-operate is an on-going requirement but I consider that it has been met in the work that has been undertaken to date on preparation of the Core Strategy and related documents (including the Local Aggregate Assessment) and that there are no unresolved issues on strategic matters between the Council and any of the other relevant councils or bodies. A draft statement on compliance with the duty to co-operate will be prepared for publication when the Core Strategy is published and a final version of this will accompany the Core Strategy when it is submitted for examination.

### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

24. I believe that as a result of considering the comments made in the responses to the consultation draft Core Strategy, carrying out further technical work (including the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 and the Waste Needs Assessment 2015) and taking into account current national planning policy and guidance, the Core Strategy has been significantly improved and strengthened. Some further detailed updating and amendment are needed to get the document into a form that can be published for

representations to be made and then submitted for examination, but the strategy and policy elements of the document are now in a final form. I consider that the amended version of the Core Strategy at Annex 4 should be found to be legally compliant and sound when examined by an independent inspector and therefore that, subject to such further detailed updating and amendment as is necessary, it can now be published and submitted.

25. Subject to approval, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document will be published in May, for representations to be made. Following this, it can then be submitted (together with the representations received) in September to the Government, for independent examination by a planning inspector. Public examination hearings would be expected to be held towards the end of 2015 and the Inspector's report received in spring 2016. Subject to a favourable report, the Council would then be able to adopt the Core Strategy.

## **B. Review of Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement**

26. The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is a statutory planning document that sets out how Oxfordshire County Council will involve the community (consultees, stakeholders and other interested parties) in:

- i. preparing and reviewing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan; and
- ii. making decisions on planning applications for minerals, waste and County Council developments.

The Council must comply with its SCI in preparing local plan documents.

27. The current SCI was adopted by the Council in November 2006. Since then there have been changes in legislative requirements for consultation and in the way the Council carries out consultation. The procedures for producing and consulting on local plans have been simplified and have been changed to take account of increased use of electronic communications. In addition, a statutory duty to co-operate has been introduced, which links to the SCI.

28. In view of these changes, a draft revised Oxfordshire SCI was agreed by Cabinet on 15 July 2014 and was published for public consultation between 1 September and 13 October 2014.

29. The comments received during that consultation are summarised at Annex 5, accompanied by a proposed County Council response to each one. These comments were reported to the Cabinet on 25 November 2014 (see Annex 1), together with proposed amendments to the revised SCI in the light of these comments. The consultation responses and amendments to the SCI were outlined at paragraphs 61 – 64 of the report. The report recommended a revised SCI for adoption by the Council.

30. The Cabinet resolved to RECOMMEND to Council to:

- (a)** adopt the Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement with the amendments as shown in Annex 5 (now Annex 6) to replace the existing Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement adopted on 7 November 2006; and
- (b)** authorise the Deputy Director Strategy & Infrastructure Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment to make any further factual corrections or updating required and finalise the adopted Statement of Community Involvement for publication.

31. The revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement is at Annex 6, which shows changes from the consultation draft as insertions and deletions. I consider that, in accordance with the recommendation of the Cabinet, this should now be adopted by the County Council to replace the SCI adopted in 2006. This will ensure that an up to date SCI is in place before the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy is published for further consultation and submitted to the Secretary of State for examination later this year.

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

32. The new Minerals & Waste Local Plan is included within the work priorities of the Environment and Economy Directorate and is in part being progressed within the existing mainstream budget for the Council's minerals and waste policy function. In addition, a specific reserve (£191,000) was created last financial year to help fund the abnormal costs of plan preparation (including the commissioning of specialist background technical studies) and the independent examination. By the end of this financial year some £47,000 of that reserve will remain. A one-off service pressure has been identified and an additional £90,000 has been allocated for 2015/16 to fund the examination.

### **Legal Implications**

33. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the County Council is required to prepare a minerals and waste local plan and a statement of community involvement. The European Waste Framework Directive, 2008 (2008/98/EC), as transposed through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended), require waste planning authorities to put in place waste local plans.

### **Risk Management**

34. If a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan is not adopted (for example, if it were abandoned, or found to be "unsound" following examination), the County Council would have no up to date and locally-determined land-use policy framework against which to regulate proposals for new mineral working and waste management in Oxfordshire. Such a diminution of local control over these operations would leave the authority with much less influence over the location of future minerals and waste operations and make it heavily reliant on the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy for Waste, which are considerably less comprehensive and detailed in their coverage of these matters. Having an up to date Statement of Community Involvement in place will help the Council to demonstrate that the Core Strategy is legally compliant and "sound" when it is independently examined.

35. The review of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) has not yet been completed. Whilst output from an initial assessment to establish the significance of changes in the flooding information since the original SFRA work was undertaken will be available in advance of the meeting, it is possible that the full review could identify a need for further amendments to be made to the Core Strategy. The preliminary view of officers, after considering this in discussion with the Environment Agency, is that the changes in flooding information are unlikely to be such that significant amendments will need to be made to the Core Strategy; and therefore that taking a decision on the Core Strategy in advance of completion of the review of the SFRA carries a low risk. The initial assessment by the consultants should confirm whether this view is correct by identifying whether or not any changes of significance for the strategy or policies in the Core Strategy need to be made. In the event that the review of the SFRA leads to

changes of significance needing to be made to the Core Strategy, it would have to be reconsidered by Council.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **36. The Council is RECOMMENDED to:**

**In respect of A:**

**(a) approve the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy at Annex 4 for publication and submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination under Regulations 19 and 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and**

**(b) authorise the Director for Environment and Economy to finalise the text, tables, diagrams and plans in the Core Strategy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, and to finalise the supporting documents, provided that the strategy and policy content of the Core Strategy is not materially changed; and**

**(c) authorise the Director for Environment and Economy to publish the Core Strategy and supporting documents in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and**

**(d) authorise the Director for Environment and Economy to consider any representations received on the published Core Strategy in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and to finalise and submit the Core Strategy and other required documents and information to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012; and**

**(e) authorise the Director for Environment and Economy to represent the Council, present evidence and respond to any comments made by other parties and any relevant changes in legislation or national policy or guidance during the examination of the Core Strategy and, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to put forward to the Inspector any necessary changes to the Core Strategy if required during the examination.**

**In respect of B:**

**(a) adopt the Revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement at Annex 6 to replace the existing Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement adopted on 7 November 2006; and**

**(b) authorise the Director for Environment and Economy to carry out final editing and preparation of the Revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement for publication.**

**BEV HINDLE**

Deputy Director for Environment and Economy (Strategy & Infrastructure Planning)

Background papers:

- i. Responses received to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy, Consultation Draft February 2014.
- ii. Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014.
- iii. Oxfordshire Waste Needs Assessment 2015.
- iv. Summary of the main findings of Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy, 2015.
- v. Draft revised Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report for the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy, 2015.
- vi. Initial Assessment for a Review of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy, 2015.
- vii. Responses received to the Revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement, Consultation Draft September 2014.

All background papers are kept in the Minerals and Waste Policy Team at Speedwell House, Oxford.

Contact Officer: Peter Day, tel. Oxford 815544  
March 2015

## **Appendix 8**

### **Consultation on and Responses to Draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014**



## Appendix 8 – Consultation on and Responses to Draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014

### Cabinet – 25 November 2014 Item 8 – Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

#### Update and Corrections

#### A. Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014

1. Paragraph 14 of the report says the outcome of engagement with adjoining and other mineral planning authorities and aggregate working parties on the Draft Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 (LAA) will be reported at the meeting.
2. The bodies that have been consulted and the responses received are set out below.

Body consulted	Response
South East Aggregate Working Party	Considered at meeting 27.10.2014. LAA approved. Some detailed comments made by individual members. Approval of LAA confirmed by letter 05.11.2014.
East of England Aggregate Working Party	No issues raised (email 06.11.2014)
East Midlands Aggregate Working Party	No concerns or objections (email 12.11.2014)
West Midlands Aggregate Working Party	No response
South West Aggregate Working Party	Response to be sent following meeting of Aggregate Working Party 28.11.2014.
London Aggregate Working Party	Agreed no need to consult as unlikely to be any cross-boundary aggregate movements (email 28.10.2014)
West Berkshire Council	Discussed at officer meeting 07.11.2014. No issues raised; LAA already agreed by South East Aggregate Working Party, of which West Berkshire Council is a member
Wokingham Borough Council	No concerns raised. Some detailed queries. (email 20.11.2014)
Bracknell Forest Council	The stance taken in the LAA is supported (email 21.11.2014)
Other Berkshire Unitary Authorities	No response
Buckinghamshire County Council	No concerns raised on LAA (email 19.11.2014)
Milton Keynes Council	LAA generally compliant with NPPF requirements. No concerns raised. Some detailed comments.

	(email 07.11.2014)
Other South East Mineral Planning Authorities	Discussed at meeting of SE MPA officers 27.10.2014 (all MPAs represented except Buckinghamshire). No concerns raised.
Northamptonshire County Council	LAA generally compliant with NPPF requirements. No concerns raised. Some detailed comments. (email 07.11.2014)
Warwickshire County Council	No objection to the methodology used to calculate the LAA figures. Some detailed comments. (email 21.11.2014)
Gloucestershire County Council	Discussed at officer meeting 22.10.2014. Generally support the LAA, as it recognises there is limited potential to continue current supply patterns from Gloucestershire to Oxfordshire and has adjusted provision accordingly. (email 07.11.2014)
Wiltshire Council	Concerns raised over assumptions used and effect on limiting supply; complex methodology; and reliance on mothballed sites reopening. (email 21.11.2014) May be based on misunderstanding. Clarification sought. (email 24.11.2014)
Swindon Borough Council	As for Wiltshire above
South Gloucestershire Council	No response
Somerset County Council	No objections to LAA or concerns about future supply of aggregate from Somerset to Oxfordshire. Some detailed comments. (letter 06.11.2014)
Leicestershire County Council	No comments on level of provision in LAA. Movement of aggregate from Leicestershire to Oxfordshire could be affected over the period to 2031 depending on the determination of a current planning application. (email 12.11.2014)
Mayor of London	No response
Marine Management Organisation	No response
City and District Councils in Oxfordshire	Issue of preparation of LAA reported to Growth Board Executive 04.09.2014 and (Shadow) Oxfordshire Growth Board 12.09.2014. LAA Discussed at officer meeting 14.11.2014. No fundamental concerns raised over approach used in LAA or conclusions reached. Detailed comments received from WODC. (email 17.11.2014)
Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Officer meeting 10.11.2014. No comments made. Report on Minerals & Waste Local Plan and LAA to go to LEP Board meeting 06.01.2014.

Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group (OMPG)	Discussed at officer meeting 17.10.2014. OMPG indicated support for the approach taken in the LAA and the conclusions. This view was subsequently confirmed by the Mineral Products Association and British Aggregates Association in expressing support for the LAA at the South East Aggregate Working Party meeting on 27.11.2014.
--	---

3. The responses that have been received do not raise any fundamental concerns or other issues with the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014. Any further responses received will be reported orally at the meeting.
4. The detailed comments made at the South East Aggregate Working Party meeting have already been addressed in the draft LAA that is attached to the report at Annex 1. Other detailed comments can, as appropriate, be addressed through minor corrections and amendments when the LAA is finalised for publication.

## **Appendix 9**

### **Summary Representations on Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document**

## Appendix 9 – Summary Representations on Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document

### Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 (Core Strategy) Proposed Submission and Supporting Documents August 2015

#### Summary of Representations (Plan Order)

Policy / Para	Respondent + Ref	Summary Comment
<b>PROPOSED SUBMISSION DOCUMENT</b>		
General	Aylesbury Vale (001/1)	No Comment
General	Central Beds Council (006/1)	No Comment
General	Berrick and Roke PC (007/1)	Support PAGE representations
General	Shiplake PC (008/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	West Berks Council (009/1)	Active engagement has taken place on cross-boundary issues
General	Bracknell Forest Council (010/1)	Active engagement has taken place on cross-boundary issues
General	Warborough PC (013/1)	Support PAGE representations
General	Earthline (012/1)	Plan should provide a favourable policy framework for extensions to Shipton-on-Cherwell quarry
General	Raymond Brown (014/1)	Chilton Waste temporary facility is well located to continue to operate for a much longer period
General	Cotswolds AONB (016/1)	Supports the plan's approach to assessing development in AONB
General	OXAGE (017/1)	The plan is not legally compliant and is unsound.
General	Berinsfield PC (018/1)	Support PAGE representations
General	Gosford/Water Eaton PC (019/1)	Re-iterates background information.
General	Benson PC (020/1)	Support PAGE representations
General	AGGROW (021/1)	Support the plan (except for Policy M2 and failure to comply with SCI).
General	Clanfield PC (022/1)	Support AGGROW representations
General	Bampton PC (023/1)	Support AGGROW representations
General	Mr R Hogg (024/1)	Support OXAGE representations

General	Siemens Tech (025/1)	Provides background to Siemens operation.
General	Woodland Trust (028/1)	Provides background on Woodland Trust
General	Marcham PC (029/1)	No Comments
General	Cherwell DC (033/1)	OCC engages in strategic planning through the Oxfordshire Growth Board. The outcome of its work on housing need will be relevant to the Plan.
General	Mr A Hatt (034/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R Bakesef (036/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr S Ball (037/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr D Kilworth (038/1)	Throw out the proposals
General	Ms K Wells (039/1)	Support OXAGE representations (response requested to questions posed).
General	Ms L Allbon (040/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Dr J Morris (041/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr D McNulty (042/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr S Fortune (043/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr G Allbon (044/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Dr J Tuson (045/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr H Bray (046/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Ms K Pomlett (047/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R and Mrs S Sladden (048/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr I Stern (049/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R Holt (050/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Mr R McMahon (051/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Rev V Gibbons (054/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mrs A Hewitt (055/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R Picken (056/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr M Westwood (057/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr T Bray (058/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mrs V Antram (059/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Mr N Antram (060/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Mr D Williams (062/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Eynsham PC (063/1)	There should be a buffer zone policy.

General	Mrs S Pavlovich (064/1)	Pro forma template is too complicated
General	Mr H Pavlovich (065/1)	Pro forma template is too complicated
General	Mr A Hull (066/1)	Support the OXAGE representations
General	Mr C Mannering (067/1)	Support the OXAGE representations
General	Ms S Keay (068/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Mrs C and Mr N Parker (069/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Hills (070/1)	Comments made on Draft Plan still apply.
General	Mr J J Taylor (072/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Ms A Elliott (073/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	CPRE Oxon (077/1)	Introduction to subsequent detailed objections
General	Mis G Guiver (078/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Dorchester PC (079/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr J Elliott (080/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr M Watt (081/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Eynsham Society (083/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Clifton Hampden PC (084/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Appleford PC (085/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mrs B Guiver (086/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr N Guiver (087/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R F Haycock (089/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Wokingham BC (090/1)	The Duty to Cooperate has been complied with
General	Greater London Authority (091/1)	Supports approach. London is planning to be self-sufficient in waste generation by 2026.
General	UKAEA (092/1)	SODC Local Plan supports the redevelopment and intensification of Culham Science Centre.
General	Mr P Power (093/1)	Concern about impact of minerals strategy on Eynsham Mill
General	Dr B Charles (094/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Hampshire County Council (096/1)	Engagement has been in line with the Duty to Co-operate and national policy
General	Highways England (097/1)	Concerned at any material increase of traffic on the strategic road network without consideration of mitigation. Understand that a transport assessment or

		statement will be prepared for the Part 2 Plan.
General	WODC (098/1)	Pleased to see the Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate
General	CAGE (099/1)	Support OXAGE representations and Brightwell Cum Sotwell.
General	Ms K Foster (100/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Wycombe District Council (101/1)	No comments. Support the Plan's aims and welcome the aim for self-sufficiency in waste.
General	Corpus Christi College (102/1)	Support the minerals planning vision and objectives. Sufficient sites need to be identified
General	SWAWP (103/1)	Approach to aggregate supply generally supported
General	Mr J Day (104/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Ms G Day (105/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Ms E Prince (106/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R Draper (107/1)	Strategy is vague and does not adequately protect local communities
General	Ms V Beardall-Richards (108/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Mr R Neale (109/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Drayton St Leonard Parish Council (110/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Wallingford TC (111/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Ms J Tucket (112/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Tarmac (119/1)	General support for (specified) parts of the plan
General	Dr K Keats-Rohan (122/1)	Support Gardener representation
General	Mr J Hewitt (123/1)	Support representations by OXAGE
General	Dr D W Reed (124/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	OUTRAGE (127/1)	The permission for gravel extraction at Stonehenge Farm has never been used and is evidence of a lack of need generally
General	P Perrin (128/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Cllr C Mathew (130/1)	Previous concerns not addressed: fundamental concerns remain
General	EA (133/1)	No Comment
General	Gallagher Estates (134/1)	Residential-led development is being proposed on the strategic resource area identified north of Wallingford.
General	Mr M Brown (135/1)	Supports Church Hanborough Residents views



General	Ms L Mansfield (138/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	Gloucs CC (139/1)	See previous consultation responses for context.
General	Magnox Ltd (140/1)	Pleased to see account taken of previous comments. Only minor modifications required.
General	Surrey CC (142/1)	No further comments
General	SEAG (145/1)	Despite the permission now issued for gravel extraction at Sonning Eye, previous comments are still valid
General	Chilterns AONB (146/1)	Comments confined to issues affecting AONB only
General	SODC (147/1)	Previous comments have been addressed but further concerns raised
General	J Howell MP (149/1)	Support PAGE representations
General	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/1)	Previous concerns not addressed: fundamental concerns remain
General	Mrs V Lester (151/1)	Support OXAGE representations
General	VoWHDC (152/1)	Previous comments have been addressed but further concerns raised
General	Woodstock TC (154L/1)	Background on process for approving the comments being made.
General	Dr A Harvey (155L/1)	Support OXAGE representations.
General	Ms A Hoare (156L/1)	Important publications have not been referred to and should inform plan content, including OCC's previously published Topic Paper on Restoration.
General	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/1)	Plan has been positively prepared and accords with national policy. Proposals made are welcomed.
1.4	Hills (070/2)	Preparation of a 2-part plan is contrary to NPPF (+ no timetable for the Part 2 Plan). Adequate information exists (site nominations) to allow a single plan with site allocations to be prepared.
1.4	Mrs B Guiver (086/2)	Preparation of a 2-part plan is contrary to NPPF. The stated preference for gravel extraction in south Oxon is not supported by appropriate site assessment.
1.4	Mr N Guiver (087/2)	Preparation of a 2-part plan is contrary to NPPF. The stated preference for gravel extraction in south Oxon is not supported by appropriate site assessment.
1.4	Sheehan (113/1)	There should be a single plan to include site allocations, there being a limited number of nominations that meet the locational strategy. Without a land availability study the Core Strategy does not provide a sound basis for planning

		in advance of the Part 2 Plan (for which there is no time-scale). The stated reason of wishing to avoid delay does not justify a 2 part plan.
1.4	M&M Skip (114/1)	See 113/1
1.4	David Einig (115/1)	See 113/1
1.4	McKenna (116/1)	See 113/1
1.4	Mr J Hewitt (123/2)	Failure to provide for sites in a single plan is contrary to NPPF.
1.4	SODC (147/2)	Ideally a single plan should be prepared: failing that a clear timetable for the Part 2 Plan is required
1.4	VoWHDC (152/2)	Ideally a single plan should be prepared: failing that a clear timetable for the Part 2 Plan is required
1.9	Historic England (120/1)	No explanation of how evidence base is used to develop policies. Specific requirements for a historic environment evidence base in NPPF.
1.14	OXAGE (017/2)	No public consultation on LAA 2014, yet this is the evidence base for the provision to be made for aggregate (policy M2). SCI (para 4.3) commits to early consultation with communities in the development of plan documents. Wider consultation should have taken place on LAA 2014 (it uses a different methodology to LAA 2013 and the Draft Plan). Reg 18 requires that relevant bodies and residents be invited to make representation on what the plan should contain (and this has not been adequately done).
1.14	OXAGE (017/3)	DtC Statement not published at start of Reps period and may be counter to Regs 17, 19 and 35. It is “relevant to the preparation of the local plan”. There is inadequate evidence to confirm SEEAWP supports LAA 2014. OCC only met 3 counties to discuss LAA 2014 but claims to have engaged with all South East and adjoining counties at ‘key stages’. The DtC Statement does not demonstrate that the legal requirement is satisfied.
1.14	AGGROW (021/2)	Not prepared in accordance with SCI.
1.14	Mr and Mrs S Sladden (048/2)	Inadequate consultation on LAA 2014
1.14	Cllr L Atkins (051/1)	Not prepared in accordance with SCI or national regulations
1.14	Prof R Harding (053/1)	Inadequate consultation on LAA 2014
1.14	Mr R Picken (056/2)	The plan is unsound, lack of public consultation, failure to comply with duty to cooperate
1.14	Mrs T Bray (058/2)	Failure of public consultation

1.14	Mrs V Antram (059/2)	Failure to consult, contrary to government policy
1.14	Mr N Antram (060/2)	Failure to consult adequately (see OXAGE)
1.14	Cllr L Lindsay-Gale (061/1)	Not prepared in accordance with SCI or national regulations
1.14	Mr D Williams (062/2)	Failure to consult properly in accordance with SCI
1.14	Mr H Pavlovich (065/2)	People not able to comment on environmental aspects – legally unsound
1.14	Ms S Keay (068/2)	Failure to consult properly in accordance with SCI
1.14	Stadhampton PC (074/1)	Support PAGE representations
1.14	Ed Vaizey MP (075/1)	Not prepared in accordance with SCI
1.14	Newington PC (076/1)	Not prepared in accordance with SCI
1.14	CPRE Oxon (077/2)	Failure to follow SCI (by not engaging with local groups on LAA 2014) is legally flawed.
1.14	Mrs B Guiver (086/3)	Failure to consult widely on LAA 2014
1.14	Mr N Guiver (087/3)	Failure to consult widely on LAA 2014
1.14	Cholsey Parish Council (095/1)	OCC failed to meet national and SCI requirements in preparing the LAA.
1.14	Ms V Beardall-Richards (108/2)	Failure to consult adequately on LAA 2014
1.14	Mr R J Neale (109/2)	Commercial interests have been favoured in the council's approach to consultation.
1.14	Sheehan (113/2)	The Council's responses to comments made on the Draft Plan were not available when the PSD was approved by Council (March 2015). Key Topic Papers are not provided with the PSD. The SCI has not been followed in a number of cases, making the Plan not legally compliant.
1.14	M&M Skip (114/2)	See 113/2
1.14	David Einig (115/2)	See 113/2
1.14	McKenna (116/2)	See 113/2
1.14	Mr V Goodstadt (117/1)	Consultation on the Draft Plan was flawed: evidence base documents were not made available (contrary to NPPF para 155; Reg 35 i.e. present evidence before consultation and for a minimum of 6 weeks).
1.14	Dr K Keats-Rohan	Consultation on LAA 2014 excluded Parishes and did not comply with SCI
1.14	OUTRAGE (127/2)	Local groups were consulted on LAA 2013 but not on LAA 2014, contrary to Regulations and SCI 2006. LAA 2014 is a key evidence base document on

		which wider consultation was required
1.14	P Perrin (128/2)	Failure to consult public/groups on LAA 2014
1.14	Cllr C Mathew (130/2)	Fresh consultation should have been undertaken on the revised methodology being used to assess the provision required for aggregate. Key evidence documents still not published – process flawed.
1.14	Mr M Brown (135/2)	Para 7.11 refers to an assessment of nominated sites: if it is relevant why is it not available?
1.14	Ms L Mansfield (138/2)	Inadequate consultation on LAA 2014
1.14	Office of Rail and Road (148/1)	No need to consult unless waste plan mentions impacts on mainline railway
1.14	J Howell MP (149/2)	SCI intends ‘meaningful engagement....at an early stage’. Regulations require consultation with ‘such of the general consultation bodies as the lpa consider appropriate <i>and residents</i> ’. Residents/groups consulted on LAA 2013 were not consulted on LAA 2014 – a key evidence document supporting policy M2. Councillors advised this was due to time pressures but time was found to consult MPAs and Operators.
1.14	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/2)	Fresh consultation should have been undertaken on the revised methodology being used to assess the provision required for aggregate. Key evidence documents still not published – process flawed.
S.2	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell PC (118/1)	Evidence base flawed viz: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fig 1 omits SSSI in the parish;</li> <li>- Fig 2 omits Science Vale;</li> <li>- Fig 13 omits restrictions (weight limits?)</li> </ul>
2.1	Historic England (120/2)	Reference should be made to the World Heritage Site at Blenheim Palace, registered parks and gardens and conservation areas
Fig 1	Ms A Hoare (156L/2)	Fails to show Oxfordshire Biodiversity Conservation Target Areas.
2.8	Hills (070/3)	Inadequate explanation as to how imports have helped sustain Oxon development during the period of low aggregate production.
Fig 5	Earthline (012/2)	Shipton-on-Cherwell operations should appear on the plan
2.16	Ms A Hoare (156L/3)	No reference made to UN Convention on Biological Unity
2.18	Ms A Hoare (156L/4)	Relevant national/international is poorly referenced or missing.
2.19	Ms A Hoare (156L/5)	As 156L/4
2.21	Ms A Hoare (156L/6)	NPPF policy on Mineral Planning is poorly summarised and omits important

		references to environmental protection.
2.30	Mr M Brown (135/3)	Information should be provided on WODC policies and what has been done to address the Inspector’s concerns with the previous plan.
2.31	Cherwell DC (033/2)	Adoption of the Cherwell Local Plan in July 2015 should be referred to.
2.31	Opes Industries (129/1)	Adoption of the Cherwell Local Plan in July 2015 should be referred to.
2.34	Ms A Hoare (156L/7)	Strategic objectives should refer to/reflect Oxon Biodiversity Action Plan.
2,41	Ms A Hoare (156L/8)	Issues do not adequately reflect the need to protect the environment from the impact of minerals and waste development.
2.43	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/1)	Make reference to Sonning Eye as an example of an area affected by flooding
2.44	Tarmac (119/2)	Make reference to AONB being relevant when choosing locations for mineral working. The importance of inert waste to restore quarries should also be referred to.
2.44	Historic England (120/3)	Impact on the historic (and natural) environment should be a key issue for minerals
2.44	Ms A Hoare (156L/9)	In view of its importance, restoration should be included in the strategic issues
2.48	Historic England (120/4)	Impact on the historic (and natural) environment should be a key issue for waste
2.49	Ms A Hoare (156L/10)	Reference should be made to the importance of restoring mineral workings as well as the need to ensure an adequate supply of raw material.
3.3	Lord Bradshaw (032/1)	Vision should reflect that imported crushed rock will replace the need for locally won primary aggregate
3.3	Cherwell DC (033/3)	The Vision is supported
3.3	Hills (070/4)	Vision should apply to the whole of the plan period and omit as irrelevant ‘world class economy’.
3.3	Grundon (082/1)	Supported but objective (ii) could usefully seek to make provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate by ‘ensuring sufficient reserves and productive capacity’.
3.3	WODC (098/2)	Minimising the distance aggregates travel by road is supported. To be consistent with the vision the objectives should explicitly refer to a shift from West Oxfordshire to South Oxfordshire.
3.3	Sheehan (113/3)	The words “where practicable” should be removed from the preference expressed for using recycled and secondary aggregate to land-won mineral.

		Recycled aggregate can meet more demanding construction specifications.
3.3	M&M Skip (114/3)	See 113/3
3.3	David Einig (115/3)	See 113/3
3.3	McKenna (116/3)	See 113/3
3.3 (& 3.6)	Mr R Draper (107/2)	Vision, Principles and Objectives should be strengthened to protect communities
3.3	Mr V Goodstadt (117/2)	Vision not sufficiently 'local' and does not refer to the key aim of redressing the balance of supply for aggregate between west and south of county
3.3	Tarmac (119/3)	Greater emphasis on the economic importance of minerals to growth required. Also needs to better set out how cross-border relationships will work.
3.3	Historic England (120/5)	Support clause b, though it would be helpful to specify 'natural and historic environment'
3.3	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/2)	Add reference to adverse impact of development on flood risk and landscape
3.3	Ms A Hoare (156L/11)	The aim to secure the restoration of exhausted workings should be more positively expressed.
3.4	Mr P Power (093/2)	Welcome references to the need to minimise flooding and protect natural and historic environment.
3.4	MPA (125/1)	Support objectives, but suggest addition to (ii) to provide for sufficient reserves <i>and productive capacity</i>
3.4	OMPG (131/1)	Support objectives, but suggest addition to (ii) to provide for sufficient reserves <i>and productive capacity</i>
3.4	Smiths (132/1)	Minerals objectives and vision broadly supported
3.4(1)	Sheehan (113/4)	The word "practical" should be removed from the preference expressed for using recycled and secondary aggregate to land-won mineral. Recycled aggregate can meet more demanding construction specifications.
3.4(1)	M&M Skip (114/4)	See 113/4
3.4(1)	David Einig (115/4)	See 113/4
3.4(1)	McKenna (116/4)	See 113/4
3.4(iii)	West Berks (009/2)	Support objective
3.4(vi)	Hills (070/5)	Reference to flood risk not required
3.4(vi)	Gosford/Water Eaton (019/2)	More emphasis required on sustainable drainage and capturing pollution.

3.4(vi)	Hills (070/5)	Flood impact of minerals development is already negligible
3.4(vi)	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/3)	Include reference to a desire to use of landfill for restoration in areas of high flood risk
3.4(vii)	Gosford/Water Eaton (019/3)	Place greater emphasis on preventing lorries using local (non-designated) routes – especially AQMAs.
3.4(vii)	Lord Bradshaw (032/2)	The aim of encouraging mineral supply by rail supports an import strategy over locally won sources.
3.4(ix)	Ms A Hoare (156L/12)	Needs to be strengthened: current objective is not effective as that expressed in the previous (withdrawn) Core Strategy.
3.4(x)	Ms A Hoare (156L/13)	As 156L/12
3.5	WODC (098/3)	Supports approach. Concerned about proposed closure of HWRCs. Recycling targets can only be met if there are convenient recycling facilities.
3.5	Historic England (120/6)	Support objectives iv and viii
3.6	Cherwell DC (033/4)	The Vision is supported
3.6	Grundon (082/2)	The Vision is supported (assumption made about the sense of objective x)
3.6	Tarmac (119/4)	Reference needs to be made to the importance of recovering waste to restore quarries.
3.6	Historic England (120/7)	Support clause c, though it would be helpful to specify 'natural and historic environment'
3.7(i)	West Berks (009/4)	Support objective
3.7(iv)	Hills (070/6)	The term 'other areas' is not clear
3.7 (vii)	Mr R Draper (017/3)	Emphasis should be given to reducing imports from outside Oxfordshire
3.7(viii)	Sheehan (113/5)	A presumption against use of green field sites is not supported by NPPF. No analysis of pdl has been carried out. No more than 20% of nominations on pdl.
3.7(viii)	M&M Skip (114/5)	See 113/5
3.7(viii)	David Einig (115/5)	See 113/5
3.7(viii)	McKenna (116/5)	See 113/5
3.7 (ix)	Historic England (120/8)	Support objective ix
3.7(x)	Hills (070/7)	Objective should provide a framework for investment (as 3.4v) rather than provide for temporary facilities

S.4	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/4)	Add to para 4.3 to emphasis importance of speedy restoration to preserve landscape character
S.4	Ms A Hoare (156L/14)	Makes inadequate reference to the importance of restoring exhausted quarries.
M1	Earthline (012/3)	Permanent retention of existing facilities may be preferable to new locations closer to towns
M1	Raymond Brown (014/2)	Policies on aggregate recycling should be confined to the minerals section and amended to allow long term retention of facilities in worked out quarries.
M1	Clifton Hampden PC (084/2)	Provide a forecast for S&RA and adjust requirement for primary aggregate accordingly
M1	Appleford PC (085/2)	Provide a forecast for S&RA and adjust requirement for primary aggregate accordingly
M1	WODC (098/4)	Welcome this policy. However, concerned about the omission of a minimum target.
M1	SWAWP (103/2)	South West China Clay deposits could contribute to aggregate supplies
M1	Sheehan (113/6)	The words “so far as is practicable” should be removed and reference made to new technologies. It is misplaced to think recycled aggregate (s&ra) cannot meet more demanding construction specifications. Encouraging the import of s&ra is not sustainable and not supported by evidence. Failure to include a target for s&ra is unsound as it is contrary to para 145 of NPPF (plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates). It should make provision for facilities that are capable of producing 0.926 mtpa of s&ra (in line with national and regional guidelines on aggregate provision in England 2005-2020).
M1	M&M Skip (114/6)	See 113/6
M1	David Einig (115/6)	See 113/6
M1	McKenna (116/6)	See 113/6
M1	Tarmac (119/5)	Policy supported
M1	Historic England (120/9)	Support policy
M1	Smiths (132/2)	Supported
M2	Vicky Johnson (003/1)	The level of provision made for sand and gravel is too high
M2	West Berks (009/3)	Support level of provision for soft sand
M2	Northants (011/1)	Levels of provision to be included in policy



M2	OXAGE (017/4)	Level of provision not based on last 10 year sales, as most MPAs. Relies on 'local factors' that are not sufficiently robust to justify the different approach taken. Last 3 year sales shows declining demand. The provision being made is 42% higher than required and leads to an unnecessary need to release land for at least one new quarry.
M2	AGGROW (021/3)	Fails to follow government guidance on provision to be made for aggregates or take adequate account of evidence pointing to a lower level of need than has been identified.
M2	Mr R Hogg (024/2)	Provision for aggregate should be based on previous 10 year sales average only
M2	Kent CC (031/1)	The provision to be made for aggregate should be included in the policy. There should be added flexibility to allow for cross-boundary movements, especially for soft sand.
M2	Lord Bradshaw (032/3)	The required primary aggregate could be met by imported crushed rock and china clay waste transported by rail. Rail movements from Brentford to Sutton Courtenay have ceased, creating additional capacity that has only partially been affected by recent imports of ash from Drax. Imports already exist and are growing and they are a viable alternative.
M2	Mr A Hatt (034/2)	Concerned at the decision to abandon the 10 year sales average approach to assessment of aggregate needs.
M2	Mr R Bakesef (036/2)	Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Mr S Ball (037/2)	Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Ms K Wells (039/2)	Provision for sand and gravel is now 50% greater than previous draft plan in order that Oxon can be a net exporter. Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice.
M2	Ms L Allbon (040/2)	The method used to assess aggregate need is flawed and results in an inflated level of need.
M2	Mr D McNulty (042/2)	Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Mr S Fortune (043/2)	Provision for sand and gravel is now 50% greater than previous draft plan in

		order that Oxon can be a net exporter. Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice.
M2	Mr G Allbon (044/2)	Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Mr H Bray (046/2)	Provision for sand and gravel is now 50% greater than previous draft plan in order that Oxon can be a net exporter. Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Ms K Pomlett (047/2)	The method used to assess aggregate need is flawed and results in an inflated level of need.
M2	Mr R and Mrs S Sladden (048/3)	Provision for sand and gravel is now 50% greater than previous draft plan in order that Oxon can be a net exporter. Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Mr I Stern (049/2)	Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found.
M2	Mr R Holt (050/3)	NPPF advises using 10 year average for LAA
M2	Cllr L Atkins (051/2)	Evidence does not support assertion that economic growth leads to increased demand for sand and gravel. LAA is flawed.
M2	Mr R McMahon (052/2)	NPPF advises 10 year average for LAA calculation
M2	Rev V Gibbons (054/3)	Concerned about the new method for calculating LAA
M2	Mrs A Hewitt (055/2)	Object to OCC abandoning 10 year average methodology for LAA
M2	Mr M Westwood (057/2)	Government guidelines advise 10 year average for LAA calculation
M2	Mrs T Bray (058/3)	If LAA had been done properly there would be no need for new sites
M2	Mrs V Antram (059/3)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Mr N Antram (060/3)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Cllr L Lindsay-Gale (061/2)	Evidence does not support assertion that economic growth leads to increased demand for sand and gravel. LAA is flawed.
M2	Mr D Williams (062/3)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Eynsham Parish Council (063/2)	Major flaws in the LAA document makes the plan unsound
M2	Mrs S Pavlovich (064/2)	LAA should have used 10 year average – as NPPF. OCC will be a net exporter

		as a result of using a different methodology.
M2	Mr H Pavlovich (065/2)	Provision for aggregate should be based on previous 10 year sales.
M2	Mr A Hull (066/2)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Mr C Mannering (067/2)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Ms S Keay (068/3)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Mrs C and Mr N Parker (069/2)	NPPF advises using 10 year average, object to OCC abandoning this method
M2	Hills (070/8)	Methodology not NPPF compliant. Plan should confirm which month each annual LAA will be produced. Oxon soft sand travels widely: 'less widely distributed' should be deleted.
M2	Mr J J Taylor (072/2)	Level of provision not based on last 10 year sales and is at odds with Draft Plan. Relies on 'local factors' that are not sufficiently robust to justify the different approach taken. Last 3 year sales shows declining demand. The provision being made is 42% higher than required.
M2	Ms A Elliott (073/2)	Provision for sand and gravel is now 50% greater than previous draft plan in order that Oxon can be a net exporter. Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found. Consultation on these figures has been inadequate
M2	Stadhampton PC (074/2)	The local information used to justify departing from last 10 year sales average approach is not robust
M2	Ed Vaizey MP (075/2)	The local information used to justify departing from last 10 year sales average approach is not robust
M2	Newington PC (076/2)	The local information used to justify departing from last 10 year sales average approach is not robust
M2	CPRE Oxon (077/3)	LAA 2014 is a radical departure from NPPF and not justified, resulting in an unsound policy.
M2	Miss G Guiver (078/2)	Failure to consult on LAA 2014 has resulted in a flawed conclusion.
M2	Mr J Elliott (080/2)	Provision for sand and gravel is now 50% greater than previous draft plan in order that Oxon can be a net exporter. Plan should use last 10 year sales average methodology as per government advice – negating the need for additional sites to be found. Consultation on these figures has been inadequate
M2	Mr M Watt (081/2)	Level of provision not based on last 10 year sales and is at odds with draft Plan 2014. The provision for sites is therefore more than required and suggests

		OCC wants to be a net exporter.
M2	Grundon (082/3)	Support the methodology used, but reference also needs to be made to productive capacity in order to secure a 'steady' supply of aggregate.
M2	Clifton Hampden PC (084/3)	The methodology to be used to forecast annual aggregate requirement should use the 10 year average only, be the subject of consultation and be confirmed in the policy.
M2	Appleford PC (085/3)	The methodology to be used to forecast aggregate requirement should use the 10 year average only and be the subject of consultation.
M2	Mrs B Guiver (086/4)	The methodology to be used to forecast aggregate requirement should use the 10 year average only – as per the Draft Plan
M2	Mr N Guiver (087/4)	The methodology to be used to forecast aggregate requirement should use the 10 year average only – as per the Draft Plan
M2	Mr R F Haycock (089/2)	The methodology to be used to forecast aggregate requirement should use the 10 year average only
M2	Dr B Charles (094/2)	Concerned about the new method for calculating LAA
M2	Cholsey Parish Council (095/2)	Need has been overestimated, failed to consider how demand could be met by onsite waste and external sources such as by products from china clay
M2	WODC (098/5)	Increase in sand and gravel provision should be explained more clearly. How will the annual LAA update be incorporated into the adopted plan? And how will it feed into the site allocations DPD?
M2	Ms K Foster (100/2)	Concerned about new method for calculating LAA
M2	SWAWP (103/3)	Table 2 footnote could be clearer. Supply from Gloucestershire/Wilts could be affected by abandoned site. Approach to LAA is considered sound.
M2	Mr J Day (104/2)	Concerned about LAA calculation
M2	Ms G Day (105/2)	Concerned about LAA calculation
M2	Ms E Prince (106/2)	Concerned about lack of consultation on LAA
M2	Ms V Beardall-Richards (108/3)	Higher LAA calculation based on spurious and circular arguments
M2	Ms J Tuckett (112/2)	The method used to assess aggregate need results in an inflated level of need.
M2	Mr V Goodstadt (117/3)	The policy does not provide sufficient constraint on the provision that may finally be made for sand and gravel sites
M2	Mr V Goodstadt (117/4)	The recent Gill Mill decision confirms the prospect of over-provision from the

		preferred areas unless the policy is tightened to confirm the level required
M2	Tarmac (119/6)	Approach supported
M2	Dr K Keats-Rohan (122/3)	The method used to assess aggregate need results in an inflated outcome whereas the previous method would produce a need for no new sites.
M2	Mr J Hewitt (123/3)	NPPF advises using a historic 10 year average of mineral sales to forecast future need. OCC abandoned this approach without any consultation, leaving a requirement for unnecessary need for further sites to be found.
M2	Dr D W Reed (124/2)	Aggregate forecast not clearly justified. Suggests a bias to operator interests and political complicity in West Oxfordshire.
M2	MPA (125/2)	To provide for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate policy needs to address productive capacity as well as landbanks/reserves (capacity is currently 800,000 tpa but >1.0 mtpa is currently required). To maintain landbanks throughout the plan period there needs to be a 7 year supply at 2031 (i.e. to 2038). Total SS&G requirement should thus be 7.1 mt and SS 1.3 mt.
M2	OUTRAGE (127/3)	LAA 2014 ignores evidence that growth does not require ever increasing quantities of aggregate. The method used to increase supply above the 10-year average is backward facing and will become quickly outdated. The methodology results in an excessive level of need and is unsustainable.
M2	OUTRAGE (127/4)	The local factors used to justify a departure from the 10 year sales average are not well researched and have been mis-applied.
M2	P Perrin (128/3)	Concern at abandoning the previous methodology for assessing aggregate supply (10 year average) put forward by Local Groups.
M2	Cllr C Mathew (130/3)	Methodology for calculating aggregate provision unsatisfactory and even 10 year average calculation is over-stated (relies on 2012 figures; 2013 shows further decline in sales). Inadequate consideration given to S&R contribution. Results in an over-provision of >4.2 million tonnes.
M2	OMPG (131/2)	To provide for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate policy needs to address productive capacity as well as land banks/reserves (capacity is currently 800,000 tpa but >1.0 mtpa is currently required). To maintain land banks throughout the plan period there needs to be a 7 year supply at 2031 (i.e. to 2038). Total SS&G requirement should thus be 7.1 mt and SS 1.3 mt.

M2	Smiths (132/3)	Error in Table 2 (Gill Mill average working rate)
M2	Smiths (132/4)	Policy should confirm LAA will be <i>published</i> annually and reflect AMS data collected in the year of the review
M2	Ms L Mansfield (138/3)	Concerned at LAA calculation
M2	Gloucs CC (139/2)	Supported. Note confirmed withdrawal of planning application for extraction at Down Ampney (5.5 mt) and no obvious prospect of release.
M2	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/5)	Support OXAGE submission on the provision that should be made for aggregate.
M2	SEAG (145/2)	Support OXAGE submission on the provision that should be made for aggregate.
M2	SODC (147/3)	Insufficiently clear the extent to which SHMA and SEP have influenced the aggregate forecast: also the contribution from S&RA. The contribution from the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme should also be specified.
M2	J Howell MP (149/3)	British Marine Aggregate Producers Assoc advises that since 1980 construction output has risen but s&g production fallen. This invalidates the assertion that OCC's intended economic growth produces a need for higher levels of s&g.
M2	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/3)	Methodology for calculating aggregate provision unsatisfactory and even 10 year average calculation is over-stated (relies on 2012 figures; 2013 shows further decline in sales). Inadequate consideration given to S&R contribution. Results in an over-provision of >4.2 million tonnes.
M2	Mrs V Lester (151/2)	Concern that the method previously used to assess aggregate need has been abandoned in favour one that produces a figure 50% higher than before.
M2	VoWHDC (152/3)	Insufficiently clear the extent to which SHMA and SEP have influenced the aggregate forecast: also the contribution from S&RA. The contribution from the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme should also be specified.
M2	Dr A Harvey (155L/2)	Concern that the method previously used to assess aggregate need has been abandoned in favour one that requires additional working areas to be found.
M2	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/2)	The acknowledged need to continue to import some aggregate may impact on the Wiltshire and Swindon areas and will not be helped by the abandonment of proposals for extraction at Down Ampney. The recent consent at Gill Mill will reduce these pressures but a clearer strategy is required to demonstrate how

		longer term needs will be met.
M3	Kingston Bagpuize (005/1)	The strategy allocates site SS-04 for development and the environmental impact is unacceptable
M3	Shiplake (008/1)	Gravel extraction east of Reading is contrary to SODC Local Plan landscape policy (large scale development will be inappropriate).
M3	Earthline (012/4)	Identify the area around Shipton-on-Cherwell as a preferred area for working crushed rock
M3	OXAGE (017/5)	Absence of specific sites creates unnecessary blight over the various broad areas identified. There is no evidence base showing how those areas have been selected. The two-part plan approach is contrary to government policy and is not adequately justified.
M3	Siemens Tech (025/2)	Concerned at identification of broad area close to company operations and potential to disrupt output.
M3	Lord Bradshaw (032/4)	Rather than despoil the area between Oxford and Cholsey with new working, demand can be met by increased import from elsewhere.
M3	Cherwell DC (033/5)	The working areas in Cherwell are supported.
M3	Hanborough PC (035/1)	Working Area 6 should be amended to exclude land north of A40
M3	Ms K Wells (039/3)	Oppose identification of Cholsey area. Inadequate justification given in Plan.
M3	Ms L Allbon (040/3)	The preference for new sites in southern Oxon is unsupported by evidence.
M3	Dr J Morris (041/2)	The preference for new sites in southern Oxon is unsupported by evidence.
M3	Dr J Tuson (045/2)	The preference for new sites in southern Oxon is unsupported by evidence.
M3	Mr R and Mrs S Sladden (048/4)	South Oxfordshire areas are identified without adequate evidence and notwithstanding intention to identify sites in Part 2 Plan.
M3	Mr R Holt (050/3)	The preference for new sites in southern Oxon is unsupported by evidence.
M3	Rev V Gibbons (054/4)	Concerned that potential sites and evidence for choosing each site has not been set out
M3	Mrs A Hewitt (055/3)	Not complaint with NPPF – OCC should set out potential sites and evidence
M3	Mrs V Antram (059/4)	Inadequate evidence for the stated preference of new gravel sites being in southern Oxon.
M3	Mr N Antram (060/4)	Not complaint with NPPF – OCC should set out potential sites and evidence
M3	Cllr L Lindsay-Gale (061/3)	No evidence for the proposal to shift the balance of minerals production from

		the west to the south.
M3	Mr D Williams (062/4)	Not complaint with NPPF – OCC should set out potential sites and evidence
M3	Eynsham Parish Council (063/3)	See 062/2 (M2)
M3	Mr H Pavlovich (065/4)	Not complaint with NPPF – OCC should set out potential sites and evidence
M3	Mr C Mannering (067/3)	Not complaint with NPPF – OCC should set out potential sites and evidence
M3	Ms S Keay (068/4)	Not complaint with NPPF – OCC should set out potential sites and evidence
M3	Hills (070/9)	Add criteria (landbanks and windfalls) to allow for the working of mineral outside the specified areas.
M3	Church Hanborough Residents (071)	Working Area 6 should be amended to exclude land north of A40
M3	Ms A Elliott (073/3)	South Oxfordshire areas are identified without adequate evidence and notwithstanding intention to identify sites in Part 2 Plan.
M3	Stadhampton PC (074/3)	Need to identify a new working area in south Oxon is unfounded and at odds with a 'no sites' plan. Lack of specific sites will lead to widespread blight.
M3	Newington PC (076/3)	Need to identify a new working area in south Oxon is unfounded and at odds with a 'no sites' plan.
M3	CPRE Oxon (077/4)	Inadequate justification given for the identified resource areas. Failure to identify sites is not compliant with NPPG.
M3	Mr J Elliott (080/3)	South Oxfordshire areas are identified without adequate evidence and notwithstanding intention to identify sites in Part 2 Plan.
M3	Mr M Watt (081/3)	South Oxfordshire areas are identified without adequate evidence and notwithstanding intention to identify sites in Part 2 Plan.
M3	Eynsham Society (083/2)	Policy should exclude any part of West Oxfordshire as a preferred area of working
M3	Clifton Hampden PC (084/4)	Additional resources west of Oxford should be included as preferred areas. No evidence that Green Belt has been taken into account in identifying designated areas (notwithstanding reference in footnote 83 to policy C1 as to the relevance of Green Belt).
M3	Appleford PC (085/4)	No evidence that Green Belt has been taken into account in identifying designated areas (notwithstanding reference in footnote 83 to policy C1 as to the relevance of Green Belt).
M3	Ms S Neale (088/1)	The site around Wallingford is unsuitable for mineral extraction and should be



		deleted
M3	Wokingham Borough Council (090/2)	Pending construction of third Thames Bridge, HGVs must be routed away from existing bridges across the Thames between Reading and Henley
M3	UKAEA (092/2)	Concerned about Oxford to Cholsey area of search, facilities at Culham Science Centre require clean air
M3	Mr P Power (093/3)	Inclusion of land around Eynsham Mill in an 'area of search' is inappropriate. Broad search areas will cause blight. Figure 9 is unsound as it shows areas which have no realistic prospect of being worked.
M3	WODC (098/6)	Concerned that West Oxfordshire will continue to provide majority of sand and gravel but welcome acknowledgement that requirement for additional sites should be met from South. Would only support additional sand and gravel working in West Oxfordshire in later part of plan period if need shown. Buffer zones should be detailed. A map showing the exclusion areas referred to in para 4.24 would be beneficial.
M3 (&M4)	SWAWP (103/4)	Increase in strategic resources areas welcomed, concern no consideration of candidate sites
M3	Ms G Day (105/3)	Not NPPF compliant: allocation of sites and preferred areas set out without formal evidence
M3	Ms V Beardall-Richards (108/4)	Not NPPF compliant: allocation of sites and preferred areas set out without formal evidence
M3	Mr R J Neale (109/3)	That part of the Strategic Resource Area that includes Cholsey are formed of low quality gravels and have not been adequately assessed for the impact on the areas historic and landscape character.
M3	Mr V Goodstadt (117/5)	The Preferred Areas for sand and gravel are too broad, given the modest level of provision required, and are even larger than those in the Draft Plan (2014) where the provision to be made was more.
M3	Mr V Goodstadt (117/6)	The level of provision expected from each preferred area should be shown. The area identified in west Oxon is not required.
M3	Mr V Goodstadt (117/7)	The preferred area in west Oxon is too close to housing, contrary to the assessment made when previously identified.
M3	Mr V Goodstadt (117/8)	The Key Diagram should include (reduced) areas of sand and gravel working

(KD)		based on clear priority
M3	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell PC (118/2)	Several large resource areas are not shown on Key Diagram: poor evidence why excluded, many factors not considered. Unnecessarily restricts site selection and no evidence of community involvement.
M3	Tarmac (119/7)	Approach supported. Sites in Caversham area will be brought forward.
M3 (4.24)	Historic England (120/10)	World Heritage site and conservation areas should be excluded from strategic resource areas. The exclusion of registered historic parks and gardens would also be welcome
M3 (4.35)	Historic England (120/11)	Paragraph should be revised to recognise and protect the archaeological resources of the Lower Windrush Valley and Thames and Lower Thames strategic resources areas
M3 (4.44)	Historic England (120/12)	Welcome suggestion that it would not be necessary to work aggregate within designated areas and sites
M3	Historic England (120/13)	Suggest amendment to final sentence.
M3 (Fig 9)	(Historic England 120/14)	In allocating sites consideration must be given to avoiding adverse impacts on heritage assets
M3	Croudace Strategic (121)	Landowner for SG-47 nomination no longer intending to make this land available. Area should be removed from strategic resource area, otherwise it is not deliverable
M3	Dr K Keats-Rohan (122/4)	Plan fails to be clear about potential sites
M3	Dr D W Reed (124/3)	Identifying Cholsey area as a SRA fails to pay adequate attention to community involvement
M3	Opes Industries (129/2)	The policy (and M4/M5) does not allow for planned extension of Finmere Quarry and it should.
M3	Cllr C Mathew (130/4)	Impact of flooding underestimated, especially on Lower Windrush preferred area. Further excavation will exacerbate flood risk to Oxford.
M3	Gallagher Estates (134/2)	Boundaries of MRAs are inadequately defined.
M3	Mr M Brown (135/4)	Area 6 overlays Green Belt but not shown on Key Diagram. Depiction of boundaries of Strategic Resource Areas (Key Diagram) inadequate.
M3	Mr M Brown (135/5)	Unlike Waste section, Green Belt not considered as constraint in identifying Strategic Resource Areas. Conservation Areas etc also relevant and have been ignored. Area north of A40 should be deleted from Area 6.

M3	Blenheim Estate/TD Henman (137/1)	Landowner support for inclusion of Area 6 as a Strategic Resource Area.
M3	Gloucs CC (139/3)	Expansion of working areas welcomed.
M3	Mr D Dryden (141/1)	Omit Lower Evenlode Valley from Strategic Mineral Resource Area 6.
M3	Hanson UK (143/1)	The Bampton/Clanfield SRA should not be excluded from the policy.
M3	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/6)	The need to supply aggregate to other areas does not justify extraction from an area at high risk of flooding. Delete Area 4 (Sonning Eye) from policy
M3	SEAG (145/3)	The provision to be made for the supply of aggregate is now reduced and does not justify extracting mineral from an area at high risk of flooding. Delete Area 4 (Sonning Eye) from policy
M3	SODC (147/4)	The approach now being taken provides better assurance that site allocation will be plan-led
M3	J Howell MP (149/4)	The evidence provided (para 4.24) for the mapped SRAs is wholly inadequate. Mapped boundaries insufficiently clear.
M3	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/4)	Impact of flooding underestimated, especially on Lower Windrush preferred area. Further excavation will exacerbate flood risk to Oxford.
M3	VoWHDC (152/4)	The approach now being taken provides better assurance that site allocation will be plan-led
M3	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/3)	The approach is supported.
M4	Hinton Waldrist (004/1)	Support the priority being given to extending existing quarries
M4	Earthline (012/5)	Support preference for extending existing quarries
M4(M5)	OXAGE (017/6)	The policy attempts to identify a new working area in SODC/Vale (para 4.31) without adequate evidence. This approach is at odds with the general approach outlined in M3
M4	Mr R Hogg (24/3)	Premature to express a preference for new working in south Oxon before proper environmental assessment of options.
M4	Siemens Tech (025/3)	Support for protection given to sensitive receptors against adverse impact of development
M4	Cherwell DC (033/6)	Policy is supported, particularly the intended change in balance of provision from north to south of the county and the preference for extension of soft and working over new quarries.

M4	Mr R Bakesef (036/3)	Premature to express a preference for new working in south Oxon before proper environmental assessment of options.
M4	Cllr L Atkins (051/3)	No supporting evidence for proposal to shift the balance of minerals production from West to South Oxfordshire.
M4	Eynsham Parish Council (063/4)	See 062/2 (M2)
M4	Hills (070/10)	Criterion k(iv) should refer to <i>best and most versatile</i> agricultural land
M4	Ed Vaizey MP (075/3)	Need to shift from West to South Oxon not supported by evidence.
M4	Grundon (082/4)	The desired re-adjustment in production capacity between west and south could be made by increasing production capacity in south. Working in AONB should be approached more flexibly. The approach to cumulative impact is not NPPF compliant.
M4	Clifton Hampden PC (084/5)	The aim to rebalance supply of aggregate between west and south should be deleted from the policy and replaced with a method for ensuring applications are not approved until later in the plan period (absence of need in short term). Policy should also address Green Belt impacts.
M4	Appleford PC (085/5)	The aim to rebalance supply of aggregate between west and south should be deleted from the policy and replaced with a method for ensuring applications are not approved until later in the plan period (absence of need in short term). Policy should also address Green Belt impacts.
M4	Mr P Power (093/4)	Support criterion i, j and k.
M4	WODC (098/7)	Policy should be more explicit (as supporting text) that a higher proportion of supply should come from southern Oxfordshire at least during the first half of the plan period.
M4	Mr V Goodstadt (117/9)	Policy is the only means by which a shift in production between west and south can be achieved but is not strong enough to bring this about and needs better and more specific support about levels of provision between west and south in policy M2
M4	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell PC (118/3)	Desire for new area of working in south Oxon not based on evidence. Bampton area is as convenient to supply growth in Wantage/Science Vale.
M4	Historic England (120/15)	Suggests amendments to clauses j and k
M4	Dr D W Reed (124/4)	If it is too early to identify specific sites, it is too early to say they should be in SODC, not WODC.

M4	MPA (125/3)	To provide for sufficient aggregate, supply from West Oxon will need to be maintained as well as new area(s) in south. The approach to extraction in AONB is not sufficiently flexible. Cumulative impact is wrongly interpreted as operations spanning a period of time.
M4	Cllr C Mathew (130/5)	No evidence to support plan statement that gravel is 'more extensive' in West Oxon. 74.6% excavated from this area in last 10 years: Gill Mill permission will ensure West Oxon will supply 80% to 2031. Dominant need is in south of county: better evidence required to back up the desired re-balancing between west and south Oxon.
M4	OMPG (131/3)	To provide for sufficient aggregate supply from West Oxon will need to be maintained as well as new area(s) in south. The approach to extraction in AONB is not sufficiently flexible. Cumulative impact is wrongly interpreted as operations spanning a period of time.
M4	Smiths (132/5)	Avoidance of locations in AONB and SSS1 etc should be s/t ability to suitably mitigate harm. 'Successive' working should be omitted from references to cumulative impact.
M4	Mr M Brown (135/6)	Plan only needs to provide for 2027-2031 (para 4.27). 4.0 mt required. A shift of balance from west to south, as sought, should start now – not over the plan period (para 4.46). Area 6 is not required.
M4	Gloucs CC (139/4)	Approach supported but assessment of candidate locations needed to demonstrate deliverability.
M4	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/7)	Add reference to air pollution and noise. Make other detailed change to make more equal the various criteria that are to be applied
M4	SODC (147/5)	Inadequate justification for the aspiration to shift the balance from west to south
M4	J Howell MP (149/5)	No evidence is provided for the assertions in paras 4.28 and 4.29 (west and south balance)
M4	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/5)	No evidence to support plan statement that gravel is 'more extensive' in West Oxon. 74.6% excavated from this area in last 10 years: Gill Mill permission will ensure West Oxon will supply 80% to 2031. Dominant need is in south of county: better evidence required to back up re-balancing between west and south Oxon.
M4	VoWHDC (152/5)	Inadequate justification for the aspiration to shift the balance from west to south

M4	Woodstock Town Council (154L/2)	Support the policy of keeping mineral extraction away from Blenheim World Heritage Site.
M4	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/4)	The approach to mineral extraction in and adjoining AONBs is too restrictive and not in accordance with NPPF.
M5	Cherwell DC (033/7)	Support intentions for future ironstone working, particularly the need for environmental benefit should future working be approved.
M5	Hills (070/11)	Requirements already covered elsewhere. Only needs to cover ironstone and windfalls.
M5	Grundon (082/5)	Policy should provide for sufficient productive capacity as well as maintenance of a specified land bank.
M5	MPA (125/4)	Policy should include reference to 'productive capacity'.
M5	OMPG (131/4)	Policy should include reference to 'productive capacity'.
M5	Mr M Brown (135/7)	Policy allows for permissions to be granted prior to adoption of Part 2 Plan, but para 4.27 confirms sufficient reserves to 2027. Policy flawed.
M6	Gosford/Water Eaton (019/4)	Water Eaton sidings create unacceptable impact. Designate new site at Bicester.
M6	Lord Bradshaw (032/5)	The capacity of existing rail heads (including Theale in Berkshire) should be increased and a new facility built at Bicester, to support an alternative to making provision for new areas to work primary aggregate in Oxfordshire.
M6	Cherwell DC (033/8)	Policy is confused as it provides for sites to be safeguarded in the Part 2 Plan whilst naming specific sites that are safeguarded.
M6	Tarmac (119/8)	Needs to do more for 'potential' locations (NPPF)
M6	South Gloucs (153/L/1)	LAA 2014 methodology supported but on-going need for liaison (DtC) in view of reliance on imported rock.
M6	South Gloucs Council (153L/1)	In view of the acknowledgement that some aggregate needs will be met from out of county sites, ongoing engagement with the relevant areas is required.
M7	Kent CC (031/2)	A more comprehensive policy should be developed for oil and gas.
M7	Cherwell DC (033/9)	The approach to Building Stone is supported.
M7	Tarmac (119/9)	Policy supported
M7 (4.52)	Historic England (120/16)	Welcome recognition of the importance of small scale building, roofing and waling stone extraction

M7 (4.53)	Historic England (120/17)	Welcome and support reference to salvage and re-use of traditional stone
M7	Historic England (120/18)	Welcome and support the principle. However, see comments on M3 regarding clay extraction.
M7	MPA (125/5)	'Small-scale' is neither defined nor justified and should be deleted.
M7	OMPG (131/5)	'Small-scale' is neither defined nor justified and should be deleted.
M7	Smiths (132/6)	'Small-scale' is neither defined nor justified and should be deleted.
M7	Chilterns AONB (146/2)	Too permissive and test to be applied in AONB not compliant with NPPF.
M7	Woodstock TC (154L/3)	Policy should be clear that fracking is not acceptable.
M8	Kent CC (031/3)	To provide certainty in planning for future growth and to inform site allocation in the Part 2 Plan, the extent of MSAs should be shown in the Part 1 Plan
M8	Cherwell DC (033/10)	Maps delineating Safeguarding Areas and Consultation Areas are required, unless other plans have been adopted where it is acknowledged this can be left to a Stage 2 Document.
M8	Hills (070/12)	Supported (but disappointed plan is not site specific)
M8	Grundon (082/6)	A clause is needed to allow for prior extraction on sites already allocated for alternative development in a local plan.
M8	Tarmac (119/10)	Policy supported
M8	MPA (125/6)	An exception to safeguarding for sites allocated in District Plans should only apply where there is evidence safeguarding was properly considered originally.
M8	OMPG (131/6)	An exception to safeguarding for sites allocated in District Plans should only apply where there is evidence safeguarding was properly considered originally.
M8	Gallagher Estates (134/3)	Other than (possibly) the SRAs, the areas of S&G 'that are safeguarded for future use' are not adequately defined. Policy should allow for incompatible development where extraction in a SRA is proved to be uneconomic/unviable or environmentally wrong. There will be a (considerable) period of 'blight' pending clarification of the boundaries of the MSAs in the Part 2 Plan.
M9	Eynsham Parish Council (063/5)	Policy is too restrictive, should allow for small losses of mineral bearing land to allow other development to take place
M9	Grundon (082/7)	A clause is needed to allow for prior extraction on sites already allocated for alternative development in a local plan.

M9	Tarmac (119/11)	Needs to be made clearer exactly what type of assets are being protected
M9	MPA (125/7)	An exception to safeguarding for sites allocated in District Plans should only apply where there is evidence safeguarding was properly considered originally.
M9	OMPG (131/7)	An exception to safeguarding for sites allocated in District Plans should only apply where there is evidence safeguarding was properly considered originally.
M10	Eynsham Parish Council (063/6)	The area south of A40 between Eynsham and Cassington should be excluded from Map D12 on flood risk grounds.
M10	Eynsham Parish Council (063/7)	Support the good intentions of this policy. However, practice sometimes falls short, as at Cassington. The policy should require a remediation fund.
M10	Hills (070/13)	Policy is muddled e.g. not clear whether it promotes a net gain in bio-diversity or a bio-diversity led strategy.
M10	Eynsham Society (083/3)	Policy should allow for mechanisms to ensure that remediation can always be adequately funded
M10	Clifton Hampden PC (084/6)	Policy should include criteria for assessing appropriateness of after-uses in terms of impact on the Green Belt
M10	Appleford PC (085/6)	Policy should include criteria for assessing appropriateness of after-uses in terms of impact on the Green Belt
M10	WODC (098/8)	Policy should be amended to state that afteruses should be appropriate in terms of listed criteria. Need to consult local communities on afteruses should be in policy text. Requirement to restore best and most versatile agricultural land should be in policy.
M10	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell PC (118/4)	Policy should be more positive in encouraging possible civic and economic amenity re-use.
M10	Tarmac (119/12)	Greater flexibility required: too bio-diversity led
M10 (4.72)	Historic England (120/19)	Welcome reference to public access and information on archaeological discoveries.
M10	Historic England (120/20)	Support the requirement to take into account the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment
M10	MPA (125/8)	Plan should confirm that reference to 'longer term' means 25 years.
M10	Natural England (126/1)	Additions needed to address 'landscape scale'; after-use; conservation of soil resources.
M10	Cllr C Mathew (130/6)	Policy should better address the problems of securing/enforcing effective



		restoration. All sites should have financial bonding. Sites to be dry and restored to allow Palaeolithic remains to be shown.
M10	OMPG (131/8)	Plan should confirm that reference to 'longer term' means 25 years.
M10	BBOWT (136/1)	Policy does not adequately deliver on plan objective (x) for biodiversity-led restoration.
M10	SEAG (145/4)	Inadequately addresses restoration of sites in flood plain using imported fill.
M10	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/6)	Policy should better address the problems of securing/enforcing effective restoration. All sites should have financial bonding.
M10 (4.75)	Ms A Hoare (156L/15)	Approach is too flexible and does not reflect NPPF and other national policy.
M10 (4.76)	Ms A Hoare (156L/16)	A biodiversity led approach should not just be seen in a strategy it should also be required to be delivered. Plan should be clearer on this.
M10	Ms A Hoare (156L/17)	As 156L/16
S.5	South Gloucs (153/L/2)	Strategy supported
W1	Northants (011/2)	Levels of waste to be included in policy
W1	Grundon (082/8)	Table 3 needs correctly cross referencing to table 15. Table 4 contains two sets of forecasts for CDE
W1	WODC (098/9)	Supports the principle of being net self sufficient
W1	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/5)	Ongoing dialogue needs to be maintained with neighbouring authorities – especially Berkshire and London.
W2	Grundon (082/9)	Table 5 figures based on lower CDE estimates (table 4): risk of under-provision?
W2	WODC (098/10)	Support the setting of challenging targets. But this will be difficult if proposed HWRC closures go ahead.
W2	Sheehan (113/7)	The targets for recycling CDE waste are not consistent with the council's own consultant study and should be raised in line with their recommendations.
W2	M&M Skip (114/7)	See 113/7
W2	David Einig (115/7)	See 113/7
W2	McKenna (116/7)	See 113/7
W2	Tarmac (119/13)	Approach supported
W2	Opes Industries (129/3)	C&I recycling targets over-ambitious and do not accord with BPP Consulting

		recommendations
W3	Raymond Brown (014/3)	The policy should be clearer on how development on unallocated sites is assessed and provide more flexibility for temporary sites to become permanent.
W3	Gosford/Water Eaton (019/5)	Closure of HWRCs will lead to less recycling and more fly-tipping.
W3	Somerset CC (026/1)	Circa 40,000 tonnes of waste may be transferred from Somerset for treatment at the Ardley ERF if permission for a new WTS is implemented. This may generate a need for additional capacity to treat Oxfordshire waste.
W3	Sutton Courtenay (030/1)	There should be a restriction on facilities taking waste from out of County.
W3	Kent CC (031/4)	Support the commitment made to provide for additional waste management facilities to meet plan needs.
W3	Grundon (082/10)	Policy should include reference to mineral workings as suitable types of sites – as policy W5.
W3	Sheehan (113/8)	Tables 5, 6 and 7 in supporting text contain incorrect information viz: Table 5: underestimates the CDE waste to be managed (should be 2.1 mtpa from 2021); Table 6: overestimates the CDE capacity that is available (for 2031 should be <286,500 tpa C&I recycling; >581,600 tpa CDE recycling); Table 7: underestimates the amount of new capacity required (for 2031 should be 433,500 tpa C&I recycling; 1,062,900 CDE recycling).
W3	M&M Skip (114/8)	See 113/8
W3	David Einig (115/8)	See 113/8
W3	McKenna (116/8)	See 113/8
W3	Dr D W Reed (124/5)	Opposes closure of Oakley Wood HWRC
W3	MPA (125/9)	Mineral workings should be identified as priority sites for waste management facilities
W3	Opes Industries (129/4)	The permitted capacity for residual waste treatment at Finmere should be included in table 7
W3	Cllr C Mathew (130/7)	Budget cuts may reduce HWRCs and this is not addressed in policy
W3	OMPG (131/9)	Mineral workings should be identified as priority sites for waste management facilities
W3	SODC (147/6)	The capacity limits for existing facilities is not clear. Their ability to cater for

		future (unspecified) imports is also unclear. The need for new sites is therefore also unclear and would be better addressed through site allocation in a single document.
W3	Stanton Harcourt PC (150/7)	Budget cuts may reduce HWRCs and this is not addressed in policy
W3	VoWHDC (152/6)	The capacity limits for existing facilities is not clear. Their ability to cater for future (unspecified) imports is also unclear. The need for new sites is therefore also unclear and would be better addressed through site allocation in a single document.
W4	Raymond Brown (014/4)	Insufficient flexibility given to allowing larger facilities in rural areas where well located (e.g. main road)
W4	Gosford/Water Eaton (019/6)	No more development at Water Eaton sidings.
W4	Cherwell DC (033/11)	Banbury is a key growth location in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and the master plan for eco-development at Bicester needs to be taken into account in future site provision. Particular support for restricting scale of facilities in rural areas.
W4	WODC (098/11)	Supports principle. Additional text to recognise needs of districts to have depots would be helpful. Concerned about boundaries shown on Figure 12, the part of the Oxford area beyond the outer boundary of the green belt in West Oxfordshire should be deleted.
W4	Sheehan (113/9)	No assessment has been undertaken of site availability in Oxford despite its current capacity shortcomings and the plan's intention to achieve a balance distribution of capacity across the county. Strategic facilities should be within 20k of Oxford. Other facilities should be 15k from Oxford or 5k from other towns.
W4	M&M Skip (114/9)	See 113/9
W4	David Einig (115/9)	See 113/9
W4	McKenna (116/9)	See 113/9
W4	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell PC (118/5)	Policy should require an even distribution of recycling facilities around the county and retention of existing facilities.
W5	Raymond Brown (014/5)	Insufficiently flexible to allow well- located temporary facilities to be kept on a longer term basis
W5	Middleton Stoney (027/1)	The policy should make specific provision for a HWRC to replace the facility at

		Ardley.
W5	Grundon (082/11)	Extend scope of policy to allow for retention of recycling facilities in quarries/landfills where there is no adverse impact.
W5	Mr R Draper (107/4)	Strengthen to provide better protection for local communities
W5	Sheehan (113/10)	NPPF excludes agricultural buildings and curtilage from PDL so the policy applies an exception test to buildings it identifies as priorities for waste use. A PDL assessment has not been carried out (see NPPG): only 29% of existing sites are on PDL: only 20% of nominated sites are on PDL. The plan cannot deliver without green field sites. Reference to greenfield should be deleted from the policy and the Glossary changed. The approach to site extensions onto adjoining green field is confused.
W5	M&M Skip (114/9)10	See 113/10
W5	David Einig (115/9)10	See 113/10
W5	McKenna (116/10)	See 113/10
W5	Historic England (120/21)	Policy should ideally contain a criterion for the siting of waste management facilities where they would not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the historic (and natural) environment
W5	MPA (125/10)	Restored mineral sites should not be excluded from the list of locations for new waste facilities
W5	OMPG (131/10)	Restored mineral sites should not be excluded from the list of locations for new waste facilities
W5	Chilterns AONB (146/3)	Supporting text on AONB weaker than Draft Plan
W5	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/6)	The approach is supported and represents a sustainable option.
W6	City of London (002/1)	The policy is supported
W6	West Berks (009/5)	Support use of Oxon landfill for others waste
W6	Bracknell Forest (010/2)	Support use of Oxon landfill for others waste
W6	Somerset CC (026/2)	Policy appears to provide for waste that is not capable of being recycled. Interpreted literally this reduces still further the availability of waste for restoration that is already in short supply.
W6	Sutton Courtenay (030/2)	There should be a restriction on facilities taking waste from out of County.
W6	Sutton Courtenay (030/3)	There should be a presumption against extending the end life of existing

		facilities.
W6	Wokingham Borough Council (090/3)	Pleased that strategy appropriately accommodates waste to be generated by Wokingham Borough
W6	Greater London Authority (091/2)	Waste projections have been updated, might wish to consider implications of lower waste exports from London in policy development.
W6	Hampshire CC (096/2)	Support this policy which would provide capacity for other authorities such as Hampshire
W6 (5.55)	Mr R Draper (107/5)	Should be reworded to remove the presumption that waste will continue to be imported from Berkshire
W6 (5.64)	Mr R Draper (107/6)	Reference should be made to compensation to local communities
W6	Mr R Draper (107/7)	Re-word to make it more difficult to obtain extensions to landfill sites
W6	Sheehan (113/11)	Assessment of existing capacity is not restricted to existing operational capacity (NPPW para 27) and is therefore over-estimated. Waste arisings are under-estimated. Needs are therefore under-estimated. The policy presumes against use of waste for land raising but the EA often regard such operations as 'recovery' (and thus preferred to disposal in quarries). Because there is more waste than the plan estimates, this approach is not justified.
W6	David Einig (115/11)	See 113/11
W6	McKenna (116/11)	See 113/11
W6	Tarmac (119/14)	Approach to inert waste supported
W6	Opes Industries (129/5)	Policy supported
W6	Smiths (132/7)	Greater priority should be given to use of inert waste to restore active (as opposed to abandoned) quarries
W8	Hampshire County Council (096/3)	Support this policy which allows for AD facilities and would allow waste to be processed close to source
W9	UKAEA (092/3)	Supports approach to radioactive waste, subject to some amendments to the text (paragraphs 5.80, 5.89 and 5.90) In particular 'treatment' should be removed from para 5.90
W9	Magnox Ltd (140/2)	Minor modifications required: 5.81 – make reference to national policy;

		5.84 – refer to LETP is in Enterprise Zone; 5.85 – refer to ILW permission not yet started; W9 – include reference to ILW is first part of policy
W9	SODC (147/7)	Inadequate provision made for ILW in the event of no national disposal facility. A county-wide position should be agreed.
W9	VoWHDC (152/7)	Inadequate provision made for ILW in the event of no national disposal facility. A county-wide position should be agreed.
W9	South Gloucs (153/L/3)	Supported
W10	Anglia Water (015/1)	Support the policy
W10	Cherwell DC (033/12)	Permissive approach is welcomed given the additional housing being provided in Cherwell. Additional criteria would provide greater certainty as to inappropriate locations for development.
W11	Anglian Water (015/2)	Six additional water waste treatment sites should be safeguarded with a consultation zone of 400m.
W11	Grundon (082/12)	Provide for the safeguarding of temporary as well as permanent waste sites.
W11	Sheehan (113/12)	Policy should safeguard temporary waste sites, irrespective of their end date - to be consistent with para 8 of NPPW and para 143 of NPPF. Policy is inconsistent with M9 and W1. PSD Nov 2014 (Cabinet) actually put forward such an approach.
W11	Woodstock TC (154L/4)	Measures that would reduce trips to Slape Hill Transfer Station are supported.
W11	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/7)	Support the need to safeguard waste facilities and land required for such uses.
S.6	South Gloucs Council (153/L/4)	Supported
C1-C11	Clifton Hampden PC (084/7)	Policies should make provision for safeguarding Green Belt from inappropriate mineral development
C1-C11	Appleford PC (085/7)	Policies should make provision for safeguarding Green Belt from inappropriate mineral development
S.6	Wiltshire/Swindon Councils (157L/8)	The policy measures offer a level of certainty and flexibility against which future development proposals can be assessed.

C1	Tarmac (119/115)	Policy supported
C1	Ms A Hoare (156L/18)	Delete 'unless material circumstances determine otherwise' to be compatible with NPPF.
C2	Lord Bradshaw (032/6)	This policy supports an alternative strategy of meeting aggregate needs from imports transported by rail rather than locally won sources.
C3	Hills (070/15)	Policy should be in two parts as the considerations for minerals are different to those on waste.
C3	Mr P Power (093/5)	Welcome retention of this policy
C3	Tarmac (119/16)	Policy should also refer to sequential approach to site design
C3	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/8)	Make reference to Exception Test in policy
C4	Hills (070/14)	Not clear what protection is required for the River Thames and other water courses.
C4	Mr P Power (093/6)	Welcome retention of this policy
C4	Historic England (120/22)	Policy should ideally contain a further bullet point relating to waterlogged archaeological remains
C5	Gosfrod/Water Eaton (019/7)	Policy should also protect surrounding countryside from pollution and enhance landscape screening.
C5	Somerset CC (026/3)	Policy calls for consideration of economic issues, contrary to supporting text (para 6.26) and in doing so introduces unnecessary confusion/conflict.
C5	Mr P Power (093/7)	Welcome this policy which is particularly comprehensive
C5	Smiths (132/8)	Approach to buffer zones supported
C6	Natural England (126/2)	Additions to supporting text required to refer to need to maintain agricultural land quality and retain long term capability of BMV.
C6	Ms A Hoare (156L/19)	Policy should not allow for mineral extraction if BMV is permanently lost to agriculture: would not accord with Defra policies.
C7	Woodland Trust (028/2)	Strengthen policy to allow for loss of ancient woodland only in 'wholly exceptional' cases.
C7	BBOWT (136/2)	As worded the policy allows development to cause 'significant harm' to important habitat where benefits clearly outweigh harm, without requiring any mitigation or compensation.
C7	Ms A Hoare (156L/20)	References to 'development' should be 'development and restoration'

C8	Raymond Brown (014/6)	The approach to development in AONB is not in accord with NPPF and is more restrictive
C8	Cotswolds AONB (016/2)	Supports policy and supporting text
C8	Mr P Power (093/8)	Welcome retention of this policy
C8	WODC (098/12)	Welcome revised wording. Suggest an amendment that major development in the AONB will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.
C8	Historic England (120/23)	Welcome and support protection given to AONBs
C8	MPA (125/11)	Reference to small-scale (quarries) in AONB is not needed and should be deleted.
C8	Natural England (126/3)	Amend policy to bring in line with para 116 of NPPF (major development in AONB).
C8	OMPG (131/11)	Reference to small-scale (quarries) in AONB is not needed and should be deleted.
C8	Smiths (132/9)	Reference to small-scale (quarries) in AONB is not needed and should be deleted.
C8	Chilterns AONB (146/4)	Policy should refer to the 3 tests in NPPF for assessment of major development in AONB
C8	Ms A Hoare (156L/21)	See 156L/20
C9	Mr P Power (093/5)	Welcome retention of this policy
C9 (6.47)	(Historic England 120/24)	Welcomes recognition to historic heritage, however should be aware that designated assets are not comprehensive and non-designated assets may be of equivalent significance
C9 (6.48)	(Historic England 120/25)	Welcomes and supports protection given to non-designated heritage assets
C9 (6.49)	(Historic England 120/26)	Welcomes and supports this paragraph
C9 (6.50)	(Historic England 120/27)	Welcomes and supports this paragraph
C9	Historic England (120/28)	Welcomes and supports this policy for its comprehensive consideration of historic environment
C10 (6.54)	Highways England (097/3)	Support proposals to promote alternatives to road transport



C10 (6.57)	Highways England (097/4)	Support reduction of trips during peak periods
C10	WODC (098/13)	Support the principle. Requests that Figure 13 is amended to remove routes over Newbridge and Radcot and to add wording to Bladon route to avoid if possible.
C10	MPA (125/12)	Reference to financial contribution for road improvement is unreasonable, particularly for on-going maintenance of road surfaces
C10	OMPG (131/12)	Reference to financial contribution for road improvement is unreasonable, particularly for on-going maintenance of road surfaces
C10	Woodstock TC (154L/5)	The possibility of using the Cotswold line for transport of sand and gravel should be explored.
S.7	Eye & Dunsden PC (144/9)	Add to text t(paras 7.2; 7.7; 7.18) to strengthen commitment to enforcement of conditions and adherence to criteria in M4.
<b>EVIDENCE BASE DOCUMENTS</b>		
SA/SEA	Sheehan (113/13)	With regard to aggregate and waste management needs the SA/SEA does not adequately appraise the likely environmental effects of the Plan; does not properly evaluate reasonable alternatives; does not outline reasons for the selected strategies. Adoption of the Plan would not comply with the SEA Directive or Regulations and would not be lawful (see also Save Newmarket Ltd v SoS and Heard v Broadland/South Norfolk/Norwich Councils).
SA/SEA	M&M Skip (114/11)	See 113/12
SA/SEA	David Einig (115/12)	See 113/12
SA/SEA	McKenna (116/12)	See 113/12
SFRA	EA (133/2)	Need for subsequent Level 2 SFRA cannot be discounted at this stage, even if future sites are located in FZ1 (all sources of flooding need to be considered). Some duplicate data is included in Apps F.G and H and should be deleted.