

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 (ANNEX 2)

December 2015

**Summary of Comments made in Response to the Minerals
and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy Consultation
Draft February 2014 and County Council Responses**

**Listed by respondent in Plan Order
(Consultation Draft February 2014)**

Policy/ Para- graph	Respondent Name & No.	Summary of Comments	County Council Responses
1.2	Oxford City Council 0018	It would be sensible to align the plan period to that of the recently published Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Oxfordshire which covers 2011-2031. This would enable up to date population projections to inform minerals and waste policy.	The plan period has been extended to 2031.
1.4	English Heritage 0063	Although reference is made to the evidence base for the plan, no explanation is given as to how the council has used that evidence base to develop and inform the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy.	Explanation will be provided as part of the evidence base.
1.4	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	Inadequate evidence base: The failure to provide the listed reports is not only undesirable but fundamentally undermines the consultation process.	It was not possible to provide topic papers at the time of the consultation but this did not prevent people commenting on the draft plan. Evidence base documents will be available at subsequent stages in the plan preparation process.
1.4	Marshall Leopold 0130	Documentation and detailed materials in support of the draft are incomplete. The omissions are a fatal flaw to a reasonable evaluation of the plan. The consultation process is precipitate and should not be regarded as definitive.	It was not possible to provide topic papers at the time of the consultation but this did not prevent people commenting on the draft plan. Evidence base documents will be available at subsequent stages in the plan preparation process. There will be a further opportunity for people to comment when the plan is published, prior to it being submitted for examination.
2.1	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes the recognition of the numerous listed buildings and extensive archaeological assets within the County.	Noted.
2.2 – 2.3	Oxford City Council	The M&W plan should be using the most up to date assessment of populations, which is the	The population and housing figures have been updated.

	0018	Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). There are some potentially big differences between the estimations in the M&W plan and the SHMA. E.g. paragraph 2.2 refers to population growth of 655 000 but there is no data source or time period. The SHMA suggests population could increase by 838 000 between 2011 and 2031. Paragraph 2.3 states that 40 000 new homes could be needed in Oxfordshire 2011-2026 which is a different time period again. The SHMA indicates a need for about 100 000 new homes in Oxfordshire 2011-31, which is potentially far greater.	
2.2 – 2.3	Wokingham Borough Council 0045	Clarity is needed over whether the population projections within the draft plans uses information from the recently published Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	The population and housing figures have been updated and extended to 2031.
2.3	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	Growth forecasts do not appear to include the latest data from the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and only go to 2026. It is likely data from the SHMA would significantly alter the requirements of the Core Strategy.	The population and housing figures used as the basis of growth forecasts have been updated and extended to 2031.
2.3	Vale of White Horse District Council 0095	Suggest the plan be updated to reflect the objectively assessed housing requirement in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	The population and housing figures used as the basis of growth forecasts have been updated and extended to 2031.
Figure 1	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	I could not see the Caversfield Beauty/Conservation or Airfield/MoD Historic areas indicated. This has significant potential impact as such areas are specifically addressed and exempted throughout this report (e.g. p90 Policy C9).	Figure 1 only shows certain designations, at a county-wide scale. Other designations national and local are included in policies in the plan and will be taken into account accordingly.

Figure 2	Cherwell District Council 0098	The Submission Cherwell Local Plan 2006 - 2031 provides for 5,954 homes at Banbury in addition to 6,894 homes at Bicester. It may therefore be appropriate to reflect this on Figure 2.	Figure 2 has been amended to show Banbury as a large town.
2.7	Grundon 0047	These paragraphs reference the 2013 LAA and it is later used as part of the evidence base for the plan. However it has not been published yet so we cannot make comments on the veracity of the numbers and assumptions made.	The LAA 2014 has since been published and supersedes the 2013 version.
2.7 – 2.8	Mr N Brading 0139	Detailed information of historical and current levels of mineral extraction and their locations should be included in the Core Strategy.	It would not be appropriate to include this in the Core Strategy but consideration will be given to whether it would be helpful to include it within the evidence base.
2.8	Earthline Ltd 0039	It should be recognised that Type 1 Aggregate is produced at both Hatford and Shellingford Quarries. This material competes in the same markets as imported materials, particularly as a roadstone.	The presence and production of this material is recognised in the LAA 2014 (paragraph 2.22); it is not necessary for the Core Strategy to specifically refer to this as well.
2.8	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Hard rock aggregates are imported into Oxfordshire by road as well as rail. This should be acknowledged although the volumes will be difficult to quantify.	Reference to imports by road has been added to the plan at paragraph 2.9.
2.8	Henry Pavlovich 0106	It is acknowledged that commercial operators are currently content to import sand and gravel from outside the county in greater quantities than is sourced from inside the county.	The plan seeks to enable supply of sufficient sand and gravel from within Oxfordshire, such that imports will not be needed.
Figure 4	Earthline Ltd 0039	Shipton on Cherwell quarry is an active limestone quarry producing aggregates.	This quarry has been added to what is now Figure 5.
2.13	North London Waste Plan 0087	Supports the acknowledgement of waste coming into Oxfordshire from London.	Noted.

2.13	West London Waste Plan 0147	Pleased that the plan acknowledges the current importation of waste from London to Oxfordshire. Recommend that comment from the Greater London Authority is sought as the London Plan expects the capital to continue to export waste in the short term.	Noted. The County Council has been engaging with the Greater London Authority and the waste planning authorities in London on strategic waste planning issues, under the duty to co-operate, and will continue to do so.
Table 1	North London Waste Plan 0087	Supports the acknowledgement of waste coming into Oxfordshire from London.	Noted.
Figure 6	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	We notice in figure 6 that “Philip’s Tyres” is listed as a waste facility with planning permission. If this is the Philip’s Tyres on the Northern-by-pass road at Elsfield, then this is inaccurate information; an appeal for continued lawful use of this site as a scrap tyre transfer station was dismissed in May 2007. We believe that the business has moved to the County Trading Estate, Cowley, but do not know if they are still a specific waste management company.	The status of this site has been discussed with South Oxfordshire District Council. It has been retained on figure 6.
Figure 7	Grundon 0047	This states that it shows the location of permanent CD&E recycling sites. It actually shows both temporary and permanent sites.	The title of this map has been amended to remove ‘permanent’.
Figure 7	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	The Gill Mill recycling facility is temporary, not permanent; and the inert waste facility at Gill Mill is a recovery activity, not a landfill.	The title of this map has been amended to remove ‘permanent’. This figure does distinguish between inert waste recovery and landfill sites.
2.29	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	The district council questions the extent to which the county council has satisfactorily fulfilled the new duty to co-operate in preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. No explanation is given in paragraph 2.29 as to the actions taken by the county council to address the inspector’s	The County Council has had further engagement with other planning authorities, including the Oxfordshire district councils, and other bodies under the duty to co-operate. This engagement will be summarised in a separate report on compliance with the duty to co-operate.

		concerns.	
2.30	Cherwell District Council 0098	Whilst the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 can still be a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission, please note that with regards to its strategic policies, the Submission Local Plan now carries more weight.	Noted. The list of adopted plans is currently correct but will in due course need to be updated to refer to newly adopted district local plans.
2.30	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	This still references the nearly 20yr old Cherwell Plan – when is the new one to be approved and should this not be indicated instead?	The list of adopted plans is currently correct but will in due course need to be updated to refer to newly adopted district local plans.
2.31	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Clarity is needed over the degree of consultation and cooperation that has taken place. Discussions with MPAs of neighbouring counties (particularly Gloucestershire and Wiltshire) indicate that any communication to date has been, at best, fleeting. Full consultation should be conducted with these authorities so that the LAA can take account of the changing supply situations in these areas.	The County Council has had further engagement with neighbouring and other mineral and waste planning authorities under the duty to co-operate. This engagement will be summarised in a separate report on compliance with the duty to co-operate.
2.37	CPRE 0044	Correction required to acknowledge the County Council's decision to disband OWP - which is regretted.	The plan (paragraph 2.38) has been amended to take out reference to the Oxfordshire Waste Partnership.
2.42	Grundon 0047	The plan constrains the number of productive units and capacity through the wording and implementation of policies M2 and M4.	Comment noted but the County Council considers the strategy for aggregates provision set out in policies M2 – M4 to be justified.
2.43	Grundon 0047	Should also address the maintenance of a steady and adequate supply and to allow for economic growth and be able to react to rapidly changing circumstances	This is included in the objectives of the plan (paragraph 3.4 ii) and the County Council believes that the plan does this.

2.43	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	<p>No locations have been identified - Only areas of search within which locations could be identified. The plan is deficient because with no future mineral sites identified there is no certainty that the aims of the plan can be delivered. Nominations of mineral sites have been on-going since at least 2007 and there has been continuous dialogue with the industry since then. Sites have been put forward which are both suitable and available for development. By identifying only an area of search and not identifying those sites, the council is not complying with its obligations in showing precisely how provision will be made for the supply of aggregates until 2030. If suitable sites are not identified, it will be difficult to understand how the Mineral Core Strategy will affect people's interests. Unless suitable and available key sites are identified, the strategy will fail to meet its Mineral Planning Objectives proposed in 3.5 (ii and v).</p>	<p>The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites.</p>
2.43	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	<p>It is more important to consider the supply of aggregates by road into Oxfordshire as road transportation may be the least sustainable. It is not necessarily the case that rail importation is more sustainable than local quarrying in Oxfordshire as the carbon emissions in loading and unloading aggregates at rail depots and delivering the material by lorry to the customer from the rail depot is likely to incur greater carbon emissions than the local supply of sand and gravel from local sources. A local sand and gravel</p>	<p>The plan focuses on rail transport of aggregates because this requires the provision of railhead facilities for unloading, whereas lorry imports can be delivered direct to market. The plan does not seek to promote rail import of aggregates in place of local production, but to enable the import by rail of those aggregates that are needed in Oxfordshire but which are not available locally.</p>

		quarry south of Oxford would be the most sustainable way of supplying minerals to the Oxford and south Oxfordshire markets and meet the objectives of the Core Strategy.	
2.43	English Heritage 0063	The key issues should include ensuring that minerals development does not have unacceptable impacts on the historic (and natural) environment.	It is not necessary to include in the issues all the factors that need to be taken into account in making decisions on where development should and should not be located. These factors are included in the plan objectives (paragraph 3.4) and in the Core Policies in section 6.
2.43	Henry Pavlovich 0106	It is acknowledged that sand and gravel can be railed in from outside the county. Comment: So why threaten to dig new holes when even the current pits have not been fully worked? If operators prefer to source outside the county, how is OCC going to change that?	Crushed rock is imported into Oxfordshire by rail but imports of sand and gravel are by road. The County Council believes that Oxfordshire should aim to meet its needs for sand and gravel from the resources within the county rather than relying on imports by road from its neighbours.
2.47	English Heritage 0063	The key issues should include ensuring that waste development does not have unacceptable impacts on the historic (and natural) environment.	It is not necessary to include in the issues all the factors that need to be taken into account in making decisions on where development should and should not be located. These factors are included in the plan objectives (paragraph 3.7) and in the Core Policies in section 6.
2.48	Natural England 0033	The Habitats Regulations Assessment is of the 2012 plan; a revised HRA will be required.	A revised HRA Screening Report is being prepared.

2.49	Natural England 0033	In order to conclude no likely significant effect, the HRA needs to show that the plan “is deliverable”, and this cannot be inferred from the HRA report (paragraph 8.5). Reliance on existing permitted sites to conclude no significant effect needs to be demonstrated. If conditions may be required, this needs to be explicitly factored in. If the plan is relying on mitigation measures, greater certainty would be provided by including the type of measures in a relevant policy. Significant effect cannot be ruled out merely because an activity is a continuation of an existing activity. The reference to “wide area for possible location of this plant” in the HRA report (paragraph 10.6) is ambiguous.	These issues will be addressed as appropriate in the revised HRA Screening Report.
2.50	Natural England 0033	The Habitats Regulations Assessment is of the 2012 plan; a revised HRA will be required.	A revised HRA Screening Report is being prepared.
2.51	Natural England 0033	In the Sustainability Appraisal report, the key Sustainability Issues and Options in Oxfordshire do not include landscape protection. The potential monitoring indicator "Minerals and Waste development which include conditions for the protection of restoration of statutory or non-statutory landscape designations" is unclear; “Minerals and Waste development where the anticipated residual landscape impact is neutral or positive” would be better.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.

2.51	Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society 0059	The SA/SEA report does not meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations. Detailed comments on compliance of the SA/SEA with the SEA Regulations in respect of Heritage are set out in an Appendix.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.
2.51	English Heritage 0063	In the Sustainability Appraisal report, the policies and plans should include the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 and it should explain what key issues and considerations for the historic environment arise from this legislation. The SA does not specifically identify the historic environment baseline for each of the areas of search. Further detailed comments are made.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.
2.51	Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum 0077	The SA/SEA report does not meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations. Detailed comments on compliance of the SA/SEA with the SEA Regulations in respect of Heritage are set out in an Appendix.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.
2.52	Natural England 0033	In the Sustainability Appraisal report, the key Sustainability Issues and Options in Oxfordshire do not include landscape protection. The potential monitoring indicator "Minerals and Waste development which include conditions for the protection of restoration of statutory or non-statutory landscape designations" is unclear; "Minerals and Waste development where the anticipated residual landscape impact is neutral or positive" would be better.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.

2.52	Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society 0059	The SA/SEA report does not meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations. Detailed comments on compliance of the SA/SEA with the SEA Regulations in respect of Heritage are set out in an Appendix.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.
2.52	English Heritage 0063	In the Sustainability Appraisal report, the policies and plans should include the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 and it should explain what key issues and considerations for the historic environment arise from this legislation. The SA does not specifically identify the historic environment baseline for each of the areas of search. Further detailed comments are made.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report
2.52	Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum 0077	The SA/SEA report does not meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations. Detailed comments on compliance of the SA/SEA with the SEA Regulations in respect of Heritage are set out in an Appendix.	These comments will be addressed as appropriate in a revised Sustainability Appraisal report.
2.54	Dr Anne Thomson 0016	The 2010 Level 1 SFRA does not accurately reflect flood risk in Drayton St Leonard, which was surrounded by floods this winter. A large part of the area shown within Figure 12 close to Drayton St Leonard was underwater. If this area is to be considered further a Level 2 FRA is essential. Mineral working increases risk of flooding to housing. The area under consideration comes very close to the village. Other areas shown in Figure 12 pose considerably less flood risk.	A revised Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is being prepared.

2.54	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	We have a Level 1 risk assessment performed in Oct 2010 that does not indicate the need for a Level 2 assessment. i.e. low risk. The risk assessment should be reviewed as it should no longer be considered valid based on the evidence of flooding in the past 2 years without further review.	A revised Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is being prepared.
2.54	Mr Peter C Power 0150	To properly understand the potential risks of flooding, the Council must commission a new Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	A revised Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is being prepared.
3.4	Earthline Ltd 0039	Whilst priority is given to secondary and recycled aggregates it must be recognised that their supply is limited by the scale of construction and demolition, and the materials produced have restricted uses and cannot substitute for high quality land won aggregates for many applications.	This practical limitation is recognised in the wording of minerals objective i (paragraph 3.4); and reference to this has been added at paragraph 4.8.
3.4	Corpus Christi College 0049	Supports the suggestion that mineral workings should be located with a view to minimising the need for transportation to market.	Noted.
3.4	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports clause b).	Noted.
3.4	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	The vision lacks clarity and local distinctiveness. The failure in having a clear vision results in the general weakness of the approach in the proposed policies, which leave any decision on future working to be decided on an ad hoc basis as and when a planning application is submitted. Particularly concerned about the lack of spatial dimension in the vision, especially when a core issue for the plan is to have a balanced spatial	The County Council considers the minerals vision to be appropriate and does not agree that it leads to a weak policy approach. The spatial strategy for minerals is set out through the minerals policies, in particular policies M2 – M4, which have been amended from the consultation draft. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan is now being prepared in two parts: part 2 will allocate specific sites for development within the broad locations

		distribution of aggregate workings to achieve a more sustainable pattern of development. This should be reflected in the vision. The vision should include a clear spatial priority to reduce the pressure of mineral working in west Oxfordshire and reduce traffic on the A40.	identified in this part 1 Core Strategy.
3.4	Dr Don Chapman 0066	It is heartening to see provision of secondary and recycled aggregates is now a top county priority.	Noted.
3.4	Cherwell District Council 0098	The vision adequately reflects sustainable development principles.	Noted.
3.4	Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT) 0103	Agree with the Minerals Planning Vision and the Minerals Planning Objectives set out in the Core Strategy. However, the policies to support the vision and objectives are not sufficiently robust and need to be addressed.	Noted. The County Council believes that the policies in the plan, as now amended, do provide a robust strategy to deliver the vision and objectives.
3.4	Stanton Harcourt Estate 0109	The Estate supports the proposal that mineral working should be located with a view to minimising transport.	Noted.
3.4	Exeter College 0111	The college supports the suggestion that mineral workings should be located with a view to minimising the need for transportation to market.	Noted.
3.4	RSPB 0121	Supports the aspirations of the vision, particularly relating to restored mineral sites and the ambition to create new habitats and protect biodiversity;	Noted. The minerals vision (paragraph 3.4 c)) has been amended to include this.

		but c) should be revised to refer to “delivering a net-gain in biodiversity – and making a significant contribution to establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network – through the creation of priority habitats at a landscape scale.	
3.4	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	It is unclear whether a development proposing a shorter distance on unsuitable roads is better or worse than a longer distance on suitable roads.	This is a matter for detailed consideration on a case by case basis; it is not possible to set a definite priority to apply in all cases.
3.4	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Generally supportive of b) and c); but c) should be amended to refer to “delivering a net gain in biodiversity ... through the creation of priority habitats at landscape scale”.	Noted. The minerals vision (paragraph 3.4 c)) has been amended to include this.
3.4	Oxfordshire CC Ecologist Planner 0148	The vision could place greater emphasis on achieving landscape-scale biodiversity-led restoration.	The minerals vision (paragraph 3.4 c)) has been amended to include this.
3.4a	CPRE 0044	Welcome the importance attached to supply of secondary and recycled material but note that the desiderata listed is hardly realistic.	The order of priority in paragraph a) of the minerals vision is in line with the NPPF and the County Council believes that this hierarchy of supply options should underpin the minerals strategy. “Where possible” has been added after secondary and recycled materials, to reflect practical limitations.
3.4a	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Add “where possible” after secondary and recycled aggregate materials because these cannot fulfil all aggregate specifications.	“Where possible” has been added after secondary and recycled materials.

3.4a	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of how secondary gravel will be encouraged wherever possible and will ensure that primary gravel is protected from unnecessary excavation.	Policy M1 covers recycled and secondary aggregate materials and seeks to maximise the supply of these materials.
3.4b	Henry Pavlovich 0106	Again, how is OCC going to force operators to minimise miles to market?! This is not a Soviet command economy.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.
3.5	CPRE 0044	No definition of 'appropriate' contribution is made, nor is any indication given on how this supply will be provided.	The level of provision to be made is established through the annual Local Aggregate Assessment, under policy M2; the other policies in section 4 cover how the required level of supply is to be provided.
3.5	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	Welcomes and supports the objective that seeks to protect Oxfordshire's communities and natural and historic environments from the harmful impacts of mineral development.	Noted.
3.5	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
3.5	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports viii	Noted.

3.5	Richard Bakesef 0099	While I strongly support the desire to protect Oxfordshire's communities and natural and historic environments from the harmful impacts of mineral and water management development, I would like the council to explicitly include the protection of other historical, cultural assets and landscapes important to our county's tourist industry.	This is already covered by the objectives and the core policies in Section 6; it is not necessary to refer to protection of assets specifically in relation to the tourist industry.
3.5	Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT) 0103	Agree with the Minerals Planning Vision and the Minerals Planning Objectives set out in the Core Strategy. However, the policies to support the vision and objectives are not sufficiently robust and need to be addressed.	Noted. The County Council believes that the policies in the plan, as now amended, do provide a robust strategy to deliver the vision and objectives.
3.5	RSPB 0121	Supports (viii) and (ix) but suggests (ix) be reworded: "Ensure that high quality restoration, aftercare and long-term management of mineral extraction sites are considered at the earliest opportunity in order to deliver strategic restoration benefits for Oxfordshire's natural environment, local communities and local economy". Suggests additional objective: "Implement a biodiversity-led restoration strategy that delivers a net-gain in biodiversity – and contributes to establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network – through the landscape-scale creation of priority habitat".	Amendments have been made to the minerals vision and objectives and a new objective has been added as suggested.
3.5	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	It is unclear whether a development proposing a shorter distance on unsuitable roads is better or worse than a longer distance on suitable roads.	This is a matter for detailed consideration on a case by case basis; it is not possible to set a definite priority to apply in all cases.

3.5	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	The list of objectives does not fully reflect the aspirations of the NPPF, Natural Environment White Paper and Biodiversity 2020. An additional objective should be included “to implement a biodiversity-led restoration strategy that delivers a net gain in biodiversity ... through the landscape-scale creation of priority habitat”; and other changes should be made to objectives.	Amendments have been made to the minerals vision and objectives and a new objective has been added as suggested.
3.5	Oxfordshire CC Ecologist Planner 0148	Changes suggested similar to those put forward by Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust.	Amendments have been made to the minerals vision and objectives and a new objective has been added as suggested.
3.5 (iii)	West Berkshire Council 0038	Supports minerals planning objective iii. West Berkshire Council supports the recognition that OCC will continue to be a net exporter of soft sand.	Noted.
3.5 (vi)	RSPB 0121	Supports the objective but suggests change to refer to habitat creation on restored mineral sites as a key mechanism for addressing climate change adaptation.	The objective has been amended along the lines suggested.
3.5 (vi)	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Recommend this objective also refers to habitat creation on restored minerals sites as a key mechanism for addressing climate change adaptation.	The objective has been amended along the lines suggested.
3.5 (vi)	Oxfordshire CC Ecologist Planner 0148	Support the objective but recommend it refers to habitat creation on restored minerals sites as a key mechanism for addressing climate change adaptation.	The objective has been amended along the lines suggested.
3.5 (viii)	Henry Pavlovich	So why threaten to site a pit next to an historic “burgh” and market town that is sandwiched	The Core Strategy does not propose specific mineral working sites. Factors like these will be

	0106	between two AONBs that have already expressed their objections?!	taken into account subsequently, in the assessment of site options for part 2 of the Plan, the Site Allocations Document.
3.5 (viii)	RSPB 0121	Supports the objective	Noted.
3.5 (viii)	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Strongly support this objective.	Noted.
3.5 (viii)	Oxfordshire CC Ecologist Planner 0148	Support the objective.	Noted.

3.5 (ix)	RSPB 0121	Supports the provision of benefits to Oxfordshire's natural environment through high quality restoration and aftercare. However, where the restoration involves the creation of priority habitat, there should not be an expectation for these habitats to become well established at the earliest opportunity, as they may take considerably longer than the statutory 5 year aftercare period to reach their status. Re-word as follows: Ensure that high quality restoration, aftercare and long-term management of mineral extraction sites are considered at the earliest opportunity in order to deliver strategic restoration benefits for Oxfordshire's natural environment, local communities and local economy. Include an additional objective: Implement a biodiversity-led restoration strategy that delivers a net-gain in biodiversity – and contributes to establishing a coherent and resilient ecological network – through the landscape-scale creation of priority habitat.	Amendments have been made to the objectives along the lines suggested.
3.5 (ix)	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Specific reference to nature conservation and Conservation Target Areas should be re-included.	Amendments have been made to the objectives along the lines suggested.
3.5 (ix)	Oxfordshire CC Ecologist Planner 0148	Specific reference to nature conservation and Conservation Target Areas should be re-included. The objective should emphasise the need for suitable restoration from an early stage, because priority habitat generally takes time to establish.	Amendments have been made to the objectives along the lines suggested.

3.6	Robin Draper 0113	The vision should include the prevention of additional imports of waste.	The Core Strategy is primarily aimed at making provision for the management of waste arising in Oxfordshire but the County Council believes it is right that it should also, where appropriate, make provision for waste from outside the county; and that there is no justification for seeking generally to prevent the importation of waste.
3.7	English Heritage 0063	The vision for waste planning in Oxfordshire in 2030 should also include that waste management facilities will be located and managed to minimise harmful impacts on Oxfordshire's environment.	The vision (paragraph 3.7 c)) has been amended to include this.
3.7	Cherwell District Council 0098	The waste planning vision to drive waste away from disposal by landfilling to increase re-use, recycling and composting would help in the move towards a more sustainable approach to waste management, and is welcomed. The general principle of self-sufficiency where possible is also supported.	Noted.
3.7	Robin Draper 0113	The Vision should include a commitment for operators to provide definitive benefit to the local community. This and the protection of local communities should also be included in policy.	Whilst there may be cases where it is appropriate to seek local community benefits through waste developments, the County Council does not consider that the inclusion of this as a general requirement in the plan is justified, apart from specific inclusion of enabling local employment and local use of energy (objective 3.7 vi). Policy C5 provides for the protection of local communities.

3.7c	Middleton Stoney Parish Council 0019	Ardley HWRC is due to close at the end of 2018. Given the planned expansion of Bicester, arrangements should be made now to relocate HWRC arrangements closer to Bicester. Ardley HWRC should remain operational until a Bicester alternative is operational.	The provision to be made for recycling facilities (including HWRCs) is generally covered by policies W4 – W6, but specific site provision will be covered in the subsequent part 2 of the Plan, the Site Allocations Document.
3.7c	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	Oxford is technically not a town but a city. As such the vision could be construed as being inconsistent with Waste Planning Objective iv.	Specific reference to Oxford has been included in the vision (paragraph 3.6 c)) to avoid any ambiguity.
3.8	Grundon 0047	Oxfordshire should aim to be net self-sufficient across all waste streams and not aim to be reliant upon other areas to provide capacity as there is no certainty in this approach. There is conflict with policy W1 that seeks for net self-sufficiency for agricultural waste. There is no subsequent policy to deal with such waste.	The South East Waste Planning Advisory Group has recognised that it is not realistic for individual counties to be self-sufficient in meeting their own hazardous waste needs. The County Council has engaged with other waste planning authorities to which hazardous waste is sent from Oxfordshire to check that provision will be available. Objectives i and ii have been amended and provision for all waste streams, including agricultural waste, is now included. A new policy (W8) on agricultural waste has been added.
3.8	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	Welcomes and supports the objective that seeks to protect Oxfordshire's communities and natural and historic environments from the harmful impacts of waste management development.	Noted.
3.8	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
3.8	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports waste planning objective x.	Noted.

3.8	Richard Bakesef 0099	While I strongly support the desire to protect Oxfordshire's communities and natural and historic environments from the harmful impacts of mineral and water management development, I would like the council to explicitly include the protection of other historical, cultural assets and landscapes important to our county's tourist industry.	This is already covered by the objectives and the core policies in Section 6; it is not necessary to refer to protection of assets specifically in relation to the tourist industry.
3.8 (i)	Earthline Ltd 0039	The objective of net self-sufficiency is laudable, but it needs to be based on an appreciation of the sub-regional context.	It is recognised that there are, and will continue to be, cross-boundary movements of waste, and the extent of this varies across Oxfordshire; the reference to “ <u>net</u> self-sufficiency” reflects this.
3.8 (v)	West Berkshire Council 0038	Supports waste planning objective v and viii. Would like to explore the options of working with OCC, through the duty to co-operate, to ensure that a strategy is developed whereby the level of unmet need for non-hazardous landfill in West Berkshire might be delivered from the already existing landfill sites in Oxfordshire.	Noted. The Council has and will continue to engage with West Berkshire Council and other neighbouring and more distant waste planning authorities on strategic waste planning issues.
3.8 (v)	Robin Draper 0113	This objective mentions the need for provision of facilities that are not practical below a certain size, without defining what they are and why have to be of such size. It should be rewritten to cover the need to protect local communities and in that context to limit the size of facilities to that required to meet identified needs from the county.	Objective v has been amended to take out reference to “a certain size” of facilities, but what may constitute a larger facility needed to serve the whole or a substantial part of the county cannot be generally defined. Policy C5 provides for the protection of local communities.
3.8(vi)	Robin Draper 0113	This objective mentions that waste management facilities should where possible provide benefits to the communities they serve but the FCC facilities at Sutton Courtenay have only brought considerable inconvenience to the local communities in the immediate area and little has	Whilst there may be cases where it is appropriate to seek local community benefits through waste developments, the County Council does not consider that the inclusion of this as a general requirement in the plan is justified, apart from specific inclusion of enabling local employment

		been done to protect them from its frequent breaches of conditions or to enforce conditions. It should be strengthened to include a commitment for operators to provide definitive benefit to the local community. This and the protection of local communities should also be included in policy.	and local use of energy (objective 3.7 vi). Policy C5 provides for the protection of local communities.
3.8 (viii)	West Berkshire Council 0038	Supports waste planning objective v and viii. Would like to explore the options of working with OCC, through the duty to co-operate, to ensure that a strategy is developed whereby the level of unmet need for non-hazardous landfill in West Berkshire might be delivered from the already existing landfill sites in Oxfordshire.	Noted. The Council has and will continue to engage with West Berkshire Council and other neighbouring and more distant waste planning authorities on strategic waste planning issues.
3.8 (ix)	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	The objective is based on an unrealistic assumption and is inconsistent with PPS10. The best starting point for an analysis of the soundness of a plan objective must be to look at actual practice and likely outcomes. In this instance the likely outcome is that this objective is not achievable because of the lack of available non greenfield sites for waste management purposes, which is due to the considerable constraints on development generally in the County and the preference for use of any available previously developed land for what are perceived to be more pressing other uses.	The County Council recognises that it will not always be possible to avoid the use of green field land for waste management facilities but believes it is right to have this as a general objective. The objective (vii) has been amended to refer to “unnecessary” loss of green field land to reflect this.

4.1	Dr Graham Shelton 0050	The strategy is unacceptably vague. It leaves most of the important stuff to be thrashed out at inquiries. The plan fails to make it clear that no more gravel should be extracted in West Oxfordshire to serve the South. The document should offer clear provision for compensation to the damaged communities.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the minerals spatial strategy has been changed. The plan is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites, using the criteria in amended policy M4. The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period. Where there are planning reasons for the provision of compensation, this should be considered on a case by case basis and is not a matter that can be required by general policy.
4.1	Philip Rogers 0060	The plan is vague about where extraction will eventually be allowed. This will mean development will take place on a piecemeal basis and we will be plagued by multiple applications. The plan must be much clearer on extraction limits in each area.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the minerals spatial strategy has been changed. The plan is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites, using the criteria in amended policy M4.

4.1	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	<p>There is a lack of spatial priorities in the minerals planning strategy; it fails to identify preferred areas and there is a reliance on excessively extensive search areas. Government guidance states that priority should be given to specific sites and preferred areas over search areas. The lack of direction in the draft plan and the scale of choices left to the market place in effect means that development will not be plan-led but determined by ad hoc planning applications.</p>	<p>The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the minerals spatial strategy has been changed. The plan is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Policy M3 has been amended to replace the previous areas of search within which planning permission for mineral working would be granted by strategic resource areas within which specific sites for mineral working will be identified in part 2 of the plan, using the criteria in amended policy M4.</p>
4.1	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	<p>The Core Strategy as drafted may be unnecessary within a short time given that there appears to be a close match between the level of production likely from already approved sites and the anticipated demand over both the 8 years and entire plan periods.; and it introduces the potential for planning blight through identifying broad areas of search, counter to the wishes expressed by many community representatives.</p> <p>The plan should monitor the supply of minerals; provide clear data on current and potential supply; include targets for recycled materials; not propose an area of search at this time; and seek to maximise the use of recycled materials in the construction process.</p> <p>Concerned at the inclusion of sites near Nuneham Courtenay area without recognition of the particular qualities and character of the area or the already over-burdened infrastructure; the</p>	<p>The Core Strategy covers the period to 2031; there are significant reserves remaining at existing permitted sites but there will be a need for further permissions for mineral working over the plan period and the plan should therefore set out a strategy and policies for where such permissions should and should not be granted.</p> <p>The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the minerals spatial strategy has been changed. The plan is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Policy M3 has been amended to replace the previous areas of search within which planning permission for mineral working would be granted by strategic resource areas within which specific sites for mineral working will be identified in part 2 of the plan, using the criteria in amended policy</p>

		area of search should be modified to take account of heritage and other issues.	M4. Policy M1 seeks to maximise the provision for recycled and secondary aggregate but the County Council does not consider it appropriate to set targets. It is more appropriate for policy on the use of recycled materials in construction projects to be included in district local plans. The Core Strategy does not propose specific mineral working sites. Factors like heritage and transport will be taken into account subsequently, in the assessment of site options for part 2 of the Plan, the Site Allocations.
4.1	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	It is unclear how this draft plan will ensure its policies are enforceable in the light of the recent SHMA figures.	The SHMA figures have been taken into account in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014, which is a key part of the evidence base for the revised minerals strategy.
4.1	Marshall Leopold 0130	I understand the draft plan will have very limited principles and guidelines and the aim is to treat every application on its merits and address the detail at the time of the application. This means every application will become a battleground between the community and applicant and the planning committee will find itself up against it in understanding the factors that could tip the balance for or against an application. The local community will be lacking in trust and in fear of a stealth attack slipping under the radar.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the minerals spatial strategy has been changed. The plan is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Policy M3 has been amended to replace the previous areas of search within which planning permission for mineral working would be granted by strategic resource areas within which specific sites for mineral working will be identified in part 2 of the plan, using the criteria in amended policy M4.

4.1	Wallingford Town Council 0132	Appreciative that the old strategy has been set aside and consideration given to concerns expressed in arriving at a revised strategy. In the revised strategy, with the amended forecast of need and the more objective consideration of locations for future extraction sites, the protections for communities seem much stronger and better balanced with the need for mineral extraction to support economic and housing growth.	Noted. The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and the minerals spatial strategy has been changed. The plan is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites.
4.1	Toby G Marchant 0141	Out-dated mineral extraction policies in environmentally sensitive areas should be reviewed in favour of extraction of gravel from the sea. Delivery could be made by rail.	The contribution of marine aggregate to supply in Oxfordshire is addressed in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014. It is not a significant source of supply for Oxfordshire and unlikely to become so. Policies M5 and C10 provide for and encourage the transportation of aggregates by rail.
4.3	RWE Npower 0005	As the rate of production of fresh PFA decreases there is likely to be more demand for PFA recovery. With the decline in PFA production from coal-fired electricity generation, the possibility of recovery of PFA from disposal sites should be recognised and appropriate policy provision made in this plan. The recovery of PFA should in principle be acceptable.	The County Council does not consider this to be an issue that needs to be addressed though the inclusion of specific policy in the plan. Any proposal for recovery of PFA can be considered against national policies and relevant general development plan policies.
4.4	RWE Npower 0005	As paragraph 4.3.	As paragraph 4.3.
4.5	RWE Npower 0005	As paragraph 4.3.	As paragraph 4.3.
4.6	RWE Npower 0005	As paragraph 4.3.	As paragraph 4.3.

4.6	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	This paragraph correctly confirms that it is unwise to set a policy target for recycled and secondary aggregate provision. It should be noted that only 0.35 million tonnes of this capacity is held in sites with permanent planning permission. The quality of secondary and recycled aggregates is often low and cannot meet the range that primary material can meet. It is usually not possible to provide recycled materials as a substitute for primary aggregates. The council should look to its specifications for construction contracts to specify recycled materials which would assist the recycling industry.	The County Council recognises these practical limitations. The paragraphs on recycled and secondary aggregate and policy M1 have been amended to make this clearer. The issue of specifications is not planning matter and is therefore not appropriate to be covered in this plan.
4.6	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Welcomes the shift away from a specific target for the tonnage of recycled and secondary aggregates in the overall supply of aggregates to a position which provides strong policy support and encouragement to help maximise the contribution these can make to aggregate supply in the County.	Noted.
4.7	RWE Npower 0005	As paragraph 4.3.	As paragraph 4.3.
4.7	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Targets tend to be seen as a maximum level to be achieved and it would be more valuable to aim to maximise the contribution rather than specifying what that contribution should be. This position is at odds with the approach taken in paragraph 4.6.	It is appropriate and in line with national and European policy to include targets for the management of waste, including for construction, demolition and excavation waste. This is not the same as setting targets for the production of recycled and secondary aggregate.
4.8	RWE Npower 0005	As paragraph 4.3.	As paragraph 4.3.

M1	RWE Npower 0005	As paragraph 4.3.	As paragraph 4.3.
M1	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	Support moves towards greater recycling of aggregates. This should reduce the need for new gravel workings especially in the West of Oxfordshire. More use of recycling should also help towards reducing harmful emissions and affecting climate change adversely as required in Policy C2.	Noted.
M1	Earthline Ltd 0039	Reliance on temporary recycling facilities at quarry and landfill sites results in loss of capacity as the host sites are completed. For some locations there will be a good case for retaining recycling facilities after the host quarry or landfill is completed, particularly where the site is remote from housing and has a good access. The retention of such facilities may be preferable to locations in or around the main urban areas which may not be deliverable.	Policy M1 as amended does not exclude the possibility of temporary recycling facilities being retained after completion of quarrying and/or landfill where other relevant policies of the plan are met. Part 2 of the plan will in due course allocate sites for minerals and waste development, including facilities for the production of recycled and secondary aggregate.
M1	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	The policy is contrary to the NPPF (4th bullet point of paragraph 145) as it does not set a target for the supply of recycled and secondary aggregates. The Government's Guidance on the Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) published in October 2012 also confirms at paragraph 15 that the guidelines (as referred to in the NPPF) are a material consideration when determining the soundness of mineral plans.	The NPPF does not require a target to be set for recycled and secondary aggregate supply. The government guidelines referred to are a material consideration but they do not set targets for recycled and secondary aggregate supply. The County Council does not consider it appropriate to set targets but rather that Policy M1 should seek to maximise provision for recycled and secondary aggregate.

M1	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	To maximise the contribution to aggregate from recycled and secondary aggregate sources it is not sufficient to rely on the targets for construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste (as suggested at paragraph 4.7) because recycled aggregate is only one component of the materials that can be recovered from this waste stream, and it may not encompass secondary aggregates. In addition, there should be no confusion between provision of recycling capacity and supply, which are two different things.	The County Council recognises that CDE waste recycling does not equate to production of recycled and secondary aggregate. However, most of the recycled and secondary aggregate currently and that is expected to be produced in Oxfordshire is derived from recycling of CDE waste. Consequently the targets for recycling of CDE waste are a relevant factor in considering the amount of recycled and secondary aggregate that may be produced.
M1	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	It appears that the council are not anticipating any alternative or increased potential to re-use CDE waste. Such an approach would be missing an important opportunity as there is an as yet largely under-utilised potential to re-use CDE waste in higher value applications, and which can be achieved with new more sophisticated static processing plant systems, such as at the Sheehan's Aggregates Plant at Dix Pit.	The Core Strategy recognises that there are limitations on the use of recycled aggregate produced from CDE waste (new paragraph 4.8) but the County Council recognises that with the use of more sophisticated plant higher specification and value products can be produced. Policy M1 is a positive policy for the provision of more recycled and secondary aggregate production capacity but investment in plant and end use of products are essentially commercial rather than planning issues.
M1	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	There should be specific encouragement and guidance as to locations, and specific provision, for high quality aggregate recycling.	The County Council does not consider it necessary to make specific policy provision for high quality aggregate recycling facilities beyond the provision made in the amended policy M1.
M1	Grundon 0047	Support for on-going and increased capacity is welcomed. However, concerned that the vast majority of capacity is at quarries and landfills that have temporary consents.	Policy M1 is a positive policy for the provision of more recycled and secondary aggregate production capacity, at both temporary and permanent sites. Part 2 of the plan will in due course allocate sites for minerals and waste development, including facilities for the production

			of recycled and secondary aggregate.
M1	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports the encouragement given by this policy to the production and supply of recycled and secondary aggregate.	Noted.
M1	Mineral Products Association 0090	<p>We support this policy and welcome the removal of a specific target for the amount of recycled and secondary materials that will form part of the overall supply of aggregates (referred to in paragraph 4.6).</p> <p>Data on CDE waste is poor, and not all CDE waste is suitable for substituting for primary aggregate, therefore reliance on CDE waste to provide a quantified contribution to a steady and adequate supply of aggregates is risky.</p> <p>To maximise the contribution from this material, policies W5 and W6 need to provide flexibility to recognise that CDE waste recycling facilities have characteristics and locational constraints and needs that are different to other types of facility.</p>	<p>The County Council recognises there are practical limitations to the use of recycled aggregate. The paragraphs on recycled and secondary aggregate and policy M1 have been amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>Most of the recycled and secondary aggregate currently and that is expected to be produced in Oxfordshire is derived from recycling of CDE waste. Consequently the targets for recycling of CDE waste are a relevant factor in considering the amount of recycled and secondary aggregate that may be produced.</p> <p>What are now policies W4 and W5, as amended, are considered to provide a sufficient policy framework for the allocation of sites for CDE waste recycling facilities in part 2 of the plan in due course.</p>
M1	Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group 0094	<p>We support this policy and welcome the removal of a specific target for the amount of recycled and secondary materials that will form part of the overall supply of aggregates (referred to in paragraph 4.6).</p> <p>Data on CDE waste is poor, and not all CDE waste is suitable for substituting for primary aggregate, therefore reliance on CDE waste to</p>	<p>The County Council recognises there are practical limitations to the use of recycled aggregate. The paragraphs on recycled and secondary aggregate and policy M1 have been amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>Most of the recycled and secondary aggregate currently and that is expected to be produced in Oxfordshire is derived from recycling of CDE</p>

		<p>provide a quantified contribution to a steady and adequate supply of aggregates is risky. To maximise the contribution from this material, policies W5 and W6 need to provide flexibility to recognise that CDE waste recycling facilities have characteristics and locational constraints and needs that are different to other types of facility.</p>	<p>waste. Consequently the targets for recycling of CDE waste are a relevant factor in considering the amount of recycled and secondary aggregate that may be produced. What are now polices W4 and W5, as amended, are considered to provide a sufficient policy framework for the allocation of sites for CDE waste recycling facilities in part 2 of the plan in due course.</p>
M1	<p>Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT) 0103</p>	<p>Demand had been in decline for 30 years and this is not captured in the forecasts for supply. Alternative materials and technologies have substituted for primary aggregate and this should be addressed in the forecast of supply. The strategy has not considered the contribution secondary and recycled material will make to overall supply, as required by the NPPF.</p>	<p>The requirement for provision for aggregate supply that should be made in the plan is set out in the annual Local Aggregate Assessment, which considers the contribution to be made from recycled and secondary material as well as from primary aggregate sources. Policy M1 seeks to maximise the contribution from recycled and secondary material, in line with the NPPF.</p>
M1	<p>Lafarge Tarmac Ltd 0105</p>	<p>We support this policy and welcome the removal of a specific target for the amount of recycled and secondary materials that will form part of the overall supply of aggregates (referred to in paragraph 4.6). Data on CDE waste is poor, and not all CDE waste is suitable for substituting for primary aggregate, therefore reliance on CDE waste to provide a quantified contribution to a steady and adequate supply of aggregates is risky. To maximise the contribution from this material, policies W5 and W6 need to provide flexibility to recognise that CDE waste recycling facilities have characteristics and locational constraints and needs that are different to other types of facility.</p>	<p>The County Council recognises there are practical limitations to the use of recycled aggregate. The paragraphs on recycled and secondary aggregate and policy M1 have been amended to make this clearer. Most of the recycled and secondary aggregate currently and that is expected to be produced in Oxfordshire is derived from recycling of CDE waste. Consequently the targets for recycling of CDE waste are a relevant factor in considering the amount of recycled and secondary aggregate that may be produced. What are now polices W4 and W5, as amended, are considered to provide a sufficient policy framework for the allocation of sites for CDE</p>

			waste recycling facilities in part 2 of the plan in due course.
M1	Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd 0114	Reliance on temporary recycling facilities at quarry and landfill sites results in loss of capacity as the host sites are completed. For some locations there will be a good case for retaining recycling facilities after the host quarry or landfill is completed, particularly where the site is remote from housing and has a good access.	Policy M1 as amended does not exclude the possibility of temporary recycling facilities being retained after completion of quarrying and/or landfill where other relevant policies of the plan are met. Part 2 of the plan will in due course allocate sites for minerals and waste development, including facilities for the production of recycled and secondary aggregate.
M1	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Support the encouragement given to the production and supply of recycled aggregates. It should be more clearly acknowledged that recycled and secondary aggregates may not be suitable as a direct substitute for primary aggregate as CDE waste can be highly variable. It should also be noted that the secondary aggregates produced from incinerator Bottom Ash have limitations on their use geographically relating to aquifer protection.	The County Council recognises there are practical limitations to the use of recycled aggregate. The paragraphs on recycled and secondary aggregate and policy M1 have been amended to make this clearer.
M1	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	The target of at least 0.9 million tonnes has been removed in light of the revocation of the South East Plan and the District Council is concerned that this will exacerbate the level of uncertainty further. Concerned that reference to the use of recycled /secondary aggregates in place of land won aggregates has been removed.	The County Council does not consider it appropriate to set targets but rather that Policy M1 should seek to maximise provision for recycled and secondary aggregate. Policy M1 has been amended to refer to the need for aggregate being met by recycled and secondary material in preference to primary aggregate.

M1	Hanson UK 0151	<p>Welcomes the removal of a specific target for the amount of recycled and secondary aggregates. Generally recycled and secondary aggregate is not suitable for higher specification uses due to the variable nature of the source of the material. Recycled aggregate is not a suitable substitute in concrete production, which is one of the principal sources of demand for land won sand and gravel. The production of CDE waste is dependent upon investment in redevelopment and replacement of existing infrastructure. Mineral operators have limited control over the timing and delivery of such investment, so a precautionary approach must be taken when seeking to rely upon recycled materials to meet future demand for aggregates. To significantly increase the contribution from secondary and recycled aggregates could potentially have a negative traffic impact.</p>	<p>The County Council recognises there are practical limitations to the use of recycled aggregate. The paragraphs on recycled and secondary aggregate and policy M1 have been amended to make this clearer.</p>
4.10 – 4.18	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	<p>Support the LAA methodology based on the 10 year sales average however, we are disappointed that no reference has been made on the potential impact of the 2013 sales. Assuming the current planning applications for Caversham and Gill Mill are approved, then there would be a surplus of 0.25mt over the requirement, meaning no new sites are required at all.</p>	<p>The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.</p>
4.10 – 4.18	Berrick and Roke Parish Council 0004	<p>Support the views of PAGE (see 0052).</p>	<p>As response to PAGE (see 0052).</p>

4.10 – 4.18	Drayton St Leonard Parish Council 0031	Represented by, and fully endorses Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
4.10 – 4.18	Benson Parish Council 0035	Is a member of PAGE and will be working with PAGE to submit a response on behalf of the 8 parishes involved in PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
4.10 – 4.18	Warborough Parish Council 0040	Adopt and endorse the Page response in full (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
4.10 – 4.18	Dorchester Parish Council 0055	Fully endorses and supports the PAGE response (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
4.10 – 4.18	Stadhampton Parish Council 0086	Gives full support to the PAGE approach (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
4.10 – 4.18	Newington Parish Council 0143	Fully support PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
4.10	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	There is very little assessment or consideration of other relevant local information as required by the NPPF nor is there an analysis of all aggregate supply options nor any assessment of the balance between demand and supply nor any account of published national and sub national guidelines nor Aggregate Working Party guidance, all as required by the NPPF. The LAA is not fit for purpose.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.

4.10 – 4.18	Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT) 0103	Demand had been in decline for 30 years and this is not captured in the forecasts for supply; and there is sufficient supply to require no new working for more than 10 years. At the current LAA rate, the landbank would be preserved until at least 2024 and actual rates of working would preserve it to 2029 or later. Policy should remain flexible so future economic needs can be addressed as and when new supply is required.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.10	Marine Management Organisation 0134	Although OCC does not fall within tidal reach aggregate activity may take place, such as transport of minerals for use via inland waterways, to or from the marine environment. Therefore recommend reference to marine aggregates be included within the plan.	The contribution of marine aggregate to supply in Oxfordshire is addressed in the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014. It is not a significant source of supply for Oxfordshire and unlikely to become so and therefore does not need to be specifically mentioned in the Core Strategy.
4.11	Gloucester- shire County Council 0024	Have concerns about: i) the overall level of provision for sand and gravel; ii) the location of this provision; and iii) the productive capacity within areas identified for working.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.11	Grundon 0047	These paragraphs reference the 2013 LAA and it is later used as part of the evidence base for the plan. However it has not been published yet so we cannot make comments on the veracity of the numbers and assumptions made.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.

4.11	Corpus Christi College 0049	Believe that the figures for sharp sand and gravel for 0.81 million tonnes per annum is too low	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.11	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	The LAA's lack of transparency and failure to comply with the NPPG Guidance in the main process of a demand forecast will jeopardise the supply of minerals essential for economic growth because it will jeopardise investment in production capacity.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.11	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	The minerals strategy contains various references to the updated Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment. This is not, however, available online and so it is very difficult to understand the way in which the numbers quoted in the Core Strategy have been arrived at, or indeed to make a meaningful interpretation of them.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been prepared and published and the section of the Core Strategy on provision for working aggregate minerals has been updated accordingly.

4.11	Surrey County Council 0101	The draft plan complies with the NPPF guidance on the level of provision that should be made by way of reference to the LAA. However, Surrey has been a significant supplier of sharp and gravel in the south east over recent decades. This situation is set to change as the adopted Minerals Plan indicates that available resources for concreting aggregate are becoming increasingly difficult to identify. Evidence suggests that aggregate distribution would appear to be changing with increases in haulage distances. Consequently, the 2011 average road distance haul would potentially extend the export market for Caversham sand and gravel well beyond Reading into east Berkshire, Surrey and West London, and could well substitute for diminishing local supplies in these areas.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.11	Exeter College 0111	Believe that the figures for sharp sand and gravel for 0.81 million tonnes per annum is too low	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.11	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	The data contained in the draft document is helpful in understanding issues but could perhaps be extended and more simply presented to allow for easier understanding and conclusions to be more easily drawn from the data.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate

			minerals.
4.12	CPRE 0044	Local Aggregates Assessment: The average sales for the latest decade for which data are available should be adopted when the draft is submitted.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.12	Corpus Christi College 0049	Believe that the figures for sharp sand and gravel for 0.81 million tonnes per annum is too low	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.12	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Disagrees with the paragraph because the figures it is based on are inaccurately forecasted and wrong.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.

4.12	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	“Significant headroom” – what does this mean i.e. what was the factor of increase here (e.g. +25%?). Has the impact and further needs of HS2 and Eco Town been included and considered when compiling this report?	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 takes into account demand from infrastructure and major development projects and the issue of allowing “headroom” for possible increased levels of demand is covered in the LAA.
4.12	Exeter College 0111	Believe that the figures for sharp sand and gravel for 0.81 million tonnes per annum is too low	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.15	Gloucestershire County Council 0024	Have concerns about: i) the overall level of provision for sand and gravel; ii) the location of this provision; and iii) the productive capacity within areas identified for working.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.15	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of how the rolling 10 year plan in Oxfordshire will be enforced.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.

4.15	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) Ltd 0136	Concerned about the commitment to review the LAA annually in line with NPPF guidance. This may not be deliverable or sufficiently timely for the industry to respond unless comfort is given that the County Council will commit adequate resources for such a review.	Annual review of the Local Aggregate Assessment is a requirement of the NPPF and will be prioritised accordingly by the County Council, but these annual reviews will be dependent on mineral operators providing annual sales data promptly.
4.16	Grundon 0047	These paragraphs reference the 2013 LAA and it is later used as part of the evidence base for the plan. However it has not been published yet so we cannot make comments on the veracity of the numbers and assumptions made.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.16	Philip Rogers 0060	The amount of material to be extracted must be recalculated as already the agreement to the Gill Mill extension has exceeded the amount indicated for the lower windrush area.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19.
4.16	The Eynsham Society 0074	No consideration has been given to the 5Mtonnes recently allocated at Gill Mill. There is no case for any further allocation in West Oxfordshire during the plan period.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
4.16	Richard Bakesef 0099	In reality the council cannot control where developers choose to purchase their minerals. The figures for aggregate provision should be reduced to more realistically reflect predicted demand.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to guide where mineral working takes place and consequently where minerals are available to meet local demand. The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014

			concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.16	Robin Mitchell 0110	It identifies a requirement in the period for a further 7.87 Mt of sharp sand and gravel and says that production should be balanced between W and S Oxfordshire - but this ignores the recent permission at Gill Mill for 5 Mt. So if only a further 2.87 Mt of reserves are required there is no case for any additional allocation in W Oxon. Further, there is no reference to the transportation problems involved in moving minerals from North of the Thames to points of use to its South.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. It is partly because of the issue of transportation from West Oxfordshire to southern Oxfordshire that the plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply, so that the need for such movements is reduced.
4.16	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	The data contained in the draft document is helpful in understanding issues but could perhaps be extended and more simply presented to allow for easier understanding and conclusions to be more easily drawn from the data.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.16	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	The figures lack any carry forward figures in the calculation. I.e. permitted reserves at the end of 2030. No attempt is made to calculate the variance in LAA nor to give rationale to an average figure of 811,600 tonnes despite this figure being some 50% greater than Oxfordshire's last figure of production.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate

			minerals.
4.16	Mr N Brading 0139	There can be no justification for further approaches for excavation being granted north of the Thames prior to 2030.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
Table 2	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	In recent years the west has supplied 90% of sand/gravel to 10% from the south. More will be needed for development in the south in the future and needs to be sourced there. A 50% split is inadequate to redress the balance by 2030. It should be more like 25% from the west to 75% from the south. This would mean no further need for new sites in the west as a recent planning approval at Gill Mill will provide 12.5 million tonnes. The Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton Area of Search should be eliminated.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.

Table 2	Grundon 0047	The table does not reflect the required productive capacity to meet current and future LAA requirements. It also fails to identify a requirement at the end of the 15 year plan period. The table should reflect that the LAA gives only an average figure and that sales will be higher and lower than this figure.	Table 2 has been revised to reflect the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014. The new LAA figures allow for possible fluctuations in demand. There is no requirement for the Core Strategy to make provision for beyond the plan period; that will be a matter for when the plan is reviewed and rolled forward. The issue of ensuring adequate production capacity will need to be taken into account in due course when sites for mineral working are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
Table 2	The Eynsham Society 0074	No consideration has been given to the 5Mtonnes recently allocated at Gill Mill. There is no case for any further allocation in West Oxfordshire during the plan period.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
Table 2	Henry Pavlovich 0106	The totals do not include the recently approved tonnage from the Caversham extension (although it is mentioned in footnote i) which would bring the total available to 13.57t, i.e. very nearly the full requirement of 14.58 t. So, again, why blight the Thames Valley, somewhere within a huge area between Oxford and Goring Gap, with the threat of new holes that are unlikely to be required?! The draft plan is no longer as site specific as the withdrawn plan, so the vagueness amounts to a blight.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. There is now a higher level of permitted reserves but there will still be a need for further provision to be made to cover the whole of the plan period.

Table 2	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	This shows a negative need i.e. overproduction for crushed rock. However if the forecast is inaccurate this has significant impact on locations when extraction will be occurring despite apparent assurances in this document.	Table 2 has been revised to reflect the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014. It still shows no requirement for additional crushed rock provision but paragraph 4.43 sets out the circumstances where further working areas may nevertheless be required.
Table 2	Robin Mitchell 0110	It identifies a requirement in the period for a further 7.87 Mt of sharp sand and gravel and says that production should be balanced between W and S Oxfordshire - but this ignores the recent permission at Gill Mill for 5 Mt. So if only a further 2.87 Mt of reserves are required there is no case for any additional allocation in W Oxon. Further, there is no reference to the transportation problems involved in moving minerals for North of the Thames to points of use to its South.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. It is partly because of the issue of transportation from West Oxfordshire to southern Oxfordshire that the plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply, so that the need for such movements is reduced.
Table 2	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	The data contained in the draft document is helpful in understanding issues but could perhaps be extended and more simply presented to allow for easier understanding and conclusions to be more easily drawn from the data.	Table 2 has been revised to reflect the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014.
Table 2	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	The figures lack any carry forward figures in the calculation. I.e. permitted reserves at the end of 2030. No attempt is made to calculate the variance in LAA nor to give rationale to an average figure of 811,600 tonnes despite this figure being some 50% greater than Oxfordshire's last figure of production.	Table 2 has been revised to reflect the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014.
Table 2	Mr N Brading 0139	There can be no justification for further approaches for excavation being granted north of the Thames prior to 2030.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. There is a

			relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
Table 2	Hanson UK 0151	It is unclear why the LAA is based on a straight 10 year average of past sales when the County Council previously thought that this calculation to be inappropriate. Policy M2 cannot be relied upon to form the basis of a transparent and reliable strategy for aggregate provision. The use of a straight 10 year average of past sales does not provide sufficient headroom for economic growth because it does not take account of 'other relevant information' – NPPF, paragraph 145. Concerned that provision figures set out in table 2 are not correct.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals. Table 2 has been revised to reflect the Local Aggregate Assessment 2014.
4.17	Milton Keynes Council 0006	If provision figures are not included in policy M2, more regard should be paid to the 3 year average sales figures and 4.17 should be amended to reflect this.	The non-inclusion of provision figures in policy M2 is explained in what is now paragraph 4.20. The level of provision is set by the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment. The level of regard to be had to the 3 year average sales figure is a matter for the LAA to address.
4.17	Northamptonshire County Council 0008	If provision figures are not included in policy M2, more regard should be paid to the 3 year average sales figures and 4.17 should be amended to reflect this.	The non-inclusion of provision figures in policy M2 is explained in what is now paragraph 4.20. The level of provision is set by the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment. The level of regard to be had to the 3 year average sales figure is a matter for the LAA to address.

4.17	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	The LAA makes no assessment of the trends in production and fails to take account of 'other relevant information' as required by the NPPF. The LAA approach of a simple 10year production is not sufficiently flexibly to allow the plan to respond to increased demand and ensure production and/or production capacity can recover.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.17 – 4.18	Richard Bakesef 0099	In reality the council cannot control where developers choose to purchase their minerals.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to guide where mineral working takes place and consequently where minerals are available to meet local demand. The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
4.17	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of how the search area Planning Applications will reflect the desire to excavate nearest to need.	Sites for mineral working will now be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan and these allocations will establish the locational distribution of future mineral working sites, rather than it just being left to operators to submit planning applications within areas of search.

4.18	OUTRAGE 0092	Welcomes the recognition of the disproportionate burden borne by West Oxfordshire. However, it understates the situation. Welcomes the objective expressed 'to minimise the distance that minerals need to be transported by road' and that a 'broad balance' should be struck between west and south Oxfordshire in the annual production capacity of sand and gravel. A 50/50 balance would appear to be the logical target. However, the intention of this paragraph is undermined by the principles expressed at paragraph 4.23.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.
4.18	Peter Winder 0097	Supports the arguments and position of OUTRAGE (see 0092)	As response to OUTRAGE (see 0092)
4.18	The Eynsham Society 0074	No consideration has been given to the 5Mtonnes recently allocated at Gill Mill. There is no case for any further allocation in West Oxfordshire during the plan period.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
4.18	Henry Pavlovich 0106	Again, how is OCC going to force operators to minimise miles to market?! This is not a Soviet command economy.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.

4.18	Robin Mitchell 0110	It identifies a requirement in the period for a further 7.87 Mt of sharp sand and gravel and says that production should be balanced between W and S Oxfordshire - but this ignores the recent permission at Gill Mill for 5 Mt. So if only a further 2.87 Mt of reserves are required there is no case for any additional allocation in W Oxon. Further, there is no reference to the transportation problems involved in moving minerals for North of the Thames to points of use to its South.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. It is partly because of the issue of transportation from West Oxfordshire to southern Oxfordshire that the plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply, so that the need for such movements is reduced.
4.18	Marshall Leopold 0130	Balance between south and West Oxford: OCC has no way of controlling where a given load of minerals is used.	A local plan cannot control commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.
M2	Milton Keynes Council 0006	Does not support this policy as provision figures have not been provided within it. If provision figures are not included, more regard should be paid to the 3 year average sales figures and 4.17 should be amended to reflect this.	The non-inclusion of provision figures in policy M2 is explained in what is now paragraph 4.20. The level of provision is set by the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment. The level of regard to be had to the 3 year average sales figure is a matter for the LAA to address.
M2	Northamptonshire County Council 0008	Does not support this policy as provision figures have not been provided within it. If provision figures are not included, more regard should be paid to the 3 year average sales figures and 4.17 should be amended to reflect this.	The non-inclusion of provision figures in policy M2 is explained in what is now paragraph 4.20. The level of provision is set by the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment. The level of regard to be had to the 3 year average sales figure is a matter for the LAA to address.

M2	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	In recent years the west has supplied 90% of sand/gravel to 10% from the south. More will be needed for development in the south in the future and needs to be sourced there. A 50% split is inadequate to redress the balance by 2030. It should be more like 25% from the west to 75% from the south. This would mean no further need for new sites in the west as a recent planning approval at Gill Mill will provide 12.5 million tonnes. The Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton Area of Search should be eliminated.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
M2	Natural England 0033	Concerned that it has not been demonstrated that the total aggregate provision required in the plan is deliverable. In particular it is unclear what capacity the areas of search have to deliver this quanta, and how the constraints within these areas of search will affect this capacity. Unable to comment on the suitability of the zone of search as insufficient information has been provided.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan. The deliverability of the provision required through the strategy will be addressed in a separate document that will form part of the evidence base.
M2	West Berkshire Council 0038	West Berkshire Council supports the recognition that OCC will continue to be a net exporter of soft sand.	Noted.
M2	Earthline Ltd 0039	The comments made on behalf of OMPG are fully supported (see below).	See response to OMPG comments below.
M2	CPRE 0044	Policy M2 is agreed.	Noted.

M2	Grundon 0047	Policy gives the impression future release is linked to landbanks; this would be contrary to the NPPF as there is no maximum and applications should be considered on their own merits. The LAA is based on a rolling 10 year average. Such an approach has been considered inappropriate in the earlier aggregates assessment due to specific local circumstance. There is no explanation to this change. Achieving a balance in capacity between west and south Oxford areas could lead to increased imports.	Policy M2 has been amended but in any case it is clear that the landbanks are not to be regarded as maximum levels. A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been produced. Changing the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire (now in policy M4) should increase the flexibility of supply within Oxfordshire, reducing the possible need for imports of sand and gravel.
M2	Corpus Christi College 0049	Suggest that there should be at least three active quarries of sufficient size in each area in order to ensure continuity of supply and competition between mineral operators.	It would not be appropriate for the Core Strategy to specify numbers of quarries within areas of the county; this will be addressed subsequently in part 2 of the plan which will allocate sites for working.
M2	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	Support the LAA methodology based on the 10 year sales average however, we are disappointed that no reference has been made on the potential impact of the 2013 sales. Assuming the current planning applications for Caversham and Gill Mill are approved, then there would be a surplus of 0.25mt over the requirement, meaning no new sites are required at all.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
M2	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	The document lacks quantification and evidence based analysis. The plan contains no policy for the quantum of sand and gravel required over the plan period. The plan should be based on a single resource figure and a figure for additional resources required, if any.	The non-inclusion of provision figures in policy M2 is explained in what is now paragraph 4.20. The level of provision is set by the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment. The currently assessed requirement is shown in table 2

OMWLP: Part 1 (Core Strategy) – Statement on Consultation and Representations December 2015
 Summary of Comments on Consultation Draft Core Strategy February 2014 and County Council Responses

M2	Berrick and Roke Parish Council 0004	Support the views of PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M2	Drayton St Leonard Parish Council 0031	Represented by, and fully endorses Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M2	Benson Parish Council 0035	Is a member of PAGE and will be working with PAGE to submit a response on behalf of the 8 parishes involved in PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M2	Warborough Parish Council 0040	Adopt and endorse the Page response in full (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M2	Dorchester Parish Council 0055	Fully endorses and supports the PAGE response (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).

M2	Stadhampton Parish Council 0086	Gives full support to the PAGE approach (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M2	Newington Parish Council 0143	Fully support PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M2	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	This policy lacks any credibility and should be deleted. The policy does not follow NPPF and NPPG Guidance. The policy provides no assistance to delivering a steady and adequate supply of minerals in the county. The policy implies landbanks levels should determine granting planning permission which is not the mechanism anticipated by the NPPF and NPPG. The industry has raised serious concerns about the approach in OCC's LAA, which this policy enshrines.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been produced.
M2	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	The provision for working aggregate minerals in Policy M2 is too ambiguous and weak to provide effective control of the scale of future mineral consents. The core strategy polices should set out the anticipated scale of future development over the plan period and indicate how and where this will	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the

		be met.	balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4.
M2	Aston, Cote, Shifford & Chimney Parish Council 0071	Supports the statement 'a broad balance in annual production capacity for sharp sand and gravel between the mineral resource areas in western Oxfordshire and southern Oxfordshire will be sought.	Noted. As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4.
M2	Mrs Helen Sandhu 0076	Strengthening the commitment to ensuring that minerals are extracted as close to the geographical area where they are required is a welcome revision. Concerned that the strategy is not sufficiently worded to ensure that the stated commitment to extraction nearest the place of need will be delivered. Unclear how a balance will be reached between west and south of the county.	Noted. As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4. The County Council believes this change of approach will provide a stronger mechanism for achieving this objective.
M2	Robert Florey 0082	Little thought has been given to the cumulative effect of the sand and gravel already extracted from West Oxfordshire. As the south of the county has the greatest requirement for the sand and gravel, it would seem sensible to extract the sand and gravel from the area where it is needed most. With the demand for the aggregate falling every year over recent years the required land bank would be considerably reduced and with the recent permission granted in West Oxfordshire this landbank has virtually been covered.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.

M2	Mineral Products Association 0090	The lack of quantified provision creates uncertainty for the industry, and will make delivery and monitoring of the policy difficult. The Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) and resultant 10 year rolling average of sales will change each year, affecting the landbank calculation on which the policy relies. Given this uncertainty it is vitally important that the policy does not imply that permissions will only be granted for new aggregate reserves where the landbank is close to or below the 7 year minimum for sand and gravel. The reliance on maintaining landbanks of reserves does not address the need to maintain productive capacity that is essential to maintain a steady and adequate supply of materials.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been produced. It is clear in policy M2 that the landbanks are not to be regarded as maximum levels. The required production capacity is an issue for consideration in the allocation of sites for mineral working when part 2 of the plan is prepared in due course.
M2	OUTRAGE 0092	Welcomes the recognition of the disproportionate burden borne by West Oxfordshire. However, it understates the situation. Welcomes the objective expressed 'to minimise the distance that minerals need to be transported by road' and that a 'broad balance' should be struck between west and south Oxfordshire in the annual production capacity of sand and gravel. A 50/50 balance would appear to be the logical target. However, the intention of this paragraph is undermined by the principles expressed at paragraph 4.23.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.
M2	Peter Winder 0097	Supports the arguments and position of OUTRAGE (see 0092)	As response to OUTRAGE (see 0092)

M2	Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group 0094	The lack of quantified provision creates uncertainty for the industry, and will make delivery and monitoring of the policy difficult. The Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) and resultant 10 year rolling average of sales will change each year, affecting the landbank calculation on which the policy relies. Given this uncertainty it is vitally important that the policy does not imply that permissions will only be granted for new aggregate reserves where the landbank is close to or below the 7 year minimum for sand and gravel. The reliance on maintaining landbanks of reserves does not address the need to maintain productive capacity that is essential to maintain a steady and adequate supply of materials.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been produced. It is clear in policy M2 that the landbanks are not to be regarded as maximum levels. The required production capacity is an issue for consideration in the allocation of sites for mineral working when part 2 of the plan is prepared in due course.
M2	Richard Bakesef 0099	Any new working area within southern Oxfordshire (that is sought to balance annual production capacity for sharp sand and gravel in the county) should also be assessed on the quality of its mineral deposits.	The quality of the mineral resources is included in the criteria for identifying sites for mineral working in revised policy M4.
M2	Richard Bakesef 0099	In reality the council cannot control where developers choose to purchase their minerals.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to guide where mineral working takes place and consequently where minerals are available to meet local demand. The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.

M2	Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT) 0103	Policy to rebalance workings between west and south could constrain supply and takes no account of the structural constraints of river crossings and settlements.	Changing the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire (now in policy M4) should increase the flexibility of supply within Oxfordshire. Constraints like river crossings and settlements will need to be taken into account in the allocation of sites for mineral working in part 2 of the plan, under the criteria in policy M4 and the core polices.
M2	Lafarge Tarmac Ltd 0105	The lack of quantified provision creates uncertainty for the industry, and will make delivery and monitoring of the policy difficult. The Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) and resultant 10 year rolling average of sales will change each year, affecting the landbank calculation on which the policy relies. Given this uncertainty it is vitally important that the policy does not imply that permissions will only be granted for new aggregate reserves where the landbank is close to or below the 7 year minimum for sand and gravel. The reliance on maintaining landbanks of reserves does not address the need to maintain productive capacity that is essential to maintain a steady and adequate supply of materials.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been produced. It is clear in policy M2 that the landbanks are not to be regarded as maximum levels. The required production capacity is an issue for consideration in the allocation of sites from mineral working when part 2 of the plan is prepared in due course.
M2	Henry Pavlovich 0106	This is a wish not an economic argument: operators cannot be forced to source from the south of the county if they can just as easily get material from the west or even, and this is not mentioned, just across the boundary in Gloucestershire or Hampshire. Therefore, the wish to “balance” is artificial: This takes no account whatsoever of market realities: companies will source wherever quality and price	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.

		dictate, not where OCC dictates.	
M2	Robin Mitchell 0110	It identifies a requirement in the period for a further 7.87 Mt of sharp sand and gravel and says that production should be balanced between W and S Oxfordshire - but this ignores the recent permission at Gill Mill for 5 Mt. So if only a further 2.87 Mt of reserves are required there is no case for any additional allocation in W Oxon. Further, there is no reference to the transportation problems involved in moving minerals for North of the Thames to points of use to its South.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2 and what is now paragraph 4.19. It is partly because of the issue of transportation from West Oxfordshire to southern Oxfordshire that the plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply, so that the need for such movements is reduced.
M2	Exeter College 0111	Suggest that there should be at least three active quarries of sufficient size in each area in order to ensure continuity of supply and competition between mineral operators.	It would not be appropriate for the Core Strategy to specify numbers of quarries within areas of the county; this will be addressed subsequently in part 2 of the plan which will allocate sites for working.
M2	Northmoor Parish Council 0115	From the information provided in Table 2 (and the accompanying footnote), the land-bank would be 2.87 million tonnes short of a target that is set to fall in the following years as the 10 year rolling average continues to reduce the land-bank requirement. As a result no further planning applications are needed to fulfil the land-bank requirement, and West Oxfordshire will continue to be the major source of sand and gravel for the next 16 years.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
M2	Peter Winder 0097	Endorses the comments of Northmoor Parish Council (see 0115).	As response to Northmoor Parish Council (see 0115).
M2	Valerie Ryan 0117	The current permissions to quarry for sand and gravel are predominately in West Oxfordshire, and are already virtually sufficient to meet the land-bank requirement until 2030. This is contrary	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2. There is a relatively high level of permitted

		to the strategies aim to have a broad balance of production between the west and south.	reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period, even with a change towards a more balanced distribution of production.
M2	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	The strategy appears to ignore the potential for further developments of communities in West Oxfordshire and their demand for minerals by restricting the number of sites that can be developed in that area	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.
M2	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	By proposing that sites in South Oxfordshire should be developed to serve local need it may artificially lead to a site in South Oxfordshire being considered purely on the grounds of proximity to demand when other factors may mitigate more in favour of a site elsewhere.	The allocation of sites for mineral working will be made in the subsequent part 2 of the plan and site-specific environmental and other factors will be taken into account at that stage, in accordance with policy M4.
M2	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of how those same Planning Applications will achieve a 'broad balance' between North of the Thames and South of the Thames.	As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4. The County Council believes this change to securing a balance through the allocation of sites will provide a stronger mechanism for achieving this objective.

M2	Stanton Harcourt Parish Council 0128	It is unclear how OCC will enforce the results of this LAA to ensure that it is respected in the Planning process throughout the period.	Policy M2 has been amended, a new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been prepared, and the locational strategy approach of the plan has been changed to give more certainty and provide a stronger mechanism for achieving the objectives of the plan.
M2	Stanton Harcourt Parish Council 0128	The opening position of sites in the landbank is heavily reliant on West Oxfordshire and the recent approval of some 5m tonnes at Gill Mill means that a large proportion of gravel excavation will have to travel more than 20 miles to South Oxfordshire development sites. In addition, that will further cause traffic congestion on the A34 and A40 and greater concentration of pollution. This effect is the opposite strategy of what you profess to be trying to achieve. It is unclear how OCC will enforce their stated strategy and ensure that it is respected in the planning process.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period, even with a change towards a more balanced distribution of production.
M2	Stanton Harcourt Parish Council 0128	Broad balance between South and West Oxfordshire – it is unclear how OCC will enforce their stated strategy and ensure that it is respected in the planning process. The strategy seeks to ensure that West Oxfordshire excavation will not increase and no new sites will be started. It is unclear how this will be enforced and how this will be respected in the planning process.	As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4. The County Council believes this change to securing a balance through the allocation of sites will provide a stronger mechanism for achieving this objective.
M2	Marshall Leopold 0130	Balance between south and West Oxford:-OCC has no way of controlling where a given load of minerals is used.	A local plan cannot control commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the

			locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.
M2	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	Concerned with Oxfordshire's attitude and approach towards the supply of aggregate minerals to meet sub-regional markets. In this regard, acknowledge the prudent approach future aggregate provision set out in draft policy M2 which is based upon a commitment to meeting long-term requirement in accordance with the most recent LAA, therefore allowing flexibility to accommodate market fluctuations.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been produced.
M2	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	The policy is designed to meet the requirement identified in the LAA approved by Cabinet in November 2013. This LAA is based on a 10 year rolling average whereas the work commissioned by OCC from Atkins concluded that the 10 year average was not appropriate for Oxfordshire. The LAA adopted for this plan has not been published, consulted on, nor has the reasoning for overturning the Atkins report been given.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
M2	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Support the continued identification of separate landbanks for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand and for the clear emphasis that landbanks are for at least 7 and 10 years for sand and gravel and crushed rock respectively.	Noted.
M2	Mr N Brading 0139	There can be no justification for further approaches for excavation being granted north of the Thames prior to 2030.	The recent permissions for extensions to Caversham and Gill Mill Quarries have been taken into account in amendments to Table 2. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to

			be made for towards the end of the plan period, even with a change towards a more balanced distribution of production.
M2	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	Supports the reduced level of provision identified through the LAA (2013).	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 concludes that use of the 10 year sales average is not appropriate and that adjusted figures should be used. This has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals.
M2	Mr Peter C Power 0150	Policy M2 should be amended to make clear that no more planning permissions will be granted in the west of the County unless or until a balance between west and south has been achieved.	There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period, even with a change towards a more balanced distribution of production. As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4.
M2	Hanson UK 0151	NPPG states that there is no maximum landbank level and each application for minerals extraction must be considered on its own merits regardless of the length of the landbank.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. It is clear in policy M2 that the landbanks are not to be regarded as maximum levels.
M2	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE)	Concerned about the argument still being relied upon regarding distance to market considerations. Given that areas of search are now being used, it is not easy to understand how	As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach, the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4. The

	0153	<p>this factor, as a matter relevant to choice, is being used. This must be clarified.</p> <p>The distance to market considerations also impact on the Duty to Cooperate requirement of the NPPF. Again, the approach is not clear in relation to this and the current draft Plan risks being found to be unsound in this respect.</p>	<p>County Council believes this change to securing a balance through the allocation of sites will provide a stronger mechanism for achieving this objective.</p> <p>The County Council has had further engagement with other planning authorities and other bodies under the duty to co-operate. This engagement will be summarised in a separate report on compliance with the duty to co-operate.</p>
4.20 – 4.33	Gloucestershire County Council 0024	<p>Have concerns about: i) the overall level of provision for sand and gravel; ii) the location of this provision; and iii) the productive capacity within areas identified for working.</p>	<p>The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals. The County Council believes that the spatial strategy in revised policy M3 will enable the requirement for sand and gravel supply across Oxfordshire to be met from local sources, without the need for importation.</p>
4.20	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	<p>The core strategy is unsound. No certainty is provided over where mineral working will take place. It is said that the Areas of Search are ‘a basis for sites for working to be selected by the mineral industry and planning application.’ This is wholly unacceptable. This is not the point of a plan-led system nor is it the point of a core strategy.</p>	<p>The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4.</p>

4.20	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	Planning Practice Guidance lists areas of search as the lowest priority approach to identifying potential mineral extraction sites, below specific sites and preferred areas. The reason for taking the lowest priority route is not justified in the Core Strategy. This makes district plan making assessments more difficult. To support plan making, one of the higher approaches would be the most appropriate and valuable approach.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4.
4.20	Thames Water 0119	Public water mains and sewer may lie across land from which it is proposed to extract minerals. We encourage early consultation by the developer to establish the position of such mains and sewers and to arrange for them to be diverted where necessary. The developer will be responsible for the reasonable cost for diverting the asset. Where the developer does not take responsibility for diverting the asset, Thames Water will not be responsible for the sterilization of the minerals resource.	These are site specific issues that will be addressed as appropriate in due course in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan; and should be addressed in any planning applications.
4.22	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Hills Quarry Products does not agree with the LAA for the reasons already stated above.	A new Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has been prepared.

4.23	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	First bullet point – This policy effectively prevents any increase in production in the West of Oxfordshire irrespective of any demand assessment or potential change in the pattern of supply, demand or need. Detailed consideration, at the point of a planning application, which identifies a need to increase intensity or rate of extraction should not be prejudiced by a defective statement. The implication of a broad balance between the west and south of the county is that this would be a production limit in the south tied to current production levels in West Oxfordshire.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.
4.23	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Third bullet point – Support ‘the continued sand and gravel working in the area of the county to the south of Oxford to enable local supply of aggregates – etc.’. However it is essential for the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty that this.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.
4.23	Robert Florey 0082	Little thought has been given to the cumulative effect of the sand and gravel already extracted from West Oxfordshire. As the south of the county has the greatest requirement for the sand and gravel, it would seem sensible to extract the sand and gravel from the area where it is needed most. With the demand for the aggregate falling every year over recent years the required land bank would be considerably reduced and with the recent permission granted in West Oxfordshire this landbank has virtually been covered.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.

4.23	OUTRAGE 0092	This paragraph is disingenuous. Maintaining the rate and intensity of mineral working will do little to help achieve the balance in gravel production between south and west Oxfordshire.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.
4.23	Peter Winder 0097	Supports the arguments and position of OUTRAGE (see 0092)	As response to OUTRAGE (see 0092)
4.23	Alvescot Parish Council 0100	These matters are acute in this area because of our network of country roads and the humpbacked bridges which inevitably lead to the area's exclusion from the Lorry Route Map.	Noted. The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.
4.23	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of how the search area Planning Applications will reflect the desire to excavate nearest to need.	Sites for mineral working will now be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan and these allocations will establish the locational distribution of future mineral working sites, rather than it just being left to operators to submit planning applications within areas of search.
4.23	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	It is unclear how the statement can be sustained in view of the clear effect cumulative mineral workings have on the local communities in my division.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan and former paragraph 4.23 has been deleted.

4.24	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Supports the implied assertion that additional reserves will be required in the south of the county with the statement that there will be a need for a new working area within southern Oxfordshire during the plan period. However, Hills Quarry Products are concerned that there are no specific sites identified by the strategy when there are clearly suitable, sustainable and available sites which should be identified to ensure deliverability. The wording implies that there will only be a single new working which is overly restrictive and does not reflect previous activities in the area when there was more than one operational unit. The wording would also not allow any flexibility in meeting demand as a single unit may not be responsive to increases in demand.	The section on locations for working aggregate minerals has been rewritten to reflect the change in locational strategy now included in the plan. The plan (paragraph 4.31) is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed.
4.24	Henry Pavlovich 0106	This is a wish not an economic argument: operators cannot be forced to source from the south of the county if they can just as easily get material from the west or even, and this is not mentioned, just across the boundary in Gloucestershire or Hampshire. Therefore, the wish to “balance” is artificial: This takes no account whatsoever of market realities: companies will source wherever quality and price dictate, not where OCC dictates.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.
4.24	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of how those same Planning Applications will achieve a 'broad balance' between North of the Thames and South of the Thames or of how the broad balance can be achieved within the policy M4 ('to ensure new working in Southern Oxfordshire would only be in	Sites for mineral working will now be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan and these allocations will establish the locational distribution of future mineral working sites, in line with the locational strategy set in revised policies M3 and M4, rather than it just being left to operators to

		place of an existing quarry' (Cabinet Papers 28.1.2014 - page 232 Summary: 12 re M4).	submit planning applications within areas of search.
4.25	Oxford Green Belt Network 0037	Concerned over expansion in the Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area in relation to Oxford Meadows.	A Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report is being prepared as a separate document and protection of Oxford Meadows SAC is specifically referred to in policy M4 and is generally covered by policy C7.
4.26	English Heritage 0063	Although reference is made to the fact that potentially important archaeological constraints have been identified, there is no indication that any more detailed assessment has been carried out. Due to the absence of more specific proposed areas for working, our view is that the Lower Windrush Valley and the Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap) Areas of Search should be protected.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The Core Strategy no longer identifies areas of search within which planning permission for mineral working will be granted. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4. Site specific archaeological and other heritage constraints will be taken into account in the allocation of sites, in accordance with policies M4 and C9.
4.27	Mr & Mrs RD Sharp 0140	The deposits to the south and south east of Faringdon are finer than those in the Tubney area. The former can be used in asphalt in addition to the building/mortar sand market. The soft sand deposit at Home Farm, Shellingford is derived from the Highworth Grit as per the soft sands from the Tubney area. The Home Farm, Shellingford site meets both the Archaeological Key and the overall planning status key. The site remains durable during the plan period.	These sites all fall within the Corallian Ridge area from Oxford to Faringdon strategic resource area for soft sand in policy M3, within which sites for mineral working will be allocated subsequently in part 2 of the plan. Mineral quality and other site specific issues can be considered at that stage.

4.28	CPRE 0044	For soft sand extension of existing quarries is considered economical correct and desirable paragraph 4.28	Noted.
4.28	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	It is unclear whether any research has been undertaken to identify whether soft sand can be provided by extensions to existing quarries.	Some nominations have been made by mineral operators for potential extensions to existing quarries. This indicates the possibility of extensions to existing quarries but, if the requirement for soft sand cannot be met from extensions, revised policies M3 – M5 provide for new quarries to be allocated and permitted.
4.28	Hinton Waldrist Parish Council 0091	We consider that up to 2030 soft sand extraction should continue at existing quarries where the infrastructure is in place.	Under revised paragraph 4.38 and amended policy M4 c), priority will be given to extensions to existing quarries before new sites are considered.
4.28	Mr & Mrs RD Sharp 0140	To maintain a 7 year soft sand landbank, the policy should be flexible to allow for increased demand. It is questionable as to whether the proposed preference for extensions to existing operations could be met during the plan period extending to 2030. A new greenfield site may be more environmentally acceptable to an existing site in the Faringdon locality.	The level of provision to be made under policy M2 will be set by the annual Local Aggregate Assessment and this will provide flexibility to respond to increased demand if required. Some nominations have been made by mineral operators for potential extensions to existing quarries. This indicates the possibility of extensions to existing quarries but, if the requirement for soft sand cannot be met from extensions, revised policies M3 – M5 provide for new quarries to be allocated and permitted.
4.29	CPRE 0044	Proposals in the Corillian Ridge need to demonstrate compliance with VWHDC saved policy NE7.	All relevant development plan policies will be material considerations in the determination of planning applications. They will also be taken into account as appropriate in the allocation of sites for mineral working in part 2 of the plan.

4.31	David Wilson Homes Southern 0001	Do not agree with the preference for extensions to workings in limestone areas, rather than ironstone. The plan should take a holistic view which takes other matters into account such as effects of minerals extraction on the landscape and residential amenity.	Taking into account factors of accessibility, location in relation to main areas of demand and material quality, the County Council believes there is a strong justification for preferring future requirements for local crushed supply to be met from the limestone resource rather than the ironstone. However, more detailed site specific factors will need to be taken into account in the subsequent allocation of any sites for mineral working in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
4.31	Cherwell District Council 0098	The retention of the wording from the previous Core Strategy about ironstone working in the north of the county is supported.	Noted. This paragraph has been amended in what are now paragraphs 4.41 – 4.42, but the content is essentially unchanged.
4.33	North Wessex Downs AONB 0007	Support statements that minerals development should only be located in the AONB in exceptional circumstances.	Noted.
4.33	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	Supports the recognition given to the importance of the AONBs	Noted.
4.33	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
4.33	English Heritage 0063	It is also Government policy that local planning authorities should, as far as practical, provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas.	This section of the plan deals only with aggregate minerals. Non-aggregate minerals are covered at paragraphs 4.52 – 4.60 and policy M7, but there is no significant working of non-aggregate minerals in Oxfordshire and the plan does not propose the maintenance of landbanks for them.

M3 & Figure 9	Mr Partridge 0003	The Cassington area floods and this could affect the ability to work mineral. Water mains in the Cassington area would need to be protected from mineral working. Will the Cassington processing plant be used?	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of flooding at this strategic stage of the plan. This is a factor which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and polices C8 and C3. Water mains and the location of processing plant are also matters that would be considered at the site allocation stage of the plan or the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 & Figure 12	Mr and Mrs Buch 0009	Oppose identification of Cholsey for gravel extraction. Site SG60 is beautiful and prone to flooding. Working in this area would harm tourism. Risk of flooding presents concerns about wildlife and water quality. Traffic and pollution are also concerns. Site SG33/57 also raises these issues and would have a major social impact on residents.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core polices in section 6.
M3 & Figure 9	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	Should any more sharp sand and gravel reserves be needed during the plan period, it should come from the south and not Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton and the land to the east and west of the Hanborough Road. The rate of intensity in the west should stop to allow the south to catch up by 2030.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period.
M3	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	Object to the area at Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton and land along the Hanborough Road due to loss of important landscapes and risk of flooding.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on landscape or flood risk grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with

			revised policy M4 and polices C8 and C3.
M3	Gloucestershire County Council 0024	Have concerns about: i) the overall level of provision for sand and gravel; ii) the location of this provision; and iii) the productive capacity within areas identified for working. Policy W8 satisfies previous concerns with regards to hazardous waste.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals. The County Council believes that the spatial strategy in revised policy M3 will enable the requirement for sand and gravel supply across Oxfordshire to be met from local sources, without the need for importation.
M3	Mr Nick Hutton 0030	Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area – concerned about noise and dust pollution on nearby residential areas. Also concerned that gravel extraction in this area would cause further flooding problems.	These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and polices C5 and C3.
M3	Natural England 0033	Concerned that it has not been demonstrated that the total aggregate provision required in the plan is deliverable. In particular it is unclear what capacity the areas of search have to deliver this quantity, and how the constraints within these areas of search will affect this capacity. Unable to comment on the suitability of the zone of search as insufficient information has been provided.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan. The deliverability of the provision required through the strategy will be addressed in a separate document that will form part of the evidence base.

M3	Earthline Ltd 0039	The limestone working at Shipton on Cherwell has not been recognised in the Core Strategy. An additional 'Area for Crushed Rock Working' therefore needs to be added under Policy M3 C. This could be described as 'North of Kidlington'	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas which have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits. Available geological mapping shows limestone resources in the Shipton on Cherwell area beyond the existing permitted areas to be limited and the strategic resource area has been drawn to concentrate on the more extensive areas of limestone resource further to the north east.
M3	Graham Griffiths 0048	Extraction of gravel or sand anywhere near Eynsham should not be allowed at any future time. In particular future works would cause the following damage: 1) extra lorry traffic; 2) dust and noise pollution; 3) loss of amenity; and 4) flooding. Any restoration involving lakes would risk causing permanent damage to our surroundings.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of traffic, dust and noise, loss of amenity or flooding at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3, C5 and C10.
M3	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	The PAGE area is wholly unsuitable for mineral extraction and should forever be dismissed. Any attempts to differentiate between west or south Oxfordshire, or assert that a new site is required south of Oxford, or assert that there should be only three sites in West Oxfordshire must be deleted unless there is some hard evidence and thorough assessment to justify these points. Planning strategies must be based on evidence and assessment not assertion.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan. The assessment of site options for possible allocation in the Site Allocations Document will include consideration of where new sites and further extensions will be needed having regard to the plan objective of locating mineral working closer to where it is needed (as expressed in revised policy M4 a)).

M3	Berrick and Roke Parish Council 0004	Support the views of PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Drayton St Leonard Parish Council 0031	Represented by, and fully endorses Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Benson Parish Council 0035	Is a member of PAGE and will be working with PAGE to submit a response on behalf of the 8 parishes involved in PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Warborough Parish Council 0040	Adopt and endorse the Page response in full (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Dorchester Parish Council 0055	Fully endorses and supports the PAGE response (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Stadhampton Parish Council 0086	Gives full support to the PAGE approach (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Newington Parish Council 0143	Fully support PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	This policy is wholly unsatisfactory as it provides no certainty whatsoever to the industry of the community in general, nor to Parish Councils nor individuals as to where, to quote from paragraph 4.20, 'extraction is likely to be able to take place.'	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.

M3	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Should this policy not be found unsound, Hills Quarry Products would support the area of search as it affects Culham to the east of the Oxford to Didcot railway.	This land is included within the Thames and Lower Thame Valleys area from Oxford to Cholsey strategic resource area for sharp sand and gravel.
M3	Philip Rogers 0060	The road system is overloaded and there is no plan to improve things; particularly if gravel is to be moved from the Lower Windrush Valley to southern parts of the county. Also concerned about the impact of extraction on flooding and noise and dust pollution.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of traffic, flooding or noise and dust at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3, C5 and C10.
M3	English Heritage 0063	Reference should be made to the Core policies.	Policy M3 has been changed to identify strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with policy M4. Policy M4 requires the core policies to be met but there is no need for this also to be included in policy M3.
M3	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	Locations identified in Policy M3 for working aggregate minerals in West Oxfordshire are not justified.	The County Council considers that the Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys area is the most appropriate in west Oxfordshire to be identified in policy M3 as a strategic resource area for sharp sand and gravel within which sites for mineral working should be considered for allocation in part 2 of the plan.
M3 & Figure 9	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	In view of proximity to new residential development, Green Belt status, potential impact on a SAC and capacity within other search locations, the Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area should be dropped as a search area in Policy M3.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of proximity of housing at this strategic stage of the plan. This is a factor which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policy C5. Mineral extraction is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Potential impact on the SAC is

			addresses in the separate Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report. The County Council considers it necessary to provide for continued working of sharp sand and gravel in west Oxfordshire, notwithstanding the existing workings and permitted reserves in this part of the county and other areas identified in policy M3.
M3	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	The mineral strategy should be supported by a key diagram.	A minerals key diagram indicating the strategy in policy M3 has been included as figure 9.
M3	Susan Eysackers 0065	Surprised that excavation is being considered around Eynsham. Concerned that there is an imbalance with the west suffering more than the south. Concerned about the effects it may have on traffic and flooding.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period. The County Council considers it appropriate to include the sand and gravel deposits at Eynsham in strategic resource area in policy M3. Issues such as traffic and flooding will be considered at the site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3 and C10.
M3	Sonning Eye Action Group (SEAG) 0067	There is no evidence base for the inclusion of Caversham. Therefore this is in breach of the NPPF. There is also a deficiency in the council's duty to cooperate. Concerned about the proximity to AONB, proximity to conservation areas. Adoption of the Caversham site would result in the loss of BMV agricultural land. The site is	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and site-specific factors have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. On this basis, the County Council believes that the inclusion of the sharp sand and gravel resource area between Caversham and

		located within flood zone 3b, the site does not comply with the requirements of the sequential test as set out in the NPPF.	Shiplake in policy M3 is justified. Issues like proximity to AONB and conservation areas, loss of BMV agricultural land and flooding will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage. A revised Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and sequential test are being prepared.
M3 & Figure 9	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The criteria for the area of search at Eynsham appear to be based solely on the presence of minerals. Other factors should be taken into account – potential for noise and dust and other economic activities – which would in effect create minimum buffer zones around residential areas.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage. Policy C5 on local environment, amenity and economy would need to be taken into account at that stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The policies have no specific requirements for an integrated approach to minerals development in specific areas.	The County Council believes that the policies in this section of the plan together provide for the implementation of an integrated approach to minerals development.
M3 & Figure 9	Blenheim Estate 0072	Broad support is offered in principle to the future extraction of sharp sand and gravel in the Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area.	Noted.

M3 & Figure 9	Mr TD Henman 0073	Broad support is offered in principle to the future extraction of sharp sand and gravel in the Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area.	Noted.
M3	The Eynsham Society 0074	Concerned that sites where extraction will take place have not been identified	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3	The Eynsham Society 0074	No mention is made of the difficulty of getting minerals from north of the Thames to point of use in Didcot and elsewhere south of the Thames. Movements across the Thames should be avoided.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. The issue of access and traffic will be considered at the site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policy C10.
M3	Mrs Mary Fletcher 0080	Sites are not specified only search areas. The main growth areas are south of the Thames. The cost of transportation should be taken into account. Existing road network is congested and Swinford Bridge is not designed for heavy lorries. Gravel should be extracted close to source. Extraction should take place away from Eynsham. Concerned about flooding and historical remains in the search area.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be

			<p>made for the later part of the plan period. The County Council considers it appropriate to include the sand and gravel deposits at Eynsham in strategic resource area in policy M3.</p> <p>Issues such as flooding and heritage assets will be considered at the site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3 and C9.</p>
M3	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	<p>We do not support the approach put forward in policy M3 that leaves site specific selection entirely up to the planning application process. Concerned about how the areas of search have been put together. At present they include various constraints that preclude mineral extraction, local amenity is one example, and they also appear to include sites allocated in the SODC adopted Core Strategy as strategic housing allocations (it is difficult to be certain given the scales of the presented maps).</p>	<p>The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4.</p> <p>As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints (including district council local plan allocations) have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.</p>
M3	Mineral Products Association 0090	<p>We support the identification of the Areas of Search.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

M3	OUTRAGE 0092	The areas of search for sharp sand and gravel are too widely and indiscriminately drawn. Bearing in mind Policy M2, it could be argued that in order to achieve the plan’s objective of a balance between the west and south, neither of the west Oxfordshire Areas of Search should form part of this plan.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period, and the County Council considers it appropriate to include the west Oxfordshire strategic resource area in policy M3.
M3	Peter Winder 0097	Supports the arguments and position of OUTRAGE (see 0092)	As response to OUTRAGE (see 0092)
M3	Linda Barlow 0093	The proposal for mineral extraction near Eynsham is extraordinary. The damage to the landscape on a floodplain, the consequent lakes with the totally different effect on the surrounding environment, the proximity to a thriving and well-established community, the damage to an important employer in the area (Siemens), the effect on an already clogged-up road system.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on the grounds of landscape, flooding, proximity to housing and employment uses or other local factors at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies in section 6.

M3	Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group 0094	We support the identification of the Areas of Search.	Noted.
M3	Cherwell District Council 0098	With regards to the working of aggregate minerals crushed rock in the area to the North West of Bicester, there are some concerns about the uncertainty of the exact location of future quarry works. Consideration should be given to identifying the area for crushed rock working. Any proposals for the working of minerals in the area should consider the likely environmental and amenity impact, and if necessary introduce a buffer zone to safeguard residential and visual amenities if required.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4. As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage
M3	Cherwell District Council 0098	The expressed preference for the extension of soft stone working at Duns Tew rather than opening new quarries to minimise environmental impacts is supported.	Noted.

M3	Surrey County Council 0101	The plan should present a more detailed steer for working aggregate minerals needed in the future and not rely on broad areas of search. National Planning Guidance is clear that specific sites should be designated as a priority.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4.
M3	Burcot And Clifton Hampden Protection Of River Thames (BACHPORT) 0103	Identified sites for new working have been abandoned in favour of large areas of search creating uncertainty for residents. This change in approach is contrary to NPPF guidance.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4.
M3	Lafarge Tarmac Ltd 0105	We support the identification of the Areas of Search.	Noted.
M3	Henry Pavlovich (local resident) 0106	This is a wish not an economic argument: operators cannot be forced to source from the south of the county if they can just as easily get material from the west or even, and this is not mentioned, just across the boundary in Gloucestershire or Hampshire. Therefore, the wish to “balance” is artificial: This takes no account whatsoever of market realities: companies will source wherever quality and price dictate, not where OCC dictates.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.

M3	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Why are all areas not represented on a map (inc. NW Bicester – esp. since this is to be safeguarded (M7)? Especially since extraction may occur, this would be beneficial to understanding this consultation.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas, including the crushed rock area north west of Bicester, are all shown on the minerals key diagram, figure 9.
M3	Northmoor Parish Council 0115	The strategy fails to: i) minimise the distance that aggregates are transported by road, ii) provide a broad balance of production of sand and gravel between West and South Oxfordshire, iii) maintain biodiversity in the restoration process; and iv) reduce the risk of flooding. It fails predominately as a result of planning decision taken by the county council in recent years. The plan also fails to protect small communities from costly planning appeals and makes no provision to financially compensate local communities in the immediate vicinity of mineral workings	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period, and the County Council considers it appropriate to include the west Oxfordshire strategic resource area in policy M3. Revised policies M10, C7 and C3 and C5 address restoration, flooding, biodiversity and impacts on local communities and these issues will be

			considered in more detail at the site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3	Peter Winder 0097	Endorses the comments of Northmoor Parish Council (see 0115).	As response to Northmoor Parish Council (see 0115).
M3	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	<p>Assessment Criteria: NCPC has not re-considered these criteria in detail at this time trusting that the issues raised during the last consultation process have been adequately reflected.</p> <p>The strategy appears to ignore the potential for further developments of communities in West Oxfordshire and their demand for minerals by restricting the number of sites that can be developed in that area.</p> <p>By proposing that sites in South Oxfordshire should be developed to serve local need it may artificially lead to a site in South Oxfordshire being considered purely on the grounds of proximity to demand when other factors may mitigate more in favour of a site elsewhere.</p>	<p>The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.</p> <p>The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this. There is a relatively high level of permitted reserves already in the west Oxfordshire area but there may still be a need for further provision to be made for towards the end of the plan period.</p> <p>The allocation of sites for mineral working will be made in the subsequent part 2 of the plan and site-specific environmental and other factors will be taken into account at that stage, in accordance with policy M4.</p>

M3	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	NCPC ask that the research paper previously submitted be taken into consideration if the County Council remains convinced of the need to include an area of search in the Core Strategy.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3	Stanton Harcourt Parish Council 0128	Concerned that the risk of flooding in this area is accentuated by every new gravel excavation. Also concerned about: lack of compensation to the local community for bearing this burden for so long, the cumulative effect of excavation in the Lower Windrush and Evenlode Valleys, the unimaginative aftercare/restoration, the traffic, the flouting of PP conditions and the greater risk of flooding.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on flooding, restoration or traffic grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3, M10 and C10. Where there are planning reasons for the provision of compensation, this should be considered on a case by case basis and is not a matter that can be required by general policy.
M3	Iona Millwood and Simon Hall 0129	Plans for gravel extraction in the Eynsham area – concerned about adverse effects on: i) health; ii) flood risk; iii) traffic and road safety; and iv) permanently altering the landscape.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies in section 6.
M3	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	Support the proposed distribution of mineral workings across the county. This approach will enable the development of a balanced approach to aggregates supply through the allocation of areas of search to support local/sub-regional construction markets.	Noted.

M3 & Figure 12	Peter Fry 0133	The road infrastructure in and around Drayton St Leonard is insufficient to cope with a large increase in HGVs and other large lorries. The road to the north of the village floods with regularity throughout the year and the road to the south of the village is also liable to flooding.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies in section 6.
M3	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Welcome the recognition that minerals can only be worked where they are found. Support the broad areas of search approach adopted and the areas identified for the future working of sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and for crushed rock.	Noted.
M3	Oxford Aggregates (a collaboration between Hanson and Smith and Sons) (Bletchington) 0138	Support the Policy M3 and the broad AOS approach for the areas identified for the future working of sharp sand and gravel. Support the identification of the land in the Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area as a location for future mineral working	Noted.
M3	Mr N Brading 0139	Archaeological assessments need to be carried out and, where appropriate, full archaeological surveys required, recording, recovery and emerging artefacts; this needs to be before planning permission is granted.	Requirements for protection, survey and investigation of archaeological assets are covered by policy C9 and the supporting text at paragraphs 6.47 – 6.50.
M3	Mr N Brading 0139	The major requirement for gravel will be south of the Thames but it appears that the bulk of gravel will still come from north of the Thames, where approvals have already been granted. Approved route for transporting is via the A40 and A34. This is not the shortest route and contractors may flout	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may

		route restrictions, eg via Newbridge. The A40 is already congested and this will not reduce when Oxford City's Northern Gateway Development goes ahead, and funding is unlikely to be made available for upgrading.	be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period, and the County Council considers it appropriate to include the west Oxfordshire strategic resource area in policy M3. Under policy C10, the suitability of access and transportation routes will be taken into consideration in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site allocations Document, and in the determination of planning applications.
M3	Mr & Mrs RD Sharp 0140	Policy M3 B. Areas of search for soft sand working as shown on Figure 13 is supported. The proven reserve of soft sand at Home Farm, Shellingford falls within the area defined in Figure 13. The site at Home Farm, Shellingford remains durable during this plan period.	Noted.
M3 & Figure 12	Toby G Marchant 0141	Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap): A new development of some 60ha would have a devastating impact on facilities and create an enduring blight on this entire area and its inhabitants. There is no obligation for the material to be used locally as the market will decide where the best and cheapest sources of aggregate are to be found. The site is unsuitable for a major industrial scale proposal	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. Local, site-specific issues will be taken into account at the site allocation stage.

M3	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	The delineation of broad areas of search introduces uncertainty. It is difficult to draw conclusions about whether the stated aim of achieving a more equitable balance of mineral working across the county will be achieved. Concerned that West Oxfordshire will continue to provide the majority of sharp sand and gravel. Concerned about the proximity of some of the areas of search to settlements.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4. As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the section of the policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire has been moved to policy M4. The County Council believes this change of approach will provide a stronger mechanism for achieving this objective.
M3	Brightwell- cum-Sotwell Parish Council 0149	Pleased that Policy M3 identifies broad areas of search where future workings may be needed and that the 3 Cholsey sites now fall within an area covering the whole of south of Oxford as one of the five possible areas of search. Would like confirmation that the identification of the area of search merely reflects the existence of the mineral reserve in the given area and does not indicate either positive assessment of that reserve or support for its extraction.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. New policy M5 states that permission will be granted for mineral working within sites allocated in part 2 of the plan and will only exceptionally be granted outside those sites.

M3 & M4	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council 0149	Support the move away from de facto locations being selected to broad areas of search being identified. Also welcome the worked exercise to show how a proposal for sand and gravel working would be considered against policies of Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan, but it creates the potential for confusion and needs clarifying.	Noted. The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The worked exercise did not form part of the consultation draft Core Strategy and with the changes to policies M3 and M4 it is no longer relevant.
M3	Hanson UK 0151	Supports the identified Areas of Search.	Noted.
M3	Hanson UK 0151	Objects to the presumption against new soft sand quarries (4.28). The area of search shown on Fig 13 is very limited and to restrict further working to extensions of existing quarries provides little scope for healthy competition or increased capacity to cover demand growth or production breakdowns etc. at existing facilities.	The Core Strategy does not have a presumption against new soft sand quarries but paragraph 4.38 states a preference for extensions to existing quarries and revised policy M4 requires that priority be given to extensions over new sites. The Corallian Ridge area from Oxford to Faringdon strategic resource area for soft sand has been drawn widely to encompass the whole of the potentially workable soft sand resource
M3	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	CAGE is pleased that there is no longer a limited site identified but that policy M3 identifies broad areas of search where future workings may be needed. This is welcome in that it removes the de facto choice of the Cholsey location alone in South Oxfordshire but it is unclear what the area of search means. It is of great importance that the criteria, described as policies C1 – C11, are now fully and accurately defined.	Noted. The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The criteria that are now to be used in the

			allocation of sites for mineral working in part 2 of the plan are set out in policy M4 together with policies C1 – C11. It is not appropriate to define the criteria more tightly as this would be unduly prescriptive and would be doing at the local plan stage what should more properly be left to be undertaken at the planning application stage.
M3	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	CAGE would welcome confirmation that the identification of the area of search merely reflects the existence of the mineral reserve in the given area and does not indicate positive assessment of that reserve or support for its extraction.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage. Identification of the strategic resource areas does not indicate either a positive assessment of the mineral resource in the area or support for the working of any particular site(s) within the area.
M3 & M4	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	Support the move away from de facto locations being selected to broad areas of search being identified. Also welcome the worked exercise to show how a proposal for sand and gravel working would be considered against policies of Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan, but it creates the	Noted. The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a

		potential for confusion and needs clarifying.	subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The worked exercise did not form part of the consultation draft Core Strategy and with the changes to policies M3 and M4 it is no longer relevant.
M3	Shiplake Parish Council 0154	The Caversham/Sonning Eye extension fails the flood risk Sequential Test. An extension of the Caversham/Sonning Eye workings would conflict with objectives 3.5.8 and policy C8 as the area is greenfield flood plain and is a significant part of the Thames Valley landscape and environment, bordering on an established AONB. An extension of quarry HGV traffic would be in direct conflict with objective 3.5.7 and Policy C10. The Caversham/Reading road network is unsuitable for such heavy vehicle traffic, as is the A4155 to Henley, which has specific access and safety factor risks. Traffic pollution and congestion would be further exacerbated, and therefore any increase should be regarded as unacceptable.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on any of these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies in section 6. On flood risk, a revised Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test are being prepared.
M3 – Figure 9	Dr Stuart Brooks 0015	Boundary of area of search is adjacent to Pinsley Wood, which is ancient woodland and a local wildlife site. Therefore, development in this area would be contrary to objective 3.5 viii and policy C7. Boundary of area should be modified to stop at junction of Lower Road and Church Road, Church Hanborough.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site

			allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Oxford City Council 0018	Eastern end of the identified area of search may conflict with area being considered by County Council for a new strategic link road to improve traffic flow around Pear Tree Interchange. Suggest area is refined or a note made.	The Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area of search has been replaced in policy M3 by the Thames, Lower Windrush and Evenlode Valleys Oxford to Cholsey strategic resource area; this revised area does not affect the possible location for a new link road at Pear Tree.
M3 – Figure 9	Hanborough Parish Council 0021	Area of search comes right up to Church Hanborough village, which is a settlement and conservation area. Area of search also comes right up to Pinsley Wood which is ancient woodland with amenity and biodiversity value and within a few hundred metres from a children's day nursery. Facilities and homes could suffer from noise and dust. Area of search surrounds Lower Road which is the centre of Long Hanborough. Any additional traffic is liable to bring A4095 to a standstill. Fields either side of Lower Road are prone to flooding.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 9	John and Christine Dowling 0025	The gravel search area map should be revised at this stage of the planning process as falling within the County's duty to embrace a Strategic Environmental Assessment updated with the spirit of the Buffer Zone NPPG advice of March 2014.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more

			detailed site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Richard Wright 0027	West Oxfordshire has been subjected to continual quarrying of gravel and this should now take place in another part of Oxfordshire. Part of the area illustrated on the map falls within a 'high flood risk' area. The boundary line abuts the road and would therefore impact on residents' lifestyle and house prices. Visits to the allotment would be ruined by the plan.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period. The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 9	W J Bannister 0042	Due to severe flooding this winter, and the probability of similar in the future, any further extraction of gravel from the Eynsham area will trigger considerable problems both here and further downstream, where Oxford City is already struggling with flooding. Traffic is a major problem in this area, and the prospect of another million tons of freight being funnelled onto our roads is not acceptable.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on flooding or traffic grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3 and C10.

M3 – Figure 9	GreenTEA 0061	It would appear that the area of search would bring gravel workings unduly close to residential areas. The area of search also encompasses allotment areas. A buffer zone around Eynsham is greatly needed. The projected extraction north of the River Thames would greatly exceed the need for materials in that area. If a wet extraction process is used, the potential for village flooding would be worse.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These, and factors like flooding, will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Susan Chapman 0062	Object to any gravel extraction adjacent to Eynsham.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of proximity to Eynsham at this strategic stage of the plan. This is a factor which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policy C5.
M3 – Figure 9	English Heritage 0063	The area of search includes part of the Church Harborough Conservation Area and abuts the Eynsham Conservation Area, and includes a number of listed buildings. Minerals extraction proposals that would harm the significance of these heritage assets should not be permitted.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.

M3 – Figure 9	Dr Don Chapman 0066	Concerned about the absence of buffer zones to protect the local area. Questions the need for any designated areas north of the Thames, given the recent extension to gravel working at Gill Mill. Any minerals extracted should travel by conveyor belt, not lorry and be processed at the existing plant in Cassington. After use should also be carefully considered at the planning stage in consultation with local residents.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period. The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These, and factors like transportation and restoration, will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Neil Bailey 0068	The area of search is significantly close to a number of residents.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of proximity to residential property at this strategic stage of the plan. This is a factor which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policy C5.
M3 – Figure 9	Eynsham Parish Council 0069	Approval has already been granted to extract most of the sand and gravel needed in the north west Oxfordshire area for the period up to 2030 making it unnecessary to identify large additional areas and therefore making the area of search much larger than required.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional

			provision to be made for the later part of the plan period.
M3 – Figure 9	The Eynsham Society 0074	Much of the proposed area is in the flood zone and would therefore require wet digging, thus making it impossible to preserve any archaeology.	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and site-specific factors have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. Issues like groundwater and archaeology will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Greta Rye 0075	Object due to: i) proximity to village unless there is a substantial buffer zone; ii) environmental damage and risk of flooding; and iii) additional problems with the already overcrowded A40.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of proximity to village, environmental impact, flooding or traffic at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Mark Watson 0084	Gravel extraction at Eynsham should not come too close to houses or roads or affect footpaths and local facilities. A 1km margin should be left for housing. Gravel should only be removed from unused fields. Any extraction should be filled in and returned to grass asap not lakes.	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and factors like proximity to houses etc have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These, and issues like restoration, will be taken into consideration at the site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Jane Thompson 0096	Buffer zones should be placed around people's homes, recreational facilities and sensitive industries. There should be a more even balance of sites:	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and factors like proximity to houses etc and traffic have generally not been

		there are still 3 in west Oxon and only 1 in other areas. Gravel traffic from west Oxfordshire uses narrow bridges over the Thames and traffic on the A40 is very difficult. Digging should as near as possible to the destination for the gravel.	taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage. The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Figure 9	Anne Wrapson 0102	The area of search would threaten the community both socially and industrially. The possibility of transportation via the River Thames should be explored.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. Possible impacts on communities and transportation are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies.
M3 – Figure 9	Lynda Hillyer 0104	The map follows areas prone to flooding. None of the areas designated can be restored to fields because they are wet areas. Wet gravel areas will eliminate archaeological evidence in Eynsham's surroundings.	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and site-specific factors have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. Issues like flooding and archaeology will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Robin Mitchell 0110	The Plan just identifies a large area of search and leaves the details to whatever subsequent planning applications may be made. This creates blight over a large area and will lead to the situation where every separate application will have to be fought out over the conditions to be applied - hardly a situation which will conduce to consistency or the economical use of resources.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will

		Appropriate buffer zones should be established initially - it is quite unacceptable for the area of search to extend right up to the eastern boundary of Eynsham.	subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. Issues like proximity to settlements will be taken into consideration at the site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Figure 9	Mr Peter C Power 0150	Land west of Eynsham Mill should be deleted from the area of search due to impact on a listed building and flooding.	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and site-specific factors have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. Issues like heritage and flooding will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage. The strategic resource area in west Oxfordshire does not include land on the east side of the river Evenlode.
M3 – Figure 10	Richard Wright 0027	West Oxfordshire has been subjected to continual quarrying of gravel and this should now take place in another part of Oxfordshire. Part of the area illustrated on the map falls within a 'high flood risk' area. The boundary line abuts the road and would therefore impact on residents' lifestyle and house prices. Visits to the allotment would be ruined by the plan.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period. The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.

M3 – Figure 10	English Heritage 0063	In the absence of more specific proposed areas for working, this area should be protected.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 10	Stanton Harcourt Estate 0109	The Estate supports the Area of Search identified.	Noted.
M3 – Figure 11	English Heritage 0063	The area of search includes the Sonning Eye Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings. Mineral extraction proposals that would harm the significance of these heritage assets should not be permitted.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 11	Cllr David Bartholomew 0152	The term 'North East of Caversham' is used in the current draft (see p42). This is not a term that has any local resonance and I believe local people/organisations affected by the plan may not have realised it applies to them. Caversham is very much seen as part of Reading.	The North East of Caversham area of search has been replaced in policy M3 by the Thames Valley Caversham to Shiplake strategic resource area, which better describes the area concerned.

M3 – Figure 12	Corpus Christi College 0049	The area of search at Drayton St Leonard should be modified to reflect the mineral reserve – information previously provided to the County Council.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits using available geological information.
M3 – Figure 12	English Heritage 0063	Defining Areas of Search in a broad way without giving any indication of the presence of serious constraints covering substantial parts of some of these is unhelpful and potentially misleading.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 12	Dr Duncan Reed 0081	Please recognise the scale and symbiotic nature of Cholsey-Wallingford and allow genuine strategic planning to resume by removing allocation of the intervening area as a potential mineral resource.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of proximity to Cholsey and/or Wallingford at this strategic stage of the plan. This is a factor which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policy C5.
M3 – Figure 12	Henry Pavlovich 0106	This map is too vague and not on a proper scale – it even includes half of Cholsey village as a potential search area for gravel!	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass

			potentially workable mineral deposits and, whilst the built-up areas of villages have been excluded, local constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 12	Henry Pavlovich 0106	The site previously nominated between Wallingford and Cholsey is unsuitable for as a gravel pit site.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of proximity to Cholsey and/or Wallingford at this strategic stage of the plan. This is a factor which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policy C5.
M3 – Figure 12	Exeter College 0111	The area of search at Drayton St Leonard should be modified to reflect the mineral reserve – information previously provided to the County Council.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits using available geological information.

M3 – Figure 12	Mr Charles Dickerson 0116	Gravel raising should not take place within any of South Oxfordshire's river floodplains, particularly with the Oxford to Goring Search Area. It should not take place because of: i) Landscape and wildlife value - river floodplains that are untouched by development are a rare and decreasing local resource; ii) Archaeology - The area has priceless archaeological heritage. Severe damage has already been done in the name of gravel-raising; and iii) Flooding - the area lies within the River Thames floodplain. Any strategy must be accompanied by a detailed, independent study of flood risk within the Stadhampton - Dorchester area.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core polices.
M3 – Figure 12	Alison Gomm 0118	Surprised that the area around Drayton St Leonard has been included as it is an area of outstanding natural beauty and of considerable archaeological interest through which the river Thame, with its interesting ecosystem. Quarrying would scar the area and destroy the amenity for those who reside and visit. The heavy traffic would be detrimental as there is one narrow road passing through the village.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core polices.
M3 – Figure 12	John Nagle 0123	I wish to record my opposition to any gravel extraction within the parish of Drayton St Leonard for reasons of noise, pollution and damage to the archaeology that is prevalent across this area on both sides of the river Thame.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core polices.

M3 – Figure 12	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	Given the historic significance of the village and surrounding parkland, consideration of gravel extraction seems inappropriate. The A4074, which runs through the village, is already at capacity. Linking supply and demand sites closely will create a significant impact on already creaking infrastructure.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on these grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and the core policies. The County Council believes that locating mineral working sites closer to areas of demand for aggregate will reduce overall traffic impact.
M3 – Figure 12	Peter Fry 0133	The proposed area around Drayton St Leonard is poorly defined on the maps provided. It is difficult to get a clear idea of where the proposed new extraction sites are.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Figure 12	Mrs Justine Higgin 0155	Welcome the removal of Cholsey from the plan. Suggest that when selecting a site, great emphasis be placed on its proximity to residential areas. In particular, the number of residents affected and tourism impact.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with the criteria in revised policy M4. Proximity to residential areas will be taken into account in the allocation of sites.
M3 – Figure 13	Grundon 0047	The Corallian Ridge area of search should include existing sand and gravel producers in that area and should be extended to the south of Faringdon.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas. The Corallian Ridge area from Oxford to Faringdon includes the sand resource south of Faringdon.
M3 – Figure 13	English Heritage 0063	The area of search includes a large number of designated heritage assets. Mineral extraction proposals that would harm the significance of these heritage assets should not be permitted.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and

			designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Figure 13	Dr Judith Webb 0125	Potential future minerals extraction site at Tubworth Barn, Tubney and Cothill Fen SAC - Concerned that the small, extremely valuable fen within Frilford Heath Golf Course called the Two Pine Fen may be detrimentally affected. The species is on the Rare Plants Register for Oxon. The catchment for the Two Pine Fen has not yet been calculated.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. In assessing sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, policy C7 on biodiversity will be taken into account. In relation to Cothill Fen SAC, a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report is being prepared.
M3 – Figure 14	Corpus Christi College 0049	Support the identified area of search.	Noted.
Policy M3 – Figures 9 – 14	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	The maps that are provided in the consultation document are of a poor quality that makes understanding them difficult and comparison between them almost impossible.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The maps of the areas of search have been deleted and the strategic resource areas are instead shown on a new minerals key diagram, which is more appropriate to a Core Strategy.
M3 – Areas of search	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	The lack of site identification leads to widespread blight, especially the 2,270ha in the new Thames Valley area of search sweeping across South Oxfordshire. The plan would be unsound on the basis of the NPPF in that it fails the requirement of a plan-led approach to set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land. Many other MPAs	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas

		are using the preferred site specific approach. It is unclear why Oxfordshire is different and what the rationale for the change from the development of the withdrawn strategy.	within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Areas of search	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	There is a lack of any apparent evidential basis for the mapped areas of search. From one example (Sutton Farm and Stanton Harcourt where 14mt of fully deliverable sand and gravel lies just outside an area of search) it is clear that large workable resources are not identified, which casts serious doubts on the reliability of the areas of search. Additionally, the maps are of such poor quality making boundary definition very difficult leading to confusion and hence the blighting impact on communities ever more troublesome.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits using available geological information. The 2 areas of search in west Oxfordshire have been replaced by a single strategic resource area, which includes land at Sutton Farm and Stanton Harcourt.
M3 – Areas of search	Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) 0052	The plan fails to meet Government Policy and Guidance which places the top priority on identifying Specific Sites for future mineral workings, not extensive Areas of Search from which planning applications might emerge over time.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Areas of search	Berrick and Roke Parish Council 0004	Support the views of PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3 – Areas of search	Drayton St Leonard Parish Council 0031	Represented by, and fully endorses Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).

OMWLP: Part 1 (Core Strategy) – Statement on Consultation and Representations December 2015
 Summary of Comments on Consultation Draft Core Strategy February 2014 and County Council Responses

M3 – Areas of search	Benson Parish Council 0035	Is a member of PAGE and will be working with PAGE to submit a response on behalf of the 8 parishes involved in PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3 – Areas of search	Warborough Parish Council 0040	Adopt and endorse the Page response in full (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3 – Areas of search	Dorchester Parish Council 0055	Fully endorses and supports the PAGE response (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3 – Areas of search	Stadhampton Parish Council 0086	Gives full support to the PAGE approach (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3 – Areas of search	Newington Parish Council 0143	Fully support PAGE (see 0052).	As response to PAGE (see 0052).
M3 – Areas of search	Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society 0059	These are far in excess of what is needed to meet supply requirements. Also, the areas of search are too widely drawn and include numerous highly sensitive heritage assets and areas that ought to be excluded. The policies concerning the Areas of Search do not provide sufficient safeguards for the environment.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.

M3 – Areas of search	Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum 0077	These are far in excess of what is needed to meet supply requirements. Also, the areas of search are too widely drawn and include numerous highly sensitive heritage assets and areas that ought to be excluded. The policies concerning the Areas of Search do not provide sufficient safeguards for the environment.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M3 – Areas of search	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	Concerned about the approach taken to identifying potential mineral extraction sites. Areas of search, as a way of identifying extraction sites, in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance, it is the third and lowest priority when considering the options. The reason for taking the lowest priority route is not justified in the Core Strategy text, which also makes our plan making assessments more difficult.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Areas of search	Vale of White Horse District Council 0095	Whilst identifying areas of search is compliant with national guidance, identifying specific sites for allocation is a preferred approach. Sites should be identified and proposed for allocation for mineral extraction following a comprehensive assessment of realistic alternatives including consideration for HGV access, local amenity and with appropriate boundaries identified, particularly providing protection for noise, dust, and other impacts on residential areas or other sensitive locations.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.

M3 – Area of search	Henry Pavlovich 0106	The draft plan does not meet government policy which prioritises site identification rather than areas of search.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Areas of search	Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council 0126	The strategy introduces the potential for planning blight through identifying broad areas of search which is counter to the wishes expressed by many community representatives during the previous consultation process.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.
M3 – Areas of search	Stanton Harcourt Parish Council 0128	The search areas delineate areas which could be open to planning applications. It is unclear how the parameters – broad balance and proximity to use – will be respected. How will the stated strategy be enforced and how will OCC ensure that it is respected in the planning process.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4.

M3 – Areas of search	Mr N Brading 0139	The search areas do not include buffer zones to protect settlements or industry.	The revised strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and factors like proximity to settlements etc have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the site allocation stage, but buffer zones are more appropriately considered at the more detailed planning application stage.
M3 – Areas of search	Mr Peter C Power 0150	Specific sites should be allocated within each of the broad areas of search, taking constraints like flooding into account.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1, which identifies broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with the criteria in revised policy M4.
M4	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	The west has provided more than its fair share. Existing planning approvals in the west more than provide for the amount of sand and gravel identified in this strategy. The limit of three operational sites in the west at any one time should therefore be reduced to only one.	The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period. Reference to a limit of three operational mineral working sites in west Oxfordshire has not been included in revised policy M4; the number of sites required will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.

M4	Dr Stuart Brooks 0015	Boundary of area of search is adjacent to Pinsley Wood, which is ancient woodland and a local wildlife site. Therefore, development in this area would be contrary to objective 3.5 viii and policy C7. Boundary of area should be modified to stop at junction of Lower Road and Church Road, Church Hanborough.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M4	Gloucestershire County Council 0024	Have concerns about: i) the overall level of provision for sand and gravel; ii) the location of this provision; and iii) the productive capacity within areas identified for working. Policy W8 satisfies previous concerns with regards to hazardous waste.	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 has led to an increased requirement for primary aggregate provision in the Core Strategy, as set out in the revised section on provision for working aggregate minerals. The County Council believes that the spatial strategy in revised policy M3 will enable the requirement for sand and gravel supply across Oxfordshire to be met from local sources, without the need for importation.
M4	Mr Nick Hutton 0030	Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton area – concerned about noise and dust pollution on nearby residential areas. Also concerned that gravel extraction in this area would cause further flooding problems.	These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C5 and C3.

M4	United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority 0032	Add to bullet point 7 of Policy M4: Special regard should be had to the impact that any working of aggregate minerals in the Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap) south of the A415 at Culham may have on the Major Developed Employment site of Culham Science Centre and the existing and possible future research and high technology projects there having regard to South Oxfordshire Core Strategy Policy CSME3 and the significance of the site within Science Vale Oxford.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4. As explained in paragraph 4.24, the strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints (including district council local plan allocations) have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M4	CRW Leonard 0034	Sutton Courtenay quarry only has a few years of life and the possibilities of further extension are very limited.	The Core Strategy recognises this, at paragraph 4.31.
M4	Earthline Ltd 0039	The preference for extensions of existing quarries over new quarries is supported.	Noted.
M4	W J Bannister 0042	Due to severe flooding this winter, and the probability of similar in the future, any further extraction of gravel from the Eynsham area will trigger considerable problems both here and further downstream, where Oxford City is already struggling with flooding. Traffic is a major problem in this area, and the prospect of another million tons of freight being	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on flooding or traffic grounds at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3 and C10.

		funnelled onto our roads is not acceptable.	
M4	CPRE 0044	Suggest insert at end of preamble: that there is an overriding need for the development and that all steps will be taken to minimise the impact on the landscape.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan but also states that the core policies must be taken into account, which includes policy C8 on landscape. The policy cross-refers to policy M2, under which the need for new sites will be established.
M4	Wokingham Borough Council 0045	As Caversham Quarry lies close to the Wokingham Borough boundary, the council considers that there could be an impact on the road network.	The consideration of any sites within the Thames Valley area from Caversham to Shiplake for allocation in part 2 of the plan will include consideration against policy C10 on transport.
M4	Grundon 0047	Policy M4 is linked to policy M2, but that does not address a steady and adequate supply but is what appears to be a landbank based policy. The policy is too restrictive on new soft sand quarries and makes no allowance for growth. The prevention of mineral working in the AONB is contrary to the NPPF and contradicts policy C8.	Policy M2 has been amended and sets out how the level of provision required in the plan will be established. Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. The Core Strategy does not preclude new soft sand quarries but revised policy M4 requires that priority be given to extensions over new sites. Policy M4 has been amended regarding AONBs to be consistent with policy C8 and the NPPF.
M4	Graham Griffiths 0048	Extraction of gravel or sand anywhere near Eynsham should not be allowed at any future time. In particular future works would cause the following damage: 1) extra lorry traffic; 2) dust and noise pollution; 3) loss of amenity; and 4) flooding. Any restoration involving lakes would risk causing permanent damage to our surroundings.	It would not be reasonable to exclude this area on grounds of traffic, dust and noise, loss of amenity or flooding at this strategic stage of the plan. These are factors which will be considered at the subsequent site allocation stage, in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4 and policies C3, C5 and C10.

M4	Corpus Christi College 0049	Proposed working area with the Thames Valley between Oxford and the Goring Gap: Provisions should be made for two new quarries as the area has significant workable reserves and good access to the existing road network and market.	The plan (paragraph 4.31 and policy M4) is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed. This will be established when sites for mineral working are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	The policy is too overly restrictive and does not give certainty or assist in the delivery of sufficient sites to meet demand. Primarily this is due to its reliance on policy M2 which does not follow NPPF or NPPG guidance as specifically commented upon.	Policy M2 has been amended and the County Council considers that it appropriately sets out how the level of provision to be made through the plan is to be established and is in line with national policy and guidance. Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	English Heritage 0063	Policy M4 should specifically require that there be no harm to heritage assets and should refer to World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas.	Revised policy M4 includes these specific requirements and references.
M4	Vincent Goodstadt 0064	The plan should be modified to reflect the implications of the Gill Mill extension permission by placing greater weight on limiting further mineral working in west Oxfordshire. The wording of policies M2, M3 and M4 should be tightened to make them more strongly inter-related and state consent will only be granted to ensure required levels of demand are met.	The Gill Mill permission has been included in a revised Table 2. The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with revised policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be made for the later part of the plan period. Policies M2, M3 and M4 have been revised and inter-relate to provide a strong framework for the provision of aggregate mineral working, within

			which policy M2 covers need for permissions.
M4	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The policies have no specific requirements for an integrated approach to minerals development in specific areas.	The County Council believes that the policies in this section of the plan together provide for the implementation of an integrated approach to minerals development.
M4	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Sutton Courtenay is described in Policy M4 as having only a few years of reserves left. However, it should be noted that recently Hanson sought approval for the extension of the quarry to 2020 and in Policy M4 there is an indication that this might well be sought or safeguarded for future use.	Within the context of the plan period to 2031, Sutton Courtenay Quarry does only have a few years of reserves remaining, as noted in paragraph 4.31. The specific reference to Sutton Courtenay Quarry does not appear in revised policy M4.
M4	Mineral Products Association 0090	The policy needs to provide greater flexibility for additional reserves, and additional productive capacity, to be permitted in the Areas of Search. The proposed restriction to only 3 sites (all sharp sand and gravel) in the Western Oxfordshire AoS has no basis and would be anti-competitive.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	OUTRAGE 0092	The areas of search for sharp sand and gravel are too widely and indiscriminately drawn. Bearing in mind Policy M2, it could be argued that in order to achieve the plans objective of a balance between the west and south, neither of these Areas of Search should form part of this plan.	The locational strategy approach has been revised; in policy M3, areas of search within which planning applications would be considered have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites will be allocated in a subsequent part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. The plan seeks to achieve a change in the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire through the allocation of sites for mineral working in accordance with policy M4. Whilst there is a high level of existing permitted reserves in west Oxfordshire, there may be a requirement for additional provision to be

			made for the later part of the plan period, and the County Council considers it appropriate to include the west Oxfordshire strategic resource area in policy M3.
M4	Peter Winder 0097	Supports the arguments and position of OUTRAGE (see 0092)	As response to OUTRAGE (see 0092)
M4	Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group 0094	The policy needs to provide greater flexibility for additional reserves, and additional productive capacity, to be permitted in the Areas of Search. The proposed restriction to only 3 sites (all sharp sand and gravel) in the Western Oxfordshire AoS has no basis and would be anti-competitive.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	Cherwell District Council 0098	Avoidance of harm to the Oxford Meadows SAC is supported. Limiting proposed aggregated working in Western Oxfordshire: Consideration should be given to whether further, appropriate control over working could be achieved beyond the limit on the number of sites. Avoiding further working within the AONB is supported. Proposed permission exchange condition for ironstone aggregate working: Supported on the basis that the overall environmental benefit could be clearly demonstrated including the impact on local amenity.	Support noted. Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.

M4	Richard Bakesef 0099	In the Thames Valley between Oxford and Goring Gap area of search, it makes more sense to extend the existing Sutton Courtenay Quarry (until supplies are exhausted here) before considering any new quarries in the region. Any new quarry in the south should also be assessed for the quality and quantity of its mineral deposits before permission is given for the working of aggregate materials within the defined areas.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. The specific reference to Sutton Courtenay Quarry does not appear in revised policy M4, but it gives priority to extensions to existing quarries over new sites. Consideration of the quantity and quality of the mineral is one of the criteria in policy M4.
M4	Lafarge Tarmac Ltd 0105	The policy needs to provide greater flexibility for additional reserves, and additional productive capacity, to be permitted in the Areas of Search. The proposed restriction to only 3 sites (all sharp sand and gravel) in the Western Oxfordshire AoSs has no basis and would be anti-competitive.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	Henry Pavlovich 0106	This is a wish not an economic argument: operators cannot be forced to source from the south of the county if they can just as easily get material from the west or even, and this is not mentioned, just across the boundary in Gloucestershire or Hampshire. Therefore, the wish to “balance” is artificial: This takes no account whatsoever of market realities: companies will source wherever quality and price dictate, not where OCC dictates.	A local plan cannot force commercial decisions but it can set a policy framework to enable and guide change. The main mechanism for changing the pattern of mineral supply will be the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan, in line with the locational strategy set in policies M3 and M4.
M4	Exeter College 0111	Proposed working area with the Thames Valley between Oxford and the Goring Gap: Provisions should be made for two new quarries as the area has significant workable reserves and good access to the existing road network and market.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.

M4	Mrs Clare Simpson 0112	Paragraph 4.24 states that the quarry at Sutton Courtenay only has a few years of reserves left, but Policy M4 indicates that the quarry might be “safeguarded” for future use. I object to this.	The specific reference to Sutton Courtenay Quarry does not appear in revised policy M4.
M4	Robin Draper 0113	Paragraph 4.24 states that the quarry at Sutton Courtenay has only a few years of reserves left with limited possibilities for further extension. Policy M4 indicates that an extension might well be sought, or later in the document 'safeguarded' for future use.	The specific reference to Sutton Courtenay Quarry does not appear in revised policy M4.
M4	Cllr Charles Mathew 0127	There is no explanation of what constitutes an acceptable extension.	This cannot be defined in general terms but is a matter that would need to be considered on a site specific case by case basis taking into account all relevant factors.
M4	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	Question the statement that further workings in the AONBs will not be permitted. It may be advantageous to identify areas and/or sites both within, and outside, the AONBs in order to meet the long-term demand from proximal construction markets.	The distribution of mineral resources within Oxfordshire is such that the required levels of provision can be met from outside the AONBs. Policy M4 has been amended regarding AONBs to be consistent with policy C8 and the NPPF.

M4	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Concerned that the approach of a broad balance between the main resource areas of west and south Oxfordshire will limit the ability of the industry to respond to increased demand in the economy. Concerned that the balance would be unsettled by capping supply in West Oxfordshire and then there being a pick-up in the economy and increased demand - thus any shortfall would have to be met by South Oxfordshire. In turn, this would increase transport distances. The limit is artificial and fails to recognise the merits of the planning system in granting permission only to those proposals which have demonstrated through and EIA that they would not aggravate the range of environmental concerns.	The County Council believes that changing the balance of production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire to reflect the distribution of demand should enable more local supply of sharp sand and gravel and should increase the flexibility of supply within Oxfordshire. Revised policy M4 does not set a cap on supply in west Oxfordshire. It now sets out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan and is less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	The stated preference for extensions to soft sand operations and crushed rock quarries is supported.	Noted.
M4	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Object to the complete ban on mineral working in the AONB.	Policy M4 has been amended regarding AONBs to be consistent with policy C8 and the NPPF.
M4	Oxford Aggregates (a collaboration between Hanson and Smith and Sons (Bletchington))	Object to the third bullet point which states that permission would only be granted if 'it has been demonstrated that there will be no change in water levels in the Oxford Meadows SAC'. This point is also made at paragraph 4.25	This is a conclusion reached in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report; it is necessary to include this in policy M4 in order to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.

	0138		
M4	Oxford Aggregates (a collaboration between Hanson and Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0138	The policy introduces a cap on production to current levels by limiting the number of operations units to 3. This limits the ability of the plan to respond to increased customer demand and will upset the balanced approach to supply between West and South Oxfordshire, proposed by policy M2.	Revised policy M4 does not set a cap on supply in west Oxfordshire. It now sets out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan and is less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan. The balance between west and southern Oxfordshire is now to be secured through the allocation of sites under policy M4.
M4	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	In the absence of the details of existing and anticipated capacities previously in Table 1, it will be difficult for the MPA to determine whether a particular application proposal will achieve the objective of a balance in annual production capacity between west and southern Oxfordshire. It is also difficult to quantify what is meant by this 'balance'.	As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire is now to be secured through the allocation of sites under policy M4, rather than just through the planning application process. The requirement for new mineral working sites in different parts of the county will be established when part 2 of the plan is prepared, in the light of monitoring information in the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment.
M4	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	The majority of future working should take place in southern Oxfordshire, close to the county's main areas of growth.	The plan seeks to change the distribution of sand and gravel supply between west and southern Oxfordshire so that local demand for aggregate can be met from the most local source. It is estimated that the split of demand between northern and southern Oxfordshire will be approximately 50:50, so the split of provision for aggregate supply should change towards alignment with this.

M4	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	It is unclear why policy M4 now sets a limit of no more than 3 operational mineral working sites within the proposed areas of search combined in west Oxfordshire.	Revised policy M4 is less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.
M4	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	The requirement for provision in the southern Oxfordshire areas of search should be changed to allow both extensions and new quarries to come forward in order to shift the focus of provision away from west Oxfordshire.	These specific requirements are not included in revised policy M4 but it includes giving priority to extensions to existing quarries over new sites.
M4	Hanson UK 0151	Strongly objects to the third bullet point. The County Council has not drawn the correct conclusions from the studies they have undertaken in support of M4. The requirement that mineral working shall not result in a change in water levels in the Oxford Meadows SAC is simplistic and unqualified. Reference to land to the north and north east of the River Evenlode is ambiguous and imprecise. The basic hydrogeological assessment evidence contained within the supporting documentation does not support a prescriptive approach leading to the proposed exclusion. The conclusions reached in the HRA technical supplement and on which the policy seems to rely are contradicted by the hydrogeological assessment presented earlier in the Technical Supplement.	This is a conclusion reached in the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report; it is necessary to include this in policy M4 in order to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations.
M4	Hanson UK 0151	Supports the representation made by the Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group (0094) in relation to the proposed restriction on the number of operational mineral working sites with the Western Oxfordshire Area of Search.	Policy M4 has been revised to set out criteria to be taken into account in the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan. It is now less specific about the number of new sites that may be needed; this will be established when sites are allocated in part 2 of the plan.

M4	Hanson UK 0151	In relation to working within the Thames Valley between Oxford and Goring area of search, the wording should be amended to provide flexibility for both an extension to Sutton Courtenay Quarry and a new quarry.	The requirement for either an extension or a new quarry is not included in revised policy M4 but it includes giving priority to extensions to existing quarries over new sites.
M4	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	Concerned about the argument still being relied upon regarding distance to market considerations. Given that areas of search are now being used, it is not easy to understand how this factor, as a matter relevant to choice, is being used. This must be clarified. The distance to market considerations also impact on the Duty to Cooperate requirement of the NPPF. Again, the approach is not clear in relation to this and the current draft Plan risks being found to be unsound in this respect.	As part of the change that has been made to the locational strategy approach, policy on the balance between west and southern Oxfordshire is now contained within a revised policy M4. The County Council believes this change to securing a balance through the allocation of sites will provide a stronger mechanism for achieving this objective. The County Council has had further engagement with other planning authorities and other bodies under the duty to co-operate. This engagement will be summarised in a separate report on compliance with the duty to co-operate.
4.37	Henry Pavlovich (local resident) 0106	There is no mention of the vast ss+g deposits available right now as soils from kaolin clay mining in Cornwall. So why blight an area with the threat of new holes here?!	Reference to china clay waste has been added to paragraph 4.7, but there is no indication of this material becoming available as a source of aggregate in Oxfordshire at least in the short term. Policy M1 supports the importation of such material by rail and policy M6 provides for the development of new rail depots.
M5	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	We would seek a firm assurance through the Strategy that Hanson's plant is removed promptly in 2020, as planned	The rail depot at Appleford Sidings, Sutton Courtenay has permanent planning consent.

M5	Cherwell District Council 0098	Locations for new aggregate rail depots should be located as close to the source of extraction as possible which would reduce the use of lorries and lessen the environmental impacts.	Aggregate rail depots in Oxfordshire are for the importation of aggregate extracted from quarries at distance outside the county; they need to be located near areas of demand for aggregate but also where there is suitable road access for distribution.
M5	Henry Pavlovich 0106	There is no mention of the vast ss+g deposits available right now as soils from kaolin clay mining in Cornwall. So why blight an area with the threat of new holes here?!	Reference to china clay waste has been added to paragraph 4.7, but there is no indication of this material becoming available as a source of aggregate in Oxfordshire at least in the short term. Policy M1 supports the importation of such material by rail and policy M6 provides for the development of new rail depots.
M5	Robin Draper 0113	Object to the safeguarding of the Appleford Rail Siding on the Sutton Courtney landfill site: i) for importing aggregate; and ii) beyond the end of the date of the landfill site that is 2030. This should be stipulated in the policy wording	The rail depot at Appleford Sidings, Sutton Courtenay has permanent planning consent. It is an important part of the infrastructure for the supply of aggregate to Oxfordshire and should be safeguarded in line with national planning policy.
4.39	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports the Council's recognition of the importance of small scale building, roofing and walling stone extraction in rural areas for the conservation and restoration of historic buildings and to maintain local distinctiveness in new development.	Noted.
4.44	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Whilst oil was not found, gas was. How significant were the deposits? Is the "strategic environment assessment that includes parts of Oxfordshire" available?	Paragraph 4.58 notes that gas has been found in Oxfordshire in the past; it is understood that the amounts involved were not considered significant. The strategic environmental assessment was prepared for the government and is a published document.

M6	English Heritage 0063	With regards to clay extraction, the Lower Windrush Valley and Thames Valley (Oxford to Goring Gap) area should be protected.	The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan, in accordance with revised policy M4. Any clay extraction would take place within areas allocated for sharp sand and gravel working. The strategic resource areas have been drawn broadly to encompass potentially workable mineral deposits and designations and constraints have generally not been taken into account at this strategic stage. These will be taken into consideration at the more detailed site allocation stage.
M6	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	The supply of walling and building stone to the Cotswolds AONB may be from limestone quarries within the AONB. It should be made clear that the proposed restriction to aggregates working in the AONB in policy M4 does not apply to building and walling stone.	Revised policy M4 is clearly about sites for the working of aggregate minerals. Paragraph 6.42 states that small scale quarrying for building stone may be acceptable in the Cotswolds AONB and this is provided for in policy C8.
M7	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	The policy threatens to define on maps not just the areas identified in Policy M3 but other areas of proven resource. These areas are presumably some of the sites nominated in the 2007-12 planning process and will be safeguarded for future exploitation. Object to this long term threat.	The purpose of safeguarding mineral deposits is to protect them as a resource that is potentially available for the future. Safeguarding is not a proposal for mineral extraction and does not in itself imply that mineral extraction would be acceptable or would be permitted. Safeguarding of important mineral deposits is required under national planning policy in the NPPF.
M7	Grundon 0047	The series of maps which is to accompany the plan should cover the existing sites and potential resources to ensure that current and future areas are protected from conflicting development.	The safeguarding maps will cover all mineral deposits that are known or believed to be of importance in Oxfordshire.

M7	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Surely the purpose of a Core Strategy is to identify areas which should be safeguarded as well as those areas which should provide certainty of working to the mineral industry. The Council has been working on its mineral plans for a decade and it is reasonable to expect that the Core Strategy should contain an additional Figure or Figures illustrating the proposed Safeguarding Areas. Without such plans it is not possible to consider this matter and so the Core Strategy is considered seriously deficient.	Mineral safeguarding areas have not yet been defined and mapped; this will be done in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, within the strategic policy parameters set by policy M8.
M7	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Reassurance should be given that that Hanson's plant is removed promptly in 2020, as planned	Policy M7 concerns safeguarding of mineral resources but a new policy M9 on safeguarding mineral infrastructure has been added to the Core Strategy. Local plan policies cannot over-ride the requirements of planning permissions, including any conditions that impose time limits.
M7	Vale of White Horse District Council 0095	Minerals safeguarding areas should be more clearly defined and annotated on accompanying maps.	Mineral safeguarding areas have not yet been defined and mapped; this will be done in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, within the strategic policy parameters set by policy M8.
M7	Vale of White Horse District Council 0095	An additional clause should be added to clarify the relationship between the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and other parts of the development plan for the area.	An additional clause has been added to policy M8 along the lines suggested.
M7	Cherwell District Council 0098	It would be helpful if the safeguarding maps and consultation areas could be provided within the core strategy to determine whether there is likely to be any conflict with district local plan policies.	Mineral safeguarding areas have not yet been defined and mapped; this will be done in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, within the strategic policy parameters set by policy M8.
4.52	AGGROW 0023	Welcome statement that proposals for restoration, aftercare and after use should be submitted with planning applications for mineral working but it is	Enforcement is a procedural matter carried out under planning legislation and is not a matter that should be covered by policy in a local plan.

		unclear how this will be enforced.	
4.52	Alvescot Parish Council 0100	Welcome the submission of restoration, aftercare and after-use proposals with the submission of applications. The plan states that proposals for restoration should demonstrate that local communities have been consulted on options for after-use. It is unclear how this will be enforced or what the consequences will be should this not be done. A clear time scale should be set for lengthy aftercare.	These are procedural matters relating to the determination of planning applications and the enforcement of planning permissions, carried out under planning legislation; they are not matters that should be covered by policy in a local plan.
4.52 – 4.59	RSPB 0121	Supports many of the aspirations of this chapter.	Noted.
4.52	RSPB 0121	Support the statement that 'proposals for restoration, aftercare and after-use should...include provision for long-term maintenance of the after-use and enhancement of the environment.' However, many of the habitats that can be created through mineral restoration take many years to become well established.	Noted. This is recognised in paragraph 4.83.
4.52 – 4.59	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support many of the aims within this chapter. However, we feel that it should have stronger aspirations for biodiversity and that changes to achieve this would be supported by the NPPF, NEWP and Biodiversity 202. A biodiversity-led restoration strategy would recognise the unique opportunity that the restoration of mineral workings can provide in large scale priority habitat creation.	The section on restoration and policy M10 have been revised to provide a stronger focus on restoration for biodiversity, in line with the Council's vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire.

4.52	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Strongly support the statement that 'proposals for restoration, aftercare and after-use should...include provision for long-term maintenance of the after-use and enhancement of the environment.'	Noted.
4.52 – 4.59	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	This section needs to be to be strengthened to have stronger aspirations for biodiversity. In particular, this section should ensure a landscape-scale biodiversity-led restoration strategy.	The section on restoration and policy M10 have been revised to provide a stronger focus on restoration for biodiversity, in line with the Council's vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire.
4.52	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	I support this paragraph, especially as long-term maintenance is essential to ensure that the biodiversity value of a site's restoration is delivered and retained.	Noted.
4.53	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	The restoration of sites for a leisure use is not considered in the Core Strategy.	Revised policy M10 includes restoration for recreation.
4.53	English Heritage 0063	Include mention of potential opportunities for the historic environment arising from restoration and aftercare of mineral workings.	This is included in revised policy M10.
4.53	RSPB 0121	Supports paragraph 4.53, including the new text which gives greater emphasis to habitat creation and biodiversity, but suggest inclusion of a reference to the delivery of net-gain in biodiversity so as to be compatible with the NPPF.	Noted. Revised paragraph 4.75 refers to delivering a net gain in biodiversity.

4.53	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support this paragraph but a reference to the delivery of net-gain in biodiversity is needed so as to be compatible with the NPPF.	Revised paragraph 4.75 refers to delivering a net gain in biodiversity.
4.53	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Suggest add: “All restoration schemes should assist or achieve priority habitat or species targets and objectives, including targets and objectives relation to the Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan and Conservation Target Areas”.	Additional wording along these lines is included in revised paragraph 4.77.
4.54	Environment Agency 0088	Needs to be revised to make this more powerful and ensure all relevant targets prevailing during the plan period are used to steer landscape-scale restoration targets through an ecosystem services-led approach.	The section on restoration and policy M10 have been revised to provide a stronger focus on restoration for biodiversity, in line with the Council’s vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire, and taking into account these particular comments.
4.54	RSPB 0121	Supports the requirement to incorporate relevant biodiversity after-uses within restoration schemes. However, all restoration schemes should be capable of assisting or achieving priority or species targets and / or Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan. Restoration schemes should also contribute to the delivery of Conservation Target Area (CTA) objectives and the habitat creation and potential targets for the relevant National Character Area.	Additional wording along these lines is included in revised paragraph 4.77.

4.54	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the requirement to incorporate relevant biodiversity after-uses within restoration schemes. All restoration schemes should be capable of assisting or achieving priority habitat or species targets and/or Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets.	Additional wording along these lines is included in revised paragraph 4.77.
4.54	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	I consider that all restoration schemes have the potential to assist or achieve priority habitat and/or species targets and/or Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets. Restoration schemes should also contribute to the Conservation Target Area objectives. The paragraph could also include reference to the Upper Thames River Valleys Futurescape, Living Landscapes project and relevant National Character Areas.	Additional wording along these lines is included in revised paragraph 4.77.
4.55	Environment Agency 0088	It is not always the case that restoration should take place as soon after extraction has finished as there may be temporary biodiversity interests that may exist in specific areas worthy of retention for a while. An over-prescriptive policy may not allow such temporary opportunities to be maximised.	Revised paragraph 4.79 refers to restoration in ‘a timely and phased manner’, which is consistent with the wording in policy M10, rather than ‘as soon as possible after working’.
4.55 – 4.56	RSPB 0121	Supports the prioritisation of inert fill for use in mineral restoration schemes. Also supports the consideration of improvements to flood storage capacity. However, this should be compatible with any biodiversity enhancements. Footnote 27 confuses the issue of using inert material for infilling mineral sites in the flood plain.	Noted. Restoration to flood storage would need to be set in the overall context of a biodiversity-led approach to restoration as generally promoted in the plan. Footnote 27 is not necessary and has been taken out to avoid any ambiguity.

4.55 – 4.56	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Concerned about the interpretation which may be implied by footnote 27, as it appears to confuse the issue of using inert material for infilling mineral sites in the flood plain.	Footnote 27 is not necessary and has been taken out to avoid any ambiguity.
4.55 – 4.56	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Improvements to flood storage capacity should be compatible with biodiversity enhancements, by creating priority habitat.	Restoration to flood storage would need to be set in the overall context of a biodiversity-led approach to restoration as generally promoted in the plan.
4.57	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	It would be helpful to identify those airfields which require protection and to outline any specific protection measures which might be suitable for each. E.g. Are the same measures to be applied in the vicinity of the helicopter base at Benson or the light aircraft aerodrome at Abingdon as for the heavily used Brize Norton military air base?	This level of detail is not appropriate to the Core Strategy, which is the strategic level part 1 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, but may be appropriate to be included in part 2, the Site Allocations Document.
4.57	Environment Agency 0088	Suggest rewording of final sentence: “Through careful use of inert fill, some areas of closed wetland habitat (wet woodland, reedbeds or pond complexes, for example) may be created that offer lower bird-strike risk and greater value for biodiversity, than purely open water restorations”.	Revised paragraph 4.82 includes amended wording along these lines.
4.57	RSPB 0121	Supports the concept that inert fill can lead to the creation of wetland habitats. However, the wording in its current form is incorrect – amended wording suggested.	Revised paragraph 4.82 includes amended wording on creation of wetland habitats.

4.57	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	The existing text should be amended as it implies that the careful use of inert fill and other engineering techniques leads to the formation of some areas of open water, which in turn leads to the creation of wetland habitat, whereas what would normally happen would be that inert fill is used to create wetland habitats.	Revised paragraph 4.82 includes amended wording on creation of wetland habitats.
4.57	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Suggest rewording: "The careful use of inert fill and other engineering techniques can help to reduce the area of open water and increase the area of other priority wetland habitats, such as reedbed or wet grassland. Wetland habitat offers a lower risk of bird strike and greater value for biodiversity than open water."	Revised paragraph 4.82 includes amended wording along these lines.
4.58	Environment Agency 0088	Suggest amend sentence in brackets by adding: "within the newly created habitat".	This addition is not considered to be necessary.
4.58	RSPB 0121	Supports the statement in footnote 30. The text in paragraph 4.58 should refer to habitats as well as species.	Noted. Revised paragraph 4.83 refers to habitats as well as species.
4.58	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Strongly support the statement in footnote 30 - that the standard long-term management period is 20 years, in addition to the 5 years of statutory aftercare.	Noted.
4.58	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	I support the statement in footnote 30 regarding long-term management, as this is crucial to ensure successful site restoration for biodiversity.	Noted.

M8	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	In terms of restoration, deep wet workings generally lead to lakes/wetlands. This is totally unsuitable for the area east of Eynsham because of the risk of bird strike. Eynsham doesn't need sport and recreation as there are plenty of facilities nearby, e.g. Farmoor.	Revised policy M10 promotes restoration that is primarily focused on delivery a net gain in biodiversity but requires that factors such as bird strike risk and the character of the local landscape be taken into account as well.
M8	CPRE 0044	On restoration, is the second last bullet point necessary since the opening of the paragraph already emphasises biodiversity.	Policy M10 has been revised but the reference to biodiversity in both the opening sentence and the bullet points is considered necessary and has been retained.
M8	English Heritage 0063	Include mention of potential opportunities for the historic environment arising from restoration and aftercare of mineral workings.	This is included in revised policy M10.
M8	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	This policy is focused on environmental issues and only provides limited coverage of social and community benefits. Wording of the policy is open to interpretation and allowance of case by case consideration.	Revised policy M10 promotes restoration that is primarily focused on delivery a net gain in biodiversity, in line with the Council's vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire, but it also requires restoration to take into account provision for local amenity uses and recreation.
M8	Environment Agency 0088	The policy should be amended to include aspirations for landscape-scale biodiversity-led restoration.	This is included in revised policy M10.
M8	RSPB 0121	Supports many of the aspirations of this chapter.	Noted.
M8	RSPB 0121	Supports the requirement to conserve and enhance biodiversity. All mineral sites should be required to deliver net-gains in biodiversity, not just aim to do so.	Noted. Revised policy M10 includes a requirement to deliver a net gain in biodiversity through restoration.
M8	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	The policy simply requires the after-use proposals to take the criteria listed into account rather than to ensure the proposal is appropriate and sympathetic to these.	If these criteria are properly taken into account than the restoration proposal will be sympathetic to them.

M8	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	<p>Concerned that: i) the policy no longer requires proposals to accord to the restoration strategy for the area as detailed in a site allocations development plan document; ii) the need for operators and landowners to make provision for the management of restored mineral workings for an extended period has been removed from this policy; and iii) the policy text does not include the need for local communities to be consulted on the options for after-use.</p> <p>Disappointed that previous suggestion that potential transfer of land to community land / wildlife trusts be included as a possible mechanism for securing long-term management is not included.</p> <p>Urge reintroduction of the requirement to restore best and most versatile agricultural land and to include provision for increased flood storage capacity.</p>	<p>Policy M10 has been revised and extended but it is not considered necessary to require proposals to accord with the restoration strategy for the area; a site allocations document is now to be prepared but it is not known whether this will include restoration strategies for some or all areas.</p> <p>The requirement in the policy for satisfactory proposals for the restoration, aftercare and after-use including the means of securing them in the longer term would need to include management for an extended period where this is necessary, as referred to in revised paragraph 4.83.</p> <p>Consultation on proposals, both in development plans and planning applications, is a required part of the planning process and does not need to be specified in policy.</p> <p>Transfer of land to community land / wildlife trusts is an option for securing long-term management but this is too detailed to be included in a strategic policy.</p> <p>Agricultural land quality and flood storage capacity are included in revised policy M10 and these factors are also covered by polices C3 and C6.</p>
----	---	--	--

M8	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support many of the aims within this chapter. However, we feel that it should have stronger aspirations for biodiversity and that changes to achieve this would be supported by the NPPF, NEWP and Biodiversity 202. A biodiversity-led restoration strategy would recognise the unique opportunity that the restoration of mineral workings can provide in large scale priority habitat creation.	Policy M10 has been revised to provide a stronger focus on restoration for biodiversity, in line with the Council's vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire.
M8	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	i) The phrase 'aims to' be removed from this sentence as all mineral sites should be required to deliver this net-gain in biodiversity, not just the aim to do so. ii) For the second to last bullet point to be consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 109,114 and 117), this criteria should specifically support the establishment of a coherent and resilient ecological network.	Revised policy M10 does not include 'aims to'. The bullet referred to has been amended along the lines suggested.
M8	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	This section needs to be to be strengthened to have stronger aspirations for biodiversity. In particular, this section should ensure a landscape-scale biodiversity-led restoration strategy.	Policy M10 has been revised to provide a stronger focus on restoration for biodiversity, in line with the Council's vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire.
M8	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	This policy should be revised to incorporate the restoration of all sites to landscape-scale biodiversity-led restoration which would be consistent with NPPF. The phrase "which aims to..." should be removed because all mineral sites should deliver a net gain in biodiversity.	The revisions to policy M10 include changes along the lines of the amendments suggested.
5.3	Cherwell District Council 0098	Identification of strategic waste sites should be undertaken through the development plan process.	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will

			identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites.
5.5	Thames Water 0119	Whilst the stated value of 20,000 tonnes per annum (dry solids) is accurate for 2012, it is anticipated that due to investment in improved sludge processing infrastructure the amount of sewage sludge produced following treatment in Sewage Treatment Works in Oxfordshire for recycling to agriculture will decrease to approximately 16,500 tonnes per annum (dry solids) by 2040.	This revised forecast has been included in a new table 16 at paragraph 5.94.
Table 3	Earthline Ltd 0039	This shows an increase in the generation of CDE waste of 50% from 2012 to 2020 which is unlikely.	The forecasts have been reviewed and are now included in table 4; the CDE figures have been reduced.
Table 3	Grundon 0047	The quantities of CD&E waste are different in tables 3 and 5 and need correcting	The forecasts have been reviewed and this has been corrected.
Table 3	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Have HS2 & Eco Town impacts been included / considered? The static numbers and description provided in 5.6-5.9 imply it has not (and surely it should be?)	The potential impacts, if any, of HS2 on Oxfordshire are as yet unknown. The Eco Town is part of the planned growth in Oxfordshire and has been taken into account in revised forecasts.
5.6	CPRE 0044	Reference to Oxfordshire Waste Partnership now out of date	The Core Strategy has been updated to reflect this.
5.6 – 5.9	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Have HS2 & Eco Town impacts been included / considered? The static numbers and description provided in 5.6-5.9 imply it has not (and surely it should be?)	The potential impacts, if any, of HS2 on Oxfordshire are as yet unknown. The Eco Town is part of the planned growth in Oxfordshire and has been taken into account in revised forecasts.

W1	West Berkshire Council 0038	Consideration should be given to exploring the option of making a commitment to compensate for any shortfall in capacity in managing radioactive waste, hazardous waste and waste water by planning for an over provision of another waste stream.	The County Council does not consider this to be a practical way of providing for net self-sufficiency in waste management since over-provision for particular waste streams will not bring forward the delivery of additional capacity in Oxfordshire if it is not needed here.
W1	Grundon 0047	Cannot rely upon the assumption that facilities, existing or future, located elsewhere will be available to manage the hazardous and agricultural waste streams	The South East Waste Planning Advisory Group has recognised that it is not realistic for individual counties to be self-sufficient in meeting their own hazardous waste needs. The County Council has engaged with other waste planning authorities to which hazardous waste is sent from Oxfordshire to check that provision will be available. Agricultural waste has been added to policy W1, cross-referring to new policy W8 on agricultural waste.
W1	Thames Water 0119	Amend the policy to ensure that policies W8, W9 and W10 apply "respectively", to ensure waste water is not confused with hazardous waste	The wording of policy W1 has been amended to clarify this.
5.13	North London Waste Plan 0087	Supports the acknowledgement that London has a shortage of landfill capacity. Is unclear what is meant by net self-sufficiency.	The supporting text has been amended to clarify the meaning of the policy.
5.13 – 5.20	West London Waste Plan 0147	Supports the recognition of the need for the provision of capacity for the disposal of non-hazardous waste and inert waste from London. This is consistent with paragraph 182 of the NPPF	Noted.
5.15	North London Waste Plan 0087	It is not possible for boroughs or indeed London as a whole to be waste self sufficient and policy 5.16 of the London Plan slightly misleads by its title of 'waste self-sufficiency'	The supporting text has been amended to reflect what the London Plan says on self-sufficiency.

5.15	West London Waste Plan 0147	This is consistent with the published West London Waste Local Plan. Slight concern over the wording of Policy W2 around the use of the term 'substantially' as this is open to interpretation and might result in the policy not achieving what OCC have in mind.	Noted. Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6.
5.16	North London Waste Plan 0087	It is not possible for boroughs or indeed London as a whole to be waste self sufficient and policy 5.16 slightly misleads by its title of 'waste self-sufficiency'.	The supporting text has been amended to reflect what the London Plan says on self-sufficiency.
5.16	West London Waste Plan 0147	This is consistent with the published West London Waste Local Plan. Slight concern over the wording of Policy W2 around the use of the term 'substantially' as this is open to interpretation and might result in the policy not achieving what OCC have in mind.	Noted. Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now to be considered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6.
Table 4	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Pleased to see that waste imported into the county in general is going down year on year.	Noted.
Table 4	North London Waste Plan 0087	We are seeking clarification on where the data came from. The adopted London Plan does not appear to contain this information	Data on imports of waste has been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015. With the deletion of policy W2, table 4 is no longer needed in the Core Strategy and has been deleted.
5.17	FCC Environment Ltd 0054	Paragraph 5.17 ('the transport of non hazardous waste into Oxfordshire for disposal at landfill sites is not sustainable practice and cannot be seen as a long term solution') contradicts paragraph 5.15 and the provisions of policy W2. The aim to reduce the amount of imported waste to sites like Sutton Courtenay is inappropriate.	The text has been amended to remove possible contradiction. It is recognised that the Core Strategy policies cannot affect what takes place at a particular waste management site under an existing planning permission.

W2	City of London Corporation 0010	Support. Welcomes the intention to provide for the disposal of waste from London at landfill sites	Noted. Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6.
W2	CPRE 0044	Concerns about the effect of importing large quantities of waste from other waste authorities, including the associated impact of additional processing capacity in Oxfordshire.	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. The County Council believes that, in line with national policy, the Core Strategy should make some provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire.
W2	CRW Leonard 0034	Paragraph 2.31 shows that Sutton Courtenay is the largest recipient of waste from outside the area. While you acknowledge that waste must be treated as close to its source as possible the wording at paragraph 5.21 is insufficiently clear. You need to reinforce the policy clearly and without obfuscation.	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. The County Council believes that, in line with national policy, the Core Strategy should make some provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire, notwithstanding objective 3.7 iv.
W2	West Berkshire Council 0038	Would like to explore the options of working with OCC, through the duty to co-operate, to ensure that a strategy is developed whereby the level of unmet need for non hazardous landfill in West Berkshire might be delivered from the already existing landfill sites in Oxfordshire.	The Council has and will continue to engage with West Berkshire Council and other neighbouring and more distant waste planning authorities on strategic waste planning issues.
W2	Wokingham Borough Council 0045	Whilst welcoming the additional wording in policy W2, the council still has concerns that it does not adequately recognise the RE3 partnership contract	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. Provision for waste from Berkshire is now covered in the section on landfill, paragraphs 5.55 – 5.56.

W2	FCC Environment Ltd 0054	Paragraph 5.17 ('the transport of non hazardous waste into Oxfordshire for disposal at landfill sites is not sustainable practice and cannot be seen as a long term solution') contradicts paragraph 5.15 and the provisions of policy W2. The aim to reduce the amount of imported waste to sites like Sutton Courtenay is inappropriate. Also, the policy doesn't appear to make an allowance for facilities for pre-treatment of incoming waste (e.g. inerts from major infrastructure projects) from outside of Oxfordshire, in substantial volumes or otherwise.	The text has been amended to remove possible contradiction. It is recognised that the Core Strategy policies cannot affect what takes place at a particular waste management site under an existing planning permission. Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. Pre-treatment proposals would be considered under policy W3.
W2	Prof Alan Atkinson 0058	Policy W2 at para 5.21 should be amended to specifically prohibit import of waste from outside the county.	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. The County Council believes that, in line with national policy, the Core Strategy should make some provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire.
W2	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	The Core Strategy states that waste should be treated as close to its source as possible Unfortunately, the wording of Policy W2 opens the door for this to be amended and leaves it open to interpretation.	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. The County Council believes that, in line with national policy, the Core Strategy should make some provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire, notwithstanding objective 3.7 iv.
W2	North London Waste Plan 0087	Welcomes this policy.	Noted. Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6.

W2	Mrs Clare Simpson 0112	The general principle is that waste should be treated as close to its source as possible. However, Para 2.13 highlights that the Sutton Courtenay landfill site would be the largest recipient of waste from outside the area. I would like this removed.	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. The County Council believes that, in line with national policy, the Core Strategy should make some provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire, notwithstanding objective 3.7 iv. The Sutton Courtenay landfill already has planning permission; the statement at paragraph 2.14 is factual.
W2	Robin Draper 0113	Change suggested. New import contracts should be prevented from areas that should arrange for their own facilities in line with the proximity principle. The need to accept imported waste should not justify an extension to the agreed lifetime of a facility.	Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. The County Council believes that, in line with national policy, the Core Strategy should make some provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire, notwithstanding objective 3.7 iv and the proximity principle.
W2	Mayor of London 0124	In the adopted London Plan (2011), the Mayor was anticipating that by 2031 London would be producing 11,700,000 tonnes of Household and Commercial Waste. The Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) now anticipates London will be producing c.8,200,000 tonnes by 2031. Although the updated figures represent a 30% fall, London's waste arising's are expected to increase by c.500,000 tonnes pa as London's population grows. You may wish to consider the implications of lower waste exports from London for your on-going policy development.	Data on imports of waste has been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015. Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6.

W2	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	Supports the approach.	Noted Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6.
W2	West London Waste Plan 0147	Supports the provision of capacity for the disposal of non-hazardous waste and inert waste from London. This is consistent with paragraph 182 of the NPPF but could be tightened to ensure that disposals are only of treated waste. Unclear how the policy will operate in relation to facilities for the treatment of residual waste from other areas	Noted Policy W2 has been deleted and management of waste from other areas is now covered under the same policies as waste from Oxfordshire, in particular in policies W3 and W6. Facilities for treatment of waste are now covered by policy W3 and the supporting text has been revised to provide clarification.
W3	CRW Leonard 0034	The Vale and SODC are already close to the 70% level suggested by paragraph 2.52 as a target for 2025. However, you fail to reflect or recognise this in stating the requirements for further facilities.	The Core Strategy and the figures in what is now policy W2 relate to the whole of Oxfordshire; they take into account the recycling performance of these particular districts.
W3	CPRE 0044	The waste management targets are ambitious but achievable.	Noted.
W3	Dr Don Chapman 0066	Approves of the target for recycling construction, demolition and excavation waste. Concerned that the tonnage (1,430,000) in table 5 is incorrect.	The forecasts have been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015 and the figures in table 5 have been amended.

W3	Robin Draper 0113	Questions the need for Policy W3 at paragraph 5.28a as the Vale and SODC are already close to the 70% recycling household waste levels. The policy fails to recognise the achievement of that level and thereby overstates the requirement for further facilities in the period up to 2030, even allowing for demographic and economic growth. The strategy fails to prove the requirement for further strategic sites in South Oxfordshire and pays too much attention to allowing the market to provide for them.	The Core Strategy and the figures in what is now policy W2 relate to the whole of Oxfordshire; they take into account the recycling performance of these particular districts. The figures that provide the basis for the Core Strategy waste policies have been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015. In the light of this the County Council believes that the targets in what is now policy W2 are appropriate and realistic.
Table 5	Earthline Ltd 0039	The total figure for CDE waste is inconsistent with Table 3. Given the nature of the material the balance of recycling/landfill – a ratio of more than 2:1 – seems highly optimistic. An increase in development is likely to result in an increase in landfill. We feel the statistical basis for CDE material and the forecasts of recycling and landfill need to be thoroughly reviewed.	The forecasts have been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015 and the figures in table 5 have been amended.
Table 5	Grundon 0047	The quantities of CD&E waste are different and need correcting	The forecasts have been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015 and the figures in table 5 have been amended.
Table 5	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Is 10% contingency sufficient given such major projects as Eco-Town and HS2?	Planned growth including the Eco-Town has been taken into account but there is insufficient information available on waste that may arise from HS2; this will be monitored as part of the implementation of the plan and is necessary the forecasts will be revised.
5.33 – 3.34	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Is 10% contingency sufficient given such major projects as Eco-Town and HS2?	Planned growth including the Eco-Town has been taken into account but there is insufficient information available on waste that may arise from HS2; this will be monitored as part of the

			implementation of the plan and is necessary the forecasts will be revised.
W4	Charlbury Town Council 0017	Concern about the closure of Dean Pit with no alternative provided. The fairly long journey to Dix Pit is not environmentally satisfactory. Consideration should, be given to provision of a local centre or reopening of Dean Pit.	The provision of household waste recycling centres is a matter for the County Council as the Waste Disposal Authority: the Council is consulting on a new household waste recycling centre strategy. The new strategy will inform the provision to be made in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan in terms of site allocations in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
W4	West Berkshire Council 0038	Level of need (paragraph 5.33): It is difficult to establish from the consultation document whether the proposed strategy to deliver the level capacity needed is likely to be sound or whether the strategy is complicit with the Waste Framework Directive. The apparent waste capacity shortfalls to be addressed through the plan seem significant and it may be challenging to progress with the plan without further clarification over how these shortfalls are to be met.	The Waste Needs Assessment 2015 has reviewed the data and provides a more up to date assessment of capacity requirements, as included in revised table 7. The way in which these additional capacity requirements are to be met has been made clearer in revisions to the Core Strategy.

W4	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	<p>The policy does not give any indication of the amount of new waste management capacity that will be required to meet the targets identified in Policy W3 and is therefore inconsistent with PPS10. Relying on the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) to identify capacity requirements is not appropriate. The purpose of AMR's is to assess the performance of the plan policies and it cannot do this unless a baseline position has been set against which to monitor. There is no opportunity to challenge the findings of the AMR or have it examined publicly, so the capacity identified in it could be based on erroneous principles, which would go unchecked. Care should be taken to ensure that the new recycling capacity requirements that need to be identified provide for a capacity that is greater than the recycling target.</p>	<p>The Waste Needs Assessment 2015 has reviewed the data and provides a more up to date assessment of capacity requirements; these are included in revised table 7. It is not appropriate to include these figures in a policy as they will change over the life of the plan. Capacity requirements will be monitored through the Council's Annual Monitoring Reports, in line with government guidance, and if necessary reviewed. The way in which these additional capacity requirements are to be met has been made clearer in revisions to the Core Strategy.</p>
W4	Grundon 0047	<p>66% of C&I recycling capacity will need to be replaced to maintain existing performance and more will be required. For CDE waste the needs are as, if not more, acute. Permanent retention of temporary facilities should be allowed where there is no adverse amenity impact, and realism introduced in any reliance that can be placed on unimplemented permissions (e.g. Finmere). Not clear what is expected of an operator in proving a need for additional treatment facilities.</p>	<p>The Waste Needs Assessment 2015 has reviewed the data and provides a more up to date assessment of capacity requirements, as included in revised table 7. The way in which these additional capacity requirements are to be met has been made clearer in revisions to the Core Strategy. Policy W3 encourages the provision of recycling, composting and food waste treatment facilities, in line with the waste hierarchy.</p>

W4	Robin Draper 0113	There are little statistical backing and little insight into the real or emerging requirements. There is no proof of the requirement for new strategic sites, except in Oxford, and there is no definition of strategic waste facilities. There is no indication of what facilities are needed.	The Waste Needs Assessment 2015 has reviewed the data and provides a more up to date assessment of capacity requirements, as included in revised table 7. The way in which these additional capacity requirements are to be met has been made clearer in revisions to the Core Strategy. Strategic facilities are defined in table 8. Prescription of number and size of facilities would remove necessary flexibility from the Core strategy and make it difficult to implement.
5.36	Dr Don Chapman 0066	Welcomes the emphasis on providing new recovery facilities, particularly for recycling.	Noted.
Table 6	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Does this figure include or take account of the (significant) university student population?	The population figures do include students.
Figure 15	Cherwell District Council 0098	The map includes proposed growth areas. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of Banbury.	Figure 15 has been deleted as it duplicates figure 2, which shows Banbury as a large town.
5.42	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Should not the local small rural communities, i.e. Caversfield (and others) be indicated as such in Fig 16 and the red line adjusted (southwards) accordingly?	There are numerous small rural communities across the whole of Oxfordshire; it would not be practical to show them on the key waste diagram. What is now figure 12 has been revised and the red strategic facilities area line has been deleted.
5.48	Oxford Green Belt Network 0037	Should the need arise for a recycling construction and demolition waste facility, hope that it will be possible to find a site that is not the in the Green Belt.	Under policy W5, very special circumstances need to be demonstrated for waste facilities in the Green Belt.

W5	Middleton Stoney Parish Council 0019	Ardley HWRC is due to close at the end of 2018. Given the planned expansion of Bicester, arrangements should be made now to relocate HWRC arrangements closer to Bicester. Ardley HWRC should remain operational until a Bicester alternative is operational.	Revised policy W4 provides a strategy framework for the location of new waste facilities that are required; sites for facilities will be allocated in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
W5	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
W5	Natural England 0033	Concerned that the area of search for strategic waste facilities may push visually intrusive development to locations affecting the North Wessex Downs AONB. Clarity is needed over how the area of search has been determined. The plan should show that major facilities can be located in the area identified without unacceptable impact to landscape.	The areas for strategic and non-strategic waste facilities are drawn as circles around towns, excluding any overlap with an AONB and with Green Belt but not taking into account other designations or constraints at this Core Strategy stage. Other factors will be taken into consideration in the allocation of sites for waste management facilities in part 2 of the plan.
W5	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	The strategic facility area excludes existing operational strategic CDE waste recycling sites, for which Oxford is already their principal source of waste. It should be re-drawn to include existing strategic CDE facilities west of Oxford and to better reflect the hinterland of Oxford as shown on Figure 15, be consistent with the area identified in the council's search (2007) for a residual waste treatment facility and provide better opportunity for sites closer to the main	The strategic facility area shown on the key waste diagram has been redrawn as separate areas around Oxford (10km radius) and the other specified towns (5km radius); this extends the area to the west and east of Oxford, although much of it is constrained by the Green Belt.

		source of arising (Oxford) than at present. There are currently no CDE waste recycling sites close to the eastern side of Oxford - one in this area would also be well located for Thames.	
W5	CPRE 0044	Allowing the import of waste from other areas adds to pressure for additional processing capacity to be provided in Oxfordshire.	Provision of further waste management capacity will increase the potential for waste to be diverted away from landfill, further up the waste hierarchy. Policy W3 sets a policy test for additional residual waste treatment capacity in terms of achieving the waste management targets in policy W2 and the proximity principle.
W5	Grundon 0047	Much of the area shown in figure 16 is in the Green Belt and is effectively ruled out by policy W6 and emerging government policy for the location of waste facilities. The area needs to be reviewed to provide greater flexibility. Also consider allowing for a presumption in favour of making permanent existing temporary facilities.	The strategic facility area shown on the key waste diagram has been redrawn as separate areas around Oxford (10km radius) and the other specified towns (5km radius); this extends the area to the west and east of Oxford, although much of it is constrained by the Green Belt. Policy W5 gives priority for siting waste management facilities on land already in waste management use.
W5	Cherwell District Council 0098	The plan is not sufficiently specific. Consider identifying strategic sites in the Core Strategy and other sites in a Site Allocations Plan. Provision of strategic waste facilities at Bicester is supported and locations coordinated with the Cherwell Local Plan and the master plan for the eco-development. Also support the provision of non-strategic waste facilities at Banbury and for restricting the scale of facilities in more remote areas.	Support noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.

W5	Surrey County Council 0101	Should suitable locations for waste management facilities not come forward, in view of the lack of identification of specific sites, and Oxfordshire is successful in reducing the amounts of non hazardous waste imported to landfill, waste management capacity elsewhere will have to take up any shortfall. This capacity may be at facilities in Surrey, mainly in the south and north west of the county.	The way in which additional capacity requirements are to be met has been made clearer in revisions to the Core Strategy. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared. The Council has and will continue to engage with Surry County Council and other neighbouring and more distant waste planning authorities on strategic waste planning issues.
W5	Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd 0114	The spatial strategy is overcomplicated, and does not reflect the locational requirements of sites for waste facilities. The Prospect Farm site accommodates a strategic facility but is outside the strategic facility area because it is in the AONB. But the plan conversely includes land in the AONB at Wantage which could accommodate a facility up to 50,000 tpa. The methodology is flawed and needs to be reviewed.	A three tier spatial strategy for waste management facilities is considered appropriate for Oxfordshire and not unduly complex. The strategic facility area shown on the key waste diagram (figure 12) has been redrawn as separate areas around Oxford and the other specified towns. The areas for non-strategic waste facilities have been amended on the revised waste key diagram to exclude overlap with AONBs.
W5	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	Supports the approach. It represents a sustainable option for future planning.	Noted.
5.51 – 5.56	Oxford Green Belt Network 0037	In line with the updated planning policy guidance, emphasis should be placed on the protection of the Green Belt. In particular, the government wishes to see at least as much weight put on the Green Belt as on other considerations where waste facilities are concerned.	Policy W5 and the supporting text at paragraphs 5.46 – 5.48 has been revised to reflect current government policy on Green Belt, as in the NPPF and National Planning Policy for Waste.

5.53	North Wessex Downs AONB 0007	Support statement that waste development will be located outside the AONB where possible.	Noted. Supporting text on development in AONBs has mostly been moved to paragraph 6.43 relating to policy C8 on landscape.
5.53 – 5.54	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	Supports the recognition given to the importance of the AONBs	Noted. Supporting text on development in AONBs has mostly been moved to paragraph 6.43 relating to policy C8 on landscape.
5.53 – 5.54	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
5.54	North Wessex Downs AONB 0007	Presume up to 20 000 tpa defines small scale development. This approach is supported.	Small scale facilities are defined in table 8 as less than 20,000 tpa. Supporting text on development in AONBs has mostly been moved to paragraph 6.43 relating to policy C8 on landscape.
5.54	Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd 0114	The County Council is seeking to place an arbitrary threshold of 20,000 tonnes per annum throughput. The meaning of 'major' development has been the subject of considerable debate over the years (Counsel opinion included). Reference in this para to 'small scale development' should be replaced with the NPPF reference to 'major development'.	It is appropriate to use a definition of facility size that is specific to the situation Oxfordshire. The 20,000 tpa threshold has the support of the AONB Boards and is supported by an appeal decision (see footnote 105 to paragraph 6.43).
5.56	CPRE 0044	Regret the plan envisages building facilities of up to 20,000 tpa in Green Belt and AONB.	Policy W5 and the supporting text at paragraphs 5.46 – 5.48 has been revised to reflect current government policy on Green Belt, as in the NPPF and National Planning Policy for Waste. The 20,000 tpa threshold for AONBs has the support of the AONB Boards and is supported by an appeal decision (see footnote 105 to paragraph 6.43).

W6	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
W6	Oxford Green Belt Network 0037	In line with the updated planning policy guidance, emphasis should be placed on the protection of the Green Belt. In particular, the government wishes to see at least as much weight put on the Green Belt as on other considerations where waste facilities are concerned.	Policy W5 and the supporting text at paragraphs 5.46 – 5.48 has been revised to reflect current government policy on Green Belt, as in the NPPF and National Planning Policy for Waste.
W6	Earthline Ltd 0039	The reliance on temporary recycling facilities at quarry and landfill sites will result in loss of capacity when the host sites are completed. For some locations there will be a good case for retaining recycling facilities after the host quarry or landfill is completed, particularly where the site is remote from housing and has a good access. The retention of such facilities may be preferable to possible locations in or around the main urban areas which may not be deliverable and should be reflected the second part of the policy.	The general requirement in policy W5 for temporary facilities at quarries and landfills to be removed when the sites are completed does not preclude the consideration of such locations for permanent facilities either in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document or through a planning application. Policy W5 gives priority to sites already in waste management use for siting waste management facilities.

W6	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	The policy and supporting text is not consistent with the NPPF. Previously developed land is defined to exclude land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings: such land must therefore be greenfield land, but policy W6 applies a blanket against building on green field sites. The policy is also inconsistent with objective ix, which seeks to avoid the permanent loss of green field land. Para 3 of the policy (green field land) should be removed - to also allow greater flexibility for the siting of facilities that are difficult to locate on the priority areas because of land take requirement and proximity to sensitive receptors.	The inclusion of agricultural buildings and their curtilages is consistent with the National Planning Policy for Waste; there is no conflict with also stating that green field land should generally not be used. The policy has been amended and allows for green field locations to be used where it can be shown to be the most suitable and sustainable option.
W6	Grundon 0047	Support the proposed locations.	Noted.
W6	FCC Environment Ltd 0054	Concerned about the wording of the second paragraph. The timescale for ceasing of operation of a waste management facility and its subsequent removal should be linked to the cessation of the temporary development and its subsequent restoration and not before.	The wording of policy W5 has been amended.
W6	Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd 0114	Reliance on temporary recycling facilities at quarry and landfill sites (see also M1) results in loss of capacity as the host sites are completed. For some locations (e.g. Prospect Farm, Chilton) there will be a good case for retaining recycling facilities after the host quarry or landfill is completed, particularly where the site is remote from housing and has a good access.	The general requirement in policy W5 for temporary facilities at quarries and landfills to be removed when the sites are completed does not preclude the consideration of such locations for permanent facilities either in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document or through a planning application. Policy W5 gives priority to sites already in waste management use for siting waste management facilities.

5.65	Earthline Ltd 0039	The total figure for CDE waste is inconsistent with Table 3. Given the nature of the material the balance of recycling/landfill – a ratio of more than 2:1 – seems highly optimistic. An increase in development is likely to result in an increase in landfill. We feel the statistical basis for CDE material and the forecasts of recycling and landfill need to be thoroughly reviewed.	The figures have been reviewed in the Waste Needs Assessment 2015, and where appropriate revisions and corrections have been made in the Core Strategy.
W7	Middleton Stoney Parish Council 0019	Ardley landfill is due to close at the end of 2019. Would like to see this brought forward and landfill ceasing by the end of 2017 and restoration completed by the end of 2018. If this happens it is even more imperative to make adequate provision in relation to the HWRC at Bicester.	A valid planning permission cannot be changed by policy in a local plan. Sites for new waste facilities that are required will be allocated in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
W7	CRW Leonard 0034	Please amend paragraph 5.70 to confirm that OCC will not seek to extend the Sutton Courtenay landfill site beyond 2031 as previously promised. It is a temporary site. It must close within the period of the plan and you need to recognise this.	The County Council cannot extend the life of a private sector facility; it can only respond in the event that a planning application is submitted to do so. It is appropriate for policy W6 to provide for the duration of landfill sites to be extended, to provide flexibility to respond to possible changes in rates of infill as waste management practice changes, and ensure satisfactory restoration, and to enable continued landfill availability if this is necessary to enable waste to be managed.
W7	FCC Environment Ltd 0054	FCC is in agreement with the principle of part 1 of this policy. However, the current wording of the policy is rigid and does not make allowances for the circumstances explained in paragraph 5.62. With regards to part 2 of this policy, priority should also be given to disposal of such wastes at rail linked sites where there is sufficient disposal capacity, as this inherently avoids the	Policy W6 has been revised and the requirement for non-hazardous landfill capacity to be husbanded has been deleted. The policy does not preclude the consideration of proposals for the early closure and restoration of landfills, as referred to in paragraph 5.58. Policy W6 does not refer to mode of transport. Policy C10 encourages waste facilities to be

		environmental impact of road traffic emissions.	located where waste can be transported by rail.
W7	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	The site is temporary and not permanent and this should be recognized within the policy.	A valid planning permission cannot be changed by policy in a local plan. The Core Strategy does not include polices for specific sites; part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document will do that. The requirement for non-hazardous landfill capacity to be husbanded has been deleted from policy W6.
W7	Mrs Clare Simpson 0112	It is worrying that 5.60 and 5.62 talk about the need to “husband landfill void”. What does that mean? It is very unclear and not proper English. It makes local residents deeply suspicious which is an enormous shame and not a good way of working.	Policy W6 has been revised and the requirement for non-hazardous landfill capacity to be husbanded has been deleted.
W7	Robin Draper 0113	Rather than leave the door open for the 'husbanding' of all sites, it should be amended to confirm that OCC will not seek to extend Sutton Courtenay site beyond the promised 2030. In that context, most worrying is the frequent mention of the need to 'husband landfill void' such as at 5.60 and 5.62 and the fact that in the map at page 80 the Sutton Courtenay landfill site is annotated as 'non-hazardous' landfill husbanded Policy W7' which is contract to repeated promises by OCC that the site will close in 2030.	A valid planning permission cannot be changed by policy in a local plan. Policy W6 has been revised and the requirement for non-hazardous landfill capacity to be husbanded has been deleted, and the key waste diagram has been amended acciordingly. The Core Strategy does not include polices for specific sites; part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document will do that.
W7	RSPB 0121	Supports giving priority to the use of inert fill for restoration. Amend policy to give priority to the use of scarce material for wetland restoration.	Noted. It is not appropriate to prioritise the use of waste material fir particular forms of restoration within policy W6. Policy M10 covers restoration.
W7	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Welcomes the recognition given to the importance of non-recyclable or residual inert waste for the restoration of mineral workings.	Noted.

W7	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the approach taken to the use of inert fill for quarry restoration.	Noted.
5.71	West London Waste Plan 0147	Support is provided on the basis that it does not rule out the possibility of capacity being developed which could meet a need for the management of hazardous waste arising beyond the Plan Area.	Noted
5.73	Grundon 0047	The aspiration expressed in this paragraph for the county to be 'as self-sufficient as possible' in capacity for this waste stream are not adequately met by the policy itself (W8).	The South East Waste Planning Advisory Group has recognised that it is not realistic for individual counties to be self-sufficient in meeting their own hazardous waste needs. The County Council has engaged with other waste planning authorities to which hazardous waste is sent from Oxfordshire to check that provision will be available. The supporting text has been amended to provide clarification and to be consistent with policy W7.
W8	Northamptonshire County Council 0008	Content with this.	Noted.
W8	Gloucestershire County Council 0024	Policy W8 satisfies previous concerns with regards to hazardous waste.	Noted.

W8	Grundon 0047	The policy should provide for net self-sufficiency and fails to meet current and future needs. It takes no account of economics and conflicts with policy C1 (sustainability). The policy tests for satisfying local need and accommodating waste from elsewhere are unclear and unlikely to be achievable.	The South East Waste Planning Advisory Group has recognised that it is not realistic for individual counties to be self-sufficient in meeting their own hazardous waste needs. The County Council has engaged with other waste planning authorities to which hazardous waste is sent from Oxfordshire to check that provision will be available. The policy includes flexibility for the provision of hazardous waste facilities to meet Oxfordshire's needs and to serve a wider area where necessary.
W8	FCC Environment Ltd 0054	The current wording of the second part of the policy appears to preclude the establishment of hazardous waste capacity if an alternative site exists elsewhere. This does not make an allowance for whether the proposed site is a more sustainable or environmentally preferable alternative to the existing site.	The wording 'not adequately provided for elsewhere' provides flexibility and proposals would be considered against other relevant policies of the plan as well.
W8	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Should be strengthened to protect sites like Sutton Courtenay from excessive hazardous waste.	The Core Strategy is not site specific; proposals for sites will be included in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document. The core policies, particularly C5, set criteria to ensure waste facilities will not be permitted where there would be an unacceptable impact on local communities.
W8	West London Waste Plan 0147	Support is provided on the basis that it does not rule out the possibility of capacity being developed which could meet a need for the management of hazardous waste arising beyond the Plan Area.	Noted.
5.77	Cumbria County Council	Welcome the approach taken to radioactive waste.	Noted.

	0051		
5.79	Northamptonshire County Council 0008	This paragraph should reflect a more positive approach to the management of waste from other areas, in accordance with an amended policy W9.	The text supporting policy W9 on radioactive waste has been amended and this comment has been taken into account.
5.79	Environment Agency 0088	The text refers to waste from the non-nuclear industry, but also needs to refer in equal measure to nuclear waste. The text also needs to reflect a less restricting approach to the management of waste from a wider area - to reflect a necessary amendment to policy W9.	The text supporting policy W9 on radioactive waste has been amended and this comment has been taken into account. The potentially misleading distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear waste has been removed.
5.79	Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL) 0142	RSRL welcomes acknowledgement that facilities may be required during the plan period to manage radioactive waste arising at Harwell and Culham. The policy states that provision should be made for any further development that may be needed to treat and store waste from Harwell and Culham. This is supported by RSRL.	Noted.
5.81	United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority 0032	Changes are required to the wording of this paragraph to take account of the recent grant of permanent planning permission for a number of the JET buildings at the campus.	Updated paragraphs on Culham (5.89 – 5.91) have been included.
5.87	Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL) 0142	Welcomes the need to provide flexibility within the policy to allow reconsideration options in terms of on-site/off site disposal of Very Low Level Waste, in the instance that the current disposal route cannot be maintained.	Noted.

W9	Northamptonshire County Council 0008	The provision in policy W8 for the accommodation of facilities to manage waste from other areas where meeting a need not adequately provided for should also be included in this policy.	Policy W9 has been amended to provide a policy approach to facilities that would take low level radioactive waste from outside Oxfordshire similar to that in policy W7 on hazardous waste.
W9	Cumbria County Council 0051	Welcome the approach taken to radioactive waste.	Noted.
W9	Environment Agency 0088	Welcome that the policy does not differentiate between nuclear and non-nuclear sources of waste. Proposals should also be permitted where they support policy ambitions that are not confined solely to Oxfordshire. This should apply to LLW and ILW waste. BAT would need to be demonstrated before EA permitted facilities for managing radioactive waste.	Policy W9 has been amended to provide a policy approach to facilities that would take low level radioactive waste from outside Oxfordshire similar to that in policy W7 on hazardous waste.
W9	Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL) 0142	RSRL supports the policy wording.	Noted.
5.91	Thames Water 0119	Amendment to paragraph recommended to bring current treatment strategy in Oxfordshire up to date.	The text supporting policy W10 on waste water and sewage has been updated.
W10	Cherwell District Council 0098	It is important that the strategic sewage treatment works have enough capacity to accommodate proposed growth in the district.	Policy W10 is included to enable provision to meet needs like this.
W10	Thames Water 0119	Support the inclusion of a policy on waste water and sewage sludge. Changes suggested to make it more effective for operator: provide for new or expanded facilities to be developed where	Policy W10 has been revised along these lines.

		needed to serve existing or proposed development, to improve operational efficiency or in the interests of long term waste water management, provided the need outweighs any adverse impact and any such impact is minimised..	
W10	Anglian Water 0144	We are supportive of this policy.	Noted.
W11	CRW Leonard 0034	Amend policy to make clear that it does not extend to the Sutton Courtenay Landfill site.	Policy W11 safeguards existing waste management sites but it does not include safeguarding of landfills.
W11	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd 0041	Para 143 of NPPF does not differentiate between the need to safeguard temporary, permanent or even unauthorised sites. The plan policy should safeguard all sites in use for waste management purposes. Paragraph 5.97 should also be amended. The purpose of safeguarding is to ensure that land already in waste management is not used or developed for other purposes without good reason, and to monitor land use activity in the vicinity of such sites to guard against the establishment of non-conforming uses and secure the long-term use of sufficient land for Oxfordshire's future waste needs. These purposes apply equally to temporary uses.	Amended policy W11 applies interim safeguarding to all existing and permitted waste management facilities (apart from landfill), both permanent and temporary; but it is not appropriate to apply this safeguarding to unauthorised facilities. The issue of whether temporary facilities should be given long-term safeguarding will be considered in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, and will depend on the likely suitability of the site for permanent waste use.
W11	Grundon 0047	Given the large capacities provided by temporary sites we feel that the safeguarding policy should be extended to prevent adjacent uses from prejudging their on-going use.	Amended policy W11 applies interim safeguarding to all existing and permitted waste management facilities (apart from landfill), both permanent and temporary. The issue of whether temporary facilities should be given long-term safeguarding will be considered in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, and will

			depend on the likely suitability of the site for permanent waste use.
W11	Robin Draper 0113	Sutton Courtenay landfill site is due to close in 2030 which could be read as being throughout in the planning period. This wording risks the acceptance that it might continue after that long promised end date.	Policy W11 safeguards existing waste management sites but it does not include safeguarding of landfills.
W11	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	Support the need to safeguard waste facilities and land required for such uses, in particular on existing industrial sites.	Noted.
W11	Research Sites Restoration Limited (RSRL) 0142	RSRL supports that safeguarding of existing waste management sites.	Noted.
W11	Anglian Water 0144	The Company has its own policy on encroachment of possible new development within the vicinity of its site assets.	Noted.
Figure 16	High Speed Two (Ltd) 0036	That the HS2 safeguarding direction should be shown on the policies maps contained in Local Plans	The Core Strategy is not site specific and its proposals are shown on the minerals and waste key diagrams rather than on a proposals map. The HS2 safeguarding direction will be considered for inclusion on the proposals map when part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document is prepared.

Figure 16	Cherwell District Council 0098	The plan is not specific. Consideration should be given to the feasibility of identifying specific, deliverable sites in order to provide certainty for the waste and development industries and for other local planning authorities. Provision of appropriate facilities at Bicester is supported - any site specific locations for waste recycling facilities should however, be coordinated with policies in the Cherwell Local Plan and the master plan for the eco-development where appropriate. There is support for the proposal for non-strategic waste management facilities.	A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared. The need for co-ordination with policies in the Cherwell Local Plan and the master plan for the Bicester eco-development will be addressed at the site allocations stage.
Figure 16	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	Should not the local small rural communities, i.e. Caversfield (and others) be indicated as such in Fig 16 and the red line adjusted (southwards) accordingly?	There are numerous small rural communities across the whole of Oxfordshire; it would not be practical to show them on the key waste diagram. What is now figure 12 has been revised and the red strategic facilities area line has been deleted.
C1 – C11	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	It would be useful to include a discrete policy on detrimental economic impact.	Policy C5 has been revised and extended and now covers impact on the local economy as well as the local environment and amenity.
C1	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C1	RSPB 0121	Supports policy C1 and it is consistent with the NPPF.	Noted. This has been included.

		Recommend inclusion of NPPF footnote 9 as a footnote to this policy.	
C1	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C1	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C1	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	This is consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 14). Recommend inclusion of NPPF footnote 9 as a footnote to this policy.	Noted. This has been included.
C1	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Recommend inclusion of NPPF footnote 9 as a footnote to this policy.	This has been included.
6.5	RSPB 0121	Specific reference should be made to the role that the creation of priority habitat on restored mineral sites can play in adapting to climate change.	This has been added to paragraph 6.5.

6.5	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Specific reference should be made to the role that the creation of priority habitat on restored mineral sites can play in adapting to climate change.	This has been added to paragraph 6.5.
6.5	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Specific reference should be made to the role that the creation of priority habitat on restored mineral sites can play in adapting to climate change.	This has been added to paragraph 6.5.
C2	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	Support moves towards greater recycling of aggregates. This should reduce the need for new gravel workings especially in the West of Oxfordshire. More use of recycling should also help towards reducing harmful emissions and affecting climate change adversely as required in Policy C2.	Noted.
C2	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C2	RSPB 0121	Particularly supports the requirement to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and provide flexibility for future adaption to the impacts of climate change.	Noted.

C2	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C2	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C2	Mr N Brading 0139	Once gravel pits have filled up to the level of the existing water table, they offer no flood benefit.	The water table is below the original ground surface level; the volume of void above the water table provides capacity for flood water storage.
C2	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support policy C2, in particular, the requirements to; i) minimise greenhouse gas emissions; and ii) provide flexibility for future adaptation to the impacts of climate change.	Noted.
6.10	Grundon 0047	The appendix fails to correctly reflect the NPPF which details that sand and gravel working is a water compatible use and may be located within the functional floodplain (zone 3b) where no exception test is required.	Appendix 3 has been developed from and accords with the National Planning Practice Guidance
C3	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	The strategy refers to an out of date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. In light of the 2013/2014 floods, this should be looked at again. A level 2 study is needed before any further consideration of the site SG20.	A revised level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared. The need for a level 2 assessment will be considered at the site specific stage 2 of the plan.

C3	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C3	Grundon 0047	The appendix fails to correctly reflect the NPPF which details that sand and gravel working is a water compatible use and may be located within the functional floodplain (zone 3b) where no exception test is required.	Appendix 3 has been developed from and accords with the National Planning Practice Guidance
C3	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	It is not correct to restrict mineral development to areas which are not at risk from flooding. It may not be correct to restrict the infilling of a worked quarry with inert waste because it lies in an area at risk of flooding.	Policy C3 has been drafted to accord with national policy on flooding in the NPPF and the related National Planning Practice Guidance. It does not seek to unnecessarily restrict development but to ensure that flood risk is properly taken into account in decisions on the allocation of sites and planning applications.
C3	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Concerned that the policy may not be enforced due to past experiences.	Enforcement is a procedural, legal issue and not a matter for inclusion in policy.
C3	Thames Water 0119	Support the inclusion of the section on flooding and Policy C3. There may be specific locational requirements in relation to waste water treatment development. It is necessary for sewage treatment works to discharge treated effluent and so it is normally preferable for sewage treatment works to be located in proximity to a watercourse, which by their nature are often within flood plain	Noted. Specific location requirements will considered at the part 2 stage of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.

		areas.	
C3	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C3	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C4	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	As the Eynsham site (SG20) is so close to the Thames and the water treatment works at Swinford, stringent precautions would need to be imposed on any planning approval to avoid polluting the river during extraction and after restoration. These risks are considered to be too high.	The Core Strategy identifies strategic resource areas for mineral working but does not allocate specific sites; those will follow in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, when factors like this will need to be considered.
C4	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C4	Thames Water 0119	Supports the inclusion of the section on the Water Environment and Policy C4.	Noted.
C4	RSPB 0121	Supports the first bullet point and the second part of this policy.	Noted.

C4	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C4	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C4	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Supportive of the first bullet point and the second half of the policy.	Noted.
C5	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	The site (SG20) at Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton is very close to Eynsham, Swinford, Eynsham Allotments, etc. The school and houses, and Siemans' premises, could be badly affected. A buffer zone would be needed and should be specified now	The Core Strategy identifies strategic resource areas for mineral working but does not allocate specific sites; those will follow in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, when factors like this will need to be considered, although buffer zones are more appropriately defined at the more detailed planning application stage.
C5	Sean Nicholson 0020	Good to see extraction next to homes and the AONB is not being encouraged.	Noted.

C5	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C5	Alan Briggs 0043	Concerned about the lack of clearly stated, unequivocal and enforceable policy on the importance of protecting the environment.	Policy C5 has been expanded to provide greater clarity.
C5	The Eynsham Society 0074	Overarching restrictions should be established on extraction close to houses, schools and businesses.	Policy C5 has been expanded to provide greater clarity but it is not appropriate to set detailed restrictions in the Core Strategy; these are more appropriate to the part 2 stage of the plan, the Site Allocations Document and/or the more detailed planning application stage.
C5	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Needs strengthening in order to protect places from the constant round of noise, light, odour and vermin pollution.	Policy C5 has been expanded to provide greater clarity but it is not appropriate to set detailed restrictions in the Core Strategy; these are more appropriate to the part 2 stage of the plan, the Site Allocations Document and/or the more detailed planning application stage.

C5	Henry Pavlovich 0106	These policies seem to focus on agricultural concerns with a few references but no proper weight given to historic market town environs, tourism, AONBs, history etc. An area straddles many of these C policies, so it could be argued that a C12 is necessary to address the needs of such a semi-urban/rural area – history, archaeology, AONBs on either side, proximity of large settlement, tourism on the river and the Agatha Christie trail. At the moment separate issues relevant to the area are spread over several policies, e.g. 6.41 landscape, 6.43 settlements, 6.45 history, 6.48 archaeology.	Policy C5 has been expanded to provide greater clarity on protection of local environment, amenity and economy, including local communities and local tourist interests. The core policies together cover all these issues; they need to be seen as a package that will all be applied as appropriate to any particular proposal, whether for a site allocation or a planning application. There is no need for an additional policy that would repeat elements of existing policies.
C5	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C5	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C5	Brightwell-cum-Sotwell Parish Council 0149	Proposed policy is strengthened by the addition of: “Proximity to local residential areas will be a key determinant in this regard. The impact of proposals on the economic well-being of a locality will also be considered”.	Policy C5 has been re-titled and expanded to provide greater clarity on protection of local environment, amenity and economy, including local communities and local economic interests; and a section has been added on requirements for buffer zones. The additions sought are generally covered by these changes.

C5	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	It is important that all relevant factors are considered when any future application for mineral workings is assessed. Propose policy is strengthened by the addition of: "Proximity to built-up areas of significant population will likewise be a key determinant in this regard".	Policy C5 has been re-titled and expanded to provide greater clarity on protection of local environment, amenity and economy, including local communities; and a section has been added on requirements for buffer zones. The addition sought is generally covered by these changes.
C6	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C6	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	The second paragraph of C6 should have added: "The temporary loss of best and most versatile land will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the land will be restored for agricultural use after extraction to a best and most versatile agricultural land classification".	This addition is not considered to be necessary as it is generally covered by the first and third paragraphs of the policy.
C6	RSPB 0121	The policy provides an appropriate level of flexibility on the way in which mineral sites on BMV land should be restored. Recommends the supporting text should give a stronger emphasis to promoting biodiversity-led restoration	Noted. The section of the Core strategy on restoration already gives a strong emphasis to promoting biodiversity-led restoration; it is not necessary for this to be repeated here.
C6	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.

C6	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C6	Mr N Brading 0139	Requests inclusion of agricultural land classification plans in the Core Strategy.	The agricultural land classification maps are published by Natural England; they are part of the evidence base for the plan but do not need to be included in the Core Strategy.
C6	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	The policy provides an appropriate level of flexibility on the way in which mineral sites on BMV land should be restored.	Noted.
C6	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	The presence of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land does not mean that the site must be restored to agriculture, instead that the soil must not be permanently lost. Whilst this policy does allow flexibility it would avoid confusion if the following sentence is added: “Best and most versatile agricultural land need not be restored to agriculture but soil quality must be maintained, for example, within an appropriate biodiversity-led restoration scheme”.	The meaning of the policy, when read together with the explanatory text at paragraphs 6.28 – 6.30 is already clear; the suggested additional wording is not needed.
6.32	RSPB 0121	Supports the ‘overall intention...to ensure that net gain in biodiversity is achieved, including by establishing ecological networks to reduce habitat fragmentation’.	Noted.

6.32	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the 'overall intention...to ensure that a net gain in biodiversity is achieved, including by establishing ecological networks to reduce habitat fragmentation.'	Noted.
6.32	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Support.	Noted.
6.33	Natural England 0033	It is not helpful to talk about net gains in the longer term. Either there is a net gain overall or not.	The words 'in the longer term' have been deleted.
6.33	RSPB 0121	Supports the statement that 'restoration of sites normally offers opportunity for net gains [in biodiversity] in the longer term.	Noted.
6.33	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the statement that ' restoration of sites normally offers opportunity for net gains [in biodiversity] in the longer term.'	Noted.
6.33	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Support.	Noted.

6.34	RSPB 0121	There appears to be a discrepancy between paragraph 6.34 and policy C7 regarding whether SACs are specifically referred to in Policy C7.	The discrepancy in paragraph 6.34 has been removed; SACs are specifically referred to in policy C7.
6.34	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	There appears to be a discrepancy between the supporting text in paragraph 6.34 and the text in C7. In particular reference to SACs in Policy C7.	The discrepancy in paragraph 6.34 has been removed; SACs are specifically referred to in policy C7.
6.34	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Suggest a change to say SACs are referred to in policy C7.	The discrepancy in paragraph 6.34 has been removed; SACs are specifically referred to in policy C7.
6.35	RSPB 0121	Although we support the intention that adverse effects on locally designated sites should be 'avoided or mitigated', we recommend rewording this paragraph to more closely follow the mitigation hierarchy laid down in the NPPF. The text should also clarify the circumstances in which compensation would be appropriate.	The supporting text and policy C7 itself have been amended to accord with the NPPF, including the mitigation hierarchy in it. Reference to compensatory measures has been added to paragraph 6.35.
6.35	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Although we support the intention that adverse effects on locally designated sites should be 'avoided or mitigated', we recommend rewording this paragraph to more closely follow the mitigation hierarchy laid down in the NPPF. The text should also clarify the circumstances in which compensation would be appropriate.	The supporting text and policy C7 itself have been amended to accord with the NPPF, including the mitigation hierarchy in it. Reference to compensatory measures has been added to paragraph 6.35.

6.35	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Suggest this paragraph is amended to .provide more information on the mitigation hierarchy that is set out in the NPPF; and that information is provided on where compensation would be acceptable.	The supporting text and policy C7 itself have been amended to accord with the NPPF, including the mitigation hierarchy in it. Reference to compensatory measures has been added to paragraph 6.35.
6.36	RSPB 0121	It would be helpful if the plan clarified the difference between Local Wildlife Sites and Sites of Local Importance for Nature Conservation; and also between priority habitats/species and notable habitats/species.	Definitions of these terms have been included in the glossary.
6.36	Berkshire, Buckingham- shire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Recommend rewording of the final sentence to clarify which of the following words "protected, notable and priority" apply to habitats and which to species.	The last sentence has been amended as suggested.
6.36	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	It would be helpful to have further clarification of the different designations..	Clarification has been provided in amendments to paragraph 6.36 and additions to the glossary.
6.37	RSPB 0121	Support the reference to Conservation Target Areas (CTAs). The approach used in the text is consistent with the NPPF. We support the footnote reference to the status of UK Biodiversity Action Plan objectives.	Noted.

6.37	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Strongly support the reference to Conservation Target Areas (CTAs). The approach used in the text is consistent with the NPPF. We support the footnote reference to the status of UK Biodiversity Action Plan objectives.	Noted.
6.37	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Support.	Noted.
6.38	RSPB 0121	Support the requirement to protect ancient woodland. Support tree planting 'as appropriate', but it will not always be the most appropriate restoration option as other habitats may be a higher priority in some locations.	It is clear from paragraph 6.38 that tree planting is not always the most appropriate restoration option; no change is needed.
6.38	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the requirement to protect ancient woodland. Support tree planting however, it may not always be the most appropriate restoration option as other habitats may be a higher priority in some locations.	It is clear from paragraph 6.38 that tree planting is not always the most appropriate restoration option; no change is needed.
6.38	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	4 th sentence should be amended to say "irreplaceable habitats should be protected from loss or adverse impact".	Paragraph 6.38 has been amended to include this wording.

C7	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C7	Natural England 0033	Policy C7 does not say what happens if the need does not outweigh the harm; advise adding: “Where adverse impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, compensation measures will result in the maintenance or enhancement of biodiversity / geodiversity”.	Policy C7 has been revised to accord with the NPPF, including reference to mitigation and compensation measures.
C7	Earthline Ltd 0039	This very detailed policy appears to be over restrictive, particularly for locally designated sites.	Policy C7 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. The inclusion of locally designated sites and the level of protection given to them is in line with national policy.
C7	Environment Agency 0088	Suggest the first sentence be reworded: “Minerals and waste development should achieve a net gain in biodiversity’	The policy has been amended to refer to delivering a net gain in biodiversity but the words ‘where possible’ have been retained as this reflects that there may be practical limitations to delivery of net gains in biodiversity through some minerals and waste developments which should nevertheless be permitted.
C7	Northmoor Parish Council 0115	Unclear how the plan can enhance biodiversity within the countryside if there is no land, just lakes.	Gains in biodiversity can be achieved through wet restoration as well as through restoration to land.
C7	Peter Winder 0097	Endorses the comments of Northmoor Parish Council (see 0115).	As response to Northmoor Parish Council (see 0115).

C7	RSPB 0121	Support the aspiration to conserve and enhance biodiversity. However, rather than just seeking to enhance biodiversity, where possible, the policy should require all developments to deliver a net-gain in biodiversity. Support requirements to demonstrate how development will make an appropriate contribution to maintenance and enhancement of local habitat and biodiversity. Support the requirement for long-term management arrangements for restored sites.	Noted. The inclusion of the words ‘where possible’ reflects that there may be practical limitations to delivery of net gains in biodiversity through some minerals and waste developments which should nevertheless be permitted.
C7	RSPB 0121	Support the level of protection given to international, national and local designations and to priority habitats and species. However the policy uses confusing and inconsistent variety of terminology for the level of protection to be provided for each of these assets. Recommend that the policy adopts a clearer and simpler approach by seeking ‘no adverse effect’ on each of these assets. Also recommend that the issue of delivering a net gain in biodiversity be kept separate from the issue of mitigation. Compensation needs to be included in the policy.	Policy C7 has been revised to accord with the NPPF.
C7	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C7	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at

			the time.
C7	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	Although this policy references both biodiversity and geodiversity the preamble focuses most strongly on biodiversity with only a single paragraph (6.39) on geodiversity; and the policy reads as though geodiversity has been added as an afterthought. The policy should be split and there should be a clear hierarchy of protection and mitigation measures for both biodiversity and geodiversity.	The greater content on biodiversity in both the supporting text reflects the greater complexity of legal provisions and national policy for biodiversity; geodiversity is adequately covered by a single paragraph. Policy C7 covers biodiversity and geodiversity equally, given that many of the designations referred to can be either biological or geological; the two are adequately addressed in the combined approach used.
C7	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the aspiration to conserve and enhance biodiversity. However, rather than just seeking to enhance biodiversity, where possible, the policy should require all developments to deliver a net-gain in biodiversity. Support requirements to demonstrate how development will make an appropriate contribution to maintenance and enhancement of local habitat and biodiversity. Support the requirement for long-term management arrangements for restored sites.	Noted. The inclusion of the words 'where possible' reflects that there may be practical limitations to delivery of net gains in biodiversity through some minerals and waste developments which should nevertheless be permitted.
C7	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust 0146	Support the level of protection given to international, national and local designations and to priority habitats and species. However the policy uses confusing and inconsistent variety of terminology for the level of protection to be provided for each of these assets. The wording in relation to SSSIs is inconsistent with paragraph 6.34 of the NPPF. Recommend that the policy is reworded to give the highest level of protection to sites and species of international and national importance and requires no adverse effect on other assets; and that it is reworded to properly	Policy C7 has been revised to accord with the NPPF.

		reflect the mitigation hierarchy in the NPPF. Also recommend that the issue of delivering a net gain in biodiversity be kept separate from the issue of mitigation. Compensation needs to be included in the policy.	
C7	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	Instead of seeking to ' <i>enhance</i> ' biodiversity ' <i>where possible</i> ', the policy should require all minerals and waste developments to deliver a net-gain in biodiversity.	The inclusion of the words 'where possible' reflects that there may be practical limitations to delivery of net gains in biodiversity through some minerals and waste developments which should nevertheless be permitted.
C7	Oxfordshire County Council Ecologist Planner 0148	In order to clarify the policy, recommend revised wording of the bullet points. The text relating to mitigation should follow the 'mitigation hierarchy', which priorities avoidance of adverse effects, then mitigation, with compensation as 'a last resort', in line with the NPPF (para.118).	Policy C7 has been revised to accord with the NPPF.
6.41	North Wessex Downs AONB 0007	Supports the statements in this paragraph.	Noted
6.41 – 6.43	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	Supports these paragraphs.	Noted.
6.41 – 6.43	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
C8	North Wessex Downs AONB 0007	This policy is not as clear cut as paragraph 6.41 suggests. Recommend inclusion of specific reference to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF that provides that "great weight" that	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF.

		should be afforded to the AONB, and that the starting point for "major developments" in the AONB is that they should be refused.	
C8	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	Object to the Eynsham/Cassington/Yarnton and land along the Hanborough Road area of search due to loss of important landscapes. Policy C8 states that the character and setting of a settlement should not be adversely affected. Eynsham has special views across the valley and to Hanborough that will be spoilt.	Policy C8 is not a locationally specific policy. This policy will in due course be taken into account as one of the criteria in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
C8	Sean Nicholson 0020	Good to see extraction next to homes and the AONB is not being encouraged.	Noted.
C8	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C8	Natural England 0033	i) It is unclear what approach will be taken to address any residual landscape impacts after mitigation – an additional paragraph should be added; ii) the policy is not consistent with the NPPF paragraph 116; iii) Concerned that consideration has not been given to impacts on an AONB which may occur due to development outside the AONB concerned.	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. An additional paragraph has been added, as advised, on compensation to be provided where impacts cannot be avoided or mitigated. The reworded policy covers impacts on AONBs from developments outside then AONB.
C8	Grundon 0047	The policy should not restrict development to that which is small scale and serves local needs. The meaning of this is unclear and not in accordance	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. The County Council believes it is appropriate and helpful to use the term 'small

		with the NPPF. The NPPF allows for major development to be permitted if there are exceptional circumstances. Therefore minor development would be acceptable. The NPPF does not refer to development within the setting of AONBs or to AONB management plans, which are referenced in the NPPG. Giving too much weight to these considerations could seriously constrain otherwise acceptable developments. Reference to AONB management plans should be relegated to the supporting text.	scale, to meet local needs’, and the supporting text indicates what constitutes small scale development. The policy provides for major development to be permitted where exceptional circumstances justify this, in line with the NPPF. The County Council considers it appropriate to include the impact of developments outside AONBs and having regard to AONB management plans in the policy, notwithstanding that they are not referenced in the NPPF.
C8	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	The text in Policy C8 is not as certain as the supporting text in paragraphs 6.41 to 6.43 suggests. Specific reference should be made to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF which ensure that great weight should be afforded AONBs, and that the starting point for major development in AONBs is that it should be refused point, before consideration is given to exceptional reasons.	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF.
C8	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
C8	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports the protection given to the AONBs in the County and the reference to AONB management plans.	Noted.
C8	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	This policy must be applied more vigorously because the damage to the landscape caused by the Sutton Courtenay landfill site conflicts with landscape protection policies in the District Local Plan.	Policy C8 is not a locationally specific policy. This policy will in due course be taken into account as one of the criteria in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document. District Local Plan may

			also be relevant.
C8	Mineral Products Association 0094	The Policy should not restrict minerals development to that which is small scale and serves local needs. The NPPF says major development may be permitted if there are exceptional circumstances. The NPPF does not refer to development within the setting of AONBs or to AONB management plans, which are referenced in the NPPG. Giving too much weight to these considerations could seriously constrain otherwise acceptable developments. Reference to AONB management plans should be relegated to the supporting text.	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. The County Council believes it is appropriate and helpful to use the term ‘small scale, to meet local needs’, and the supporting text indicates what constitutes small scale development. The policy provides for major development to be permitted where exceptional circumstances justify this, in line with the NPPF. The County Council considers it appropriate to include the impact of developments outside AONBs and having regard to AONB management plans in the policy, notwithstanding that they are not referenced in the NPPF.
C8	Lafarge Tarmac Ltd 0105	The Policy should not restrict minerals development to that which is small scale and serves local needs. The NPPF says major development may be permitted if there are exceptional circumstances. The NPPF does not refer to development within the setting of AONBs or to AONB management plans, which are referenced in the NPPG. Giving too much weight to these considerations could seriously constrain otherwise acceptable developments. Reference to AONB management plans should be relegated to the supporting text.	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. The County Council believes it is appropriate and helpful to use the term ‘small scale, to meet local needs’, and the supporting text indicates what constitutes small scale development. The policy provides for major development to be permitted where exceptional circumstances justify this, in line with the NPPF. The County Council considers it appropriate to include the impact of developments outside AONBs and having regard to AONB management plans in the policy, notwithstanding that they are not referenced in the NPPF.
C8	Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd 0114	National guidance on development in AONB (including minerals and waste) is clearly and simply expressed in the NPPF (paragraph 116) and there is no need to elaborate on this by referring to the AONB management plans and the	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. The County Council believes it is appropriate and helpful to use the term ‘small scale, to meet local needs’, and the supporting text indicates what constitutes small scale

		setting of the AONB or adding the Council's own definition of 'small' development, that is not tracked back to any definition. The first paragraph and first sentence of the second paragraph of the policy of the policy are fine but the rest should be deleted	development. The policy provides for major development to be permitted where exceptional circumstances justify this, in line with the NPPF. The County Council considers it appropriate to include the impact of developments outside AONBs and having regard to AONB management plans in the policy, notwithstanding that they are not referenced in the NPPF.
C8	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The package of proposed policy measures are considered to offer a level of certainty and flexibility to support development proposals for minerals and waste.	Noted.
C8	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
C8	Smith and Sons (Bletchington) 0136	In respect of proposals for mineral working in AONB, the policy does not appear to sit well with earlier reference in Policy M4. The policy should reflect the NPPF. The reference to workings being 'small scale' is not given any context and the term 'local needs' is misleading and restrictive.	Policy C8 has been revised to accord with the NPPF. The County Council believes it is appropriate and helpful to use the term 'small scale, to meet local needs', and the supporting text indicates what constitutes small scale development.
C8	West Oxfordshire District Council 0145	Supports the need for proposals to be informed by a landscape character assessment and an AONB management plan if the site falls within the AONB.	Noted.
6.45	English Heritage	Welcomes the recognition of the County's rich historic heritage and the requirement to conserve	Noted. Paragraph 6.47 has been amended to include

	0063	and protect designated heritage assets. The paragraph should also refer to conservation areas and the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site. The NPPF also accords protection to non-designated assets and designated assets are not comprehensive.	conservation areas and the Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site. New paragraph 6.48 on non-designated heritage assets has been added
6.46 – 6.47	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports these paragraphs.	Noted.
C9	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	Eynsham has 2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments	Policy C9 is not a locationally specific policy. This policy will in due course be taken into account as one of the criteria in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
C9	Eskmuir Properties Ltd (local business) 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.
C9	Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society 0059	We support policy C9 so far as it goes but there are several ways in which it needs to be enhanced to comply properly with the NPPF. A number of amendments and additions are recommended.	Policy C9 has been slightly amended, including: inclusion of reference to prior investigation in the first sentence; addition of wording to clarify the meaning of the second sentence; and addition of a requirement that proposals for mineral working and landfill contribute to conservation and enhancement of historic environment. The County Council does not consider other suggested changes to be necessary or appropriate.

			English Heritage support the wording of policy C9 in the consultation draft plan and the County Council considers that the policy as now amended fully accords with the NPPF.
C9	English Heritage 0063	Welcomes and supports the comprehensive consideration of the historic environment and the protection it affords to both designated and non-designated assets.	Noted.
C9	Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum 0077	We support policy C9 so far as it goes but there are several ways in which it needs to be enhanced to comply properly with the NPPF. A number of amendments and additions are recommended.	Policy C9 has been slightly amended, including: inclusion of reference to prior investigation in the first sentence; addition of wording to clarify the meaning of the second sentence; and addition of a requirement that proposals for mineral working and landfill contribute to conservation and enhancement of historic environment. The County Council does not consider other suggested changes to be necessary or appropriate. English Heritage support the wording of policy C9 in the consultation draft plan and the County Council considers that the policy as now amended fully accords with the NPPF.
C9	Henry Pavlovich 0106	These policies seem to focus on agricultural concerns with a few references but no proper weight given to historic market town environs, tourism, AONBs, history etc. An area straddles many of these C policies, so it could be argued that a C12 is necessary to address the needs of such a semi-urban/rural area – history, archaeology, AONBs on either side, proximity of large settlement, tourism on the river and the Agatha Christie trail. At the moment separate issues relevant to the area are spread over	Policy C9 provides for protection of the historic environment in accordance with national policy in the NPPF. The core polices together cover all these issues; they need to be seen as a package that will all be applied as appropriate to any particular proposal, whether for a site allocation or a planning application. There is no need for an additional policy that would repeat elements of existing policies.

		several policies, e.g. 6.41 landscape, 6.43 settlements, 6.45 history, 6.48 archaeology.	
C9	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
Figure 17	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	The strategy assumes use of main transport links, which include the already congested A40. Lorries must be banned from using the local B4044, with its bottle-neck at the toll bridge. Developers should be required to provide for alternative transport to the A34, by rail or water.	Under policy C10, the suitability of access and transportation routes will be taken into consideration in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site allocations Document, and in the determination of planning applications. Policy C10 supports the provision of alternatives to road for the transportation of minerals and waste.
Figure 17	Wokingham Borough Council 0045	Figure 17 indicates that lorries should avoid using the existing Thames bridges in Reading and Henley. An additional crossing of the River Thames could provide a solution, allowing effective extraction of the sharp sand and gravel at Caversham and its onward transportation. Mineral extraction at Caversham should not jeopardise a future River Thames crossing.	The possible provision of a new Thames crossing is outside the scope of this plan, which has been prepared on the basis of the existing road network. The issue of potential conflict between mineral working and provision of a future Thames crossing is a matter for consideration at stage 2 of the plan, when potential sites are assessed for possible allocation in the Site Allocations Document.
Figure 17	Caversfield Parish Council 0108	There are many items in the key that are not indicated on the map itself e.g. Major Minerals and Major Waste sites.	Some of the symbols in the key to Figure 17 (now figure 13) relate to detailed sub-maps of the Oxfordshire Lorry Route Map, which do not need to be included in the Core Strategy, but the key cannot be edited to remove them.
6.53	Alvescot Parish Council 0100	Where alterations of road junctions or improvements to minor roads are required, the cost should be borne by the excavator and not	What is now paragraph 6.56 has been amended to say: 'the developer will be expected to provide the required alteration or improvement, or the

		local communities. The phrase ‘the Council will seek a contribution’ is rather weak.	Council will seek and the developer will be expected to make an appropriate contribution to enable the required alteration or improvement to be carried out’. Contributions must be proportionate, particularly where more than one development is contributing to the cost of the required works.
C10	Mrs Rosemary Parrinder 0011	The strategy assumes use of main transport links, which include the already congested A40. Lorries must be banned from using the local B4044, with its bottle-neck at the toll bridge. Developers should be required to provide for alternative transport to the A34, by rail or water.	Under policy C10, the suitability of access and transportation routes will be taken into consideration in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site allocations Document, and in the determination of planning applications. Policy C10 supports the provision of alternatives to road for the transportation of minerals and waste.
C10	Middleton Stoney Parish Council 0019	There should be provision within the policy to ensure routeing agreements, such as that for Ardley Landfill and EFW, are strictly enforced and penalties exacted for non-compliance.	Under policy C10, lorry routeing agreements may be an appropriate mechanism for ensuring safe and suitable access to the advisory lorry route network. The use of such agreements is covered in paragraph 6.57. However, these are subject to agreement between the Council and the operator and as such it would not be reasonable to seek to require them as a matter of course through policy.
C10	Highways Agency 0026	Support Policy CS10. Support proposals that promote alternatives to road based transport. Site operators should identify opportunities to reduce trips during peak periods, such as through construction and operational management plans for individual proposals.	Noted. The possible need for construction and operational management plans to reduce trips during peak periods is a site specific matter for consideration at the part 2 – site allocation stage of the plan or the more detailed planning application process.

C10	Highways Agency 0026	<p>Concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the strategic road network as a result of planned growth in the Core Strategy without consideration of mitigation measures. The Core Strategy should provide the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure in place.</p> <p>Transportation of waste and minerals has potential to generate a significant number of HGV trips, a large proportion of which are likely to be use the strategic road network. We expect the Core Strategy to be supported by a transport impact assessment.</p>	<p>Under policy C10 the traffic impacts of specific sites and development proposals will be taken into consideration in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, and in the determination of planning applications. This will ensure that development does not progress without provision being made for safe and suitable access, including any appropriate infrastructure required. The Core Strategy sets out the overall strategy for the location of minerals and waste developments but it is not site specific and the actual location of the developments that will be required over the plan period is not known at this stage. It is therefore not practical to carry out a transport impact assessment for the Core Strategy; but this will be done as part of the evidence base for the second stage of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.</p>
C10	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	<p>Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.</p>
C10	Wokingham Borough Council 0045	<p>Support policy C10, which seeks to ensure that there is safe and suitable access to roads that are suitable for such traffic. Clarification is sought about the reference to improvements to the transport network including making an</p>	<p>Supporting paragraph 6.56 expands on situations where developer contributions to road improvements will be necessary. This has been amended to cover cases where traffic impacts are cross-boundary and there may need to be liaison</p>

		appropriate financial contribution and whether these would potentially be cross-boundary.	between the County Council and the adjoining authority over any alterations or improvements that may be required and how these are to be provided for.
C10	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	In view of the poor highway network around Sutton Courtenay, the second part of this policy, relating to road transport, needs looking at. The retention of the rail access is vital.	The Sutton Courtenay site is an existing mineral and waste operation; the Core strategy cannot seek to change existing planning permissions. In the case of any further planning applications for development at the Sutton Courtenay site and any proposals for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, policy C10 will be taken into consideration to ensure that provision is made for safe and suitable access. This will include consideration of any improvements to the transport network that may be needed before the development can go ahead, and how such improvements would be provided.
C10	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	As drafted the Core Strategy does not appropriately consider the transport impact of mineral movements; extraction sites have the potential to put lots of vehicles onto small and already overcrowded roads.	Under policy C10 the traffic impacts of specific sites and development proposals will be taken into consideration in the assessment of sites for possible allocation in part 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document, and in the determination of planning applications. This will ensure that development does not progress without provision being made for safe and suitable access, including any appropriate infrastructure required. The Core Strategy sets out the overall strategy for the location of minerals and waste developments but it is not site specific and the actual location of the developments that will be required over the plan period is not known at this stage. It is therefore not practical to carry out a transport

			impact assessment for the Core Strategy; but this will be done as part of the evidence base for the second stage of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
C10	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
6.56 – 6.59	British Horse Society, Oxfordshire 0029	Welcome reference to the Oxfordshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the mention of horse riders in the final sentence. Reference to horse riders and other vulnerable users should be inserted throughout the Core Strategy.	Horse riders are one type of the many different users of the highway network. It is not appropriate or necessary to make specific reference to horse riders throughout then Core Strategy.
6.56 – 6.59	British Horse Society, Oxfordshire 0029	Equestrians are a particularly vulnerable group when landworks such as minerals development take place; drivers and workers on site need to be well-briefed in the ‘flight’ nature of horses and be aware of the need for safety of horseriders. Any re-landscaping should be done on equestrian rights of way with horses properly in mind, with regards to correct surfacing and other attributes.	These are detailed, operational issues that should be addressed were appropriate at the detailed planning application stage. The Core Strategy provides the overall policy framework for these issues to be addressed, in particular through polices C5, C10 and C11, but it is not appropriate to set blanket requirements on such detailed matters through strategic level policy in the Core Strategy.
C11	Eskmuir Properties Ltd 0028	Broadly supportive of the content and purpose behind Policies W5, W6, C1-C11. These policies appropriately seek to direct waste development to the most appropriate locations, against a whole host of criteria. There would be merit in preparing a separate Site Allocations Development Plan Document to accompany the Minerals and Waste Revised Local Plan: Core Strategy.	Noted. A part 2 of the plan – Site Allocations Document – is now to be prepared.

C11	British Horse Society, Oxfordshire 0029	Welcome reference to the Oxfordshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the mention of horse riders in the final sentence. Reference to horse riders and other vulnerable users should be inserted throughout the Core Strategy.	Horse riders are one type of the many different users of the highway network. It is not appropriate or necessary to make specific reference to horse riders throughout then Core Strategy.
C11	British Horse Society, Oxfordshire 0029	Equestrians are a particularly vulnerable group when landworks such as minerals development take place; drivers and workers on site need to be well-briefed in the 'flight' nature of horses and be aware of the need for safety of horseriders. Any re-landscaping should be done on equestrian rights of way with horses properly in mind, with regards to correct surfacing and other attributes.	These are detailed, operational issues that should be addressed were appropriate at the detailed planning application stage. The Core Strategy provides the overall policy framework for these issues to be addressed, in particular through polices C5, C10 and C11, but it is not appropriate to set blanket requirements on such detailed matters through strategic level policy in the Core Strategy.
C11	Natural England 0033	The policy and supporting text does not seem to consider impacts on the amenity value of the public right of way.	Policy C11 and paragraph 6.62 have been amended to include consideration of the amenity value of the rights of way network.
C11	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	The integrity of parts of the rights of way network around Sutton Courtenay is not maintained particularly well. There is clear conflict with this policy.	This is a detailed implementation / operational issue that is outside the scope of a planning policy document like the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
C11	Wallingford Town Council 0132	The impact of any proposed future mineral workings on local communities and the associated economy and environment should be given due weight.	These factors are covered by the core policies. The weight that should be given to any particular consideration in the determination of a planning application is a matter for the decision maker at the time.
7.11	Gloucestershire County Council 0024	It is regrettable that the plan is not more specific with regard to future working areas. Paragraph 7.11 refers to sites having been nominated for possible inclusion and to a preliminary assessment of these site options. Following publication of the NPPG, Oxfordshire CC may	The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic

		need to consider how allocations for mineral working should be made.	mineral resource areas within which sites be allocated will subsequently in accordance with policy M4. The nominated sites will be fully assessed at the part 2 stage.
7.11	Henry Pavlovich 0106	The nominations and assessments referred to have not been properly subject to local consultation. No technical assessment of the specific area between Wallingford and Cholsey has ever been made public. The arguments against nominating the area have been made in the course of consultations about the now withdrawn Plan, but no technical assessments were divulged in the course of that consultation.	The Core Strategy is not site specific; land between Wallingford and Cholsey is included in a strategic resource area for sand and gravel working in policy M3 but specific sites for mineral working will not be allocated until part 2 of the plan, then Site Allocations Document, is prepared, in accordance with policy M4. No full assessment of site options has yet been carried out; the only assessment of sites that has been undertaken is the preliminary assessment of nominated site options, which was done in order to test the potential deliverability of the minerals strategy and has previously been published.
7.11	Communities Against Gravel Extraction (CAGE) 0153	For the sake of clarity, the matrix used to assess sites in the former exercise in identifying sites for mineral extraction should be withdrawn except as part of an historic withdrawn draft strategy.	The only assessment of sites that has been undertaken is the preliminary assessment of nominated site options, which was done in order to test the potential deliverability of the minerals strategy and was published. This is being updated as part of the evidence base, to demonstrate the potential deliverability of the Core Strategy. The purpose and status of this assessment will be made clear.
7.13	Alvescot Parish Council 0100	Where alterations of road junctions or improvements to minor roads are required, we feel the cost should be borne by the excavator and not local communities. The phrase 'appropriate financial contributions should be clarified and strengthened.	Amended paragraph 6.56 say: 'the developer will be expected to provide the required alteration or improvement, or the Council will seek and the developer will be expected to make an appropriate contribution to enable the required alteration or improvement to be carried out'.

			Contributions must be proportionate, particularly where more than one development is contributing to the cost of the required works.
7.17	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	The council should provide a firm commitment to provide an annual review of the LAA. This is a serious omission given the pivotal role the Core Strategy places on the LAA. This needs to include an ability for stakeholder involvement/comment and a date upon which the LAA will be published annually.	Annual review of the Local Aggregate Assessment is a requirement of the NPPF and will be prioritised accordingly by the County Council. Paragraph 4.14 refers to annual review of the LAA. The LAA will be linked to the Annual Monitoring Report and produced towards the end of the calendar year. However, these annual reviews will be dependent on mineral operators providing annual sales data promptly.
7.43	Henry Pavlovich 0106	There is no reference to how the annual monitoring of needs and availability will be brought to the public for information let alone consultation.	Monitoring arrangements are set out in paragraphs 7.16 – 7.23 (minerals) and 7.38 – 7.47 (waste) and include a commitment to publishing an Annual Monitoring Report.
Appendix 1	Grundon 0047	The appendix fails to correctly reflect the NPPF which details that sand and gravel working is a water compatible use and may be located within the functional floodplain (zone 3b) where no exception test is required.	Appendix 3 has been developed from and accords with the National Planning Practice Guidance.
Glossary and abbreviations	Hills Quarry Products Ltd 0053	Local Aggregates Assessment should be defined in the glossary and also its abbreviation noted.	Local Aggregate Assessment should be included in the glossary.
Not stated	Police and Crime Commissioner Warwickshire 0002	No comments	Noted.

Not stated	Peter Cannon-Brookes 0012	Areas within the PFA disposal site at Radley have been overfilled which aggravates flooding	This is a development management issue relating to a particular site and planning permission and not a policy issue for this plan.
Not stated	Marcham Parish Council 0013	No comments - no considerable difference for Marcham	Noted
Not stated	Pyrton Parish Council 0014	No comments to make at this stage.	Noted.
Not stated	East Midlands AWP 0022	No Comment.	Noted.
Not stated	AGGROW 0023	It is unclear how long quarries may be left idle once permission has been granted and whether there is a time limit on permissions. It is unclear what construes 'working' – we have heard of a site where 1,000 tonnes of gravel dug and left on the side constituted working. Such a situation is clearly unacceptable and provision should be made to combat it.	Planning permissions for mineral working have conditions requiring commencement of development within a specified period and cessation of working by a specified date. There will also normally be an agreed scheme of working. But within these parameters it can be legitimate for operators to leave quarries idle for periods of time.
Not stated	AGGROW 0023	The practice of digging gravel and other minerals is clearly indefensible; it destroys farmland and creates unusable eyesores. Research should start to find an alternative.	At present, notwithstanding the availability of alternative sources of aggregate such as recycled and secondary materials, and alternative construction techniques and materials, the continued supply of primary aggregates is essential for construction and some of this has to come from sand and gravel resources.

Not stated	West Berkshire Council 0038	The plan refers to Berkshire as a single entity. West Berkshire Council is one of the 6 unitary authorities that make up the former county of Berkshire. It needs to be recognised that each of the 6 unitary authority is an individual mineral planning authority, waste planning authority and waste disposal authority.	The County Council recognises this and has engaged with and consulted the 6 unitary authorities separately. Nevertheless, in certain contexts it is appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer to the geographical area of Berkshire as a whole. Where necessary the Core Strategy has been amended to provide more clarity.
Not stated	The Coal Authority 0046	No specific comments	Noted.
Not stated	Aylesbury Vale District Council 0056	Would welcome active, constructive and on-going engagement on the Minerals Local Plan so that any wider impacts can be anticipated, identified and addressed in future iterations of the plan.	The County Council will continue to engage with adjoining authorities on preparation of the plan.
Not stated	The Chilterns Conservation Board 0057	Welcomes and supports the numerous references to the importance of the AONBs within the county and the fact that the AONBs are annotated on many of the maps.	Noted.
Not stated	The Cotswolds Conservation Board 0135	Supports and endorses the response of the Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).	As response to Chilterns Conservation Board (see 0057).
Not stated	Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society 0059	The draft plan does not conform with NPPF plan making and heritage policies to exclude environmentally sensitive sites.	The County Council considers that the Core Strategy as now amended does conform with the NPPF and that national policy for protection of environmentally sensitive sites has been properly taken into account at the strategic level. The assessment of sites for possible allocation in the part 2 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Site Allocations Document, will have appropriate regard to environmentally sensitive sites at the more detailed level.

Not stated	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The policies have minimal requirements for formal consideration of community impacts and are unduly focused on environmental impacts. Requirements for inclusion of community and economic impacts should be strengthened.	Policy C5 requires impacts on local communities, residential amenity and the local economy to be taken into account and will apply to both the allocation of sites in part 2 of the plan and the determination of planning applications. Policy C5 has been expanded to make clearer the factors that need to be taken into account.
Not stated	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The policies have very limited requirement for community engagement.	Community engagement is a required part of both the plan preparation process and the consideration of planning applications. The Council adopted a revised Statement of Community Involvement in March 2015. This does not need to be duplicated in the Core Strategy.
Not stated	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The policies provide very few specific requirements relating to community benefits beyond general and non-binding policy statements for this to be considered.	It is not reasonable to set general requirements for community benefits through policy. There are limits on the extent to which such benefits can be secured through the planning process and they need to be considered on a case by case basis.
Not stated	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The plan fails to state that in certain situations the County Council will be in a situation where there is an actual or perceived conflict of interest. No explicit mention is given to ensure that these conflicts of interest will be appropriately handled.	This is a legal matter and not a planning policy matter that it would be appropriate to cover in this plan. Planning policy must be made and applied regardless of land ownership or other commercial interests.
Not stated	Synergy Global Consulting 0070	The plan should mention the capacity required in order to effectively implement the plan.	This is an operational issue for the Council and not a planning policy matter that it would be appropriate to cover in this plan.

Not stated	Oxford City and County Archaeological Forum 0077	The draft plan does not conform with NPPF plan making and heritage policies to exclude environmentally sensitive sites	The County Council considers that the Core Strategy as now amended does conform with the NPPF and that national policy for protection of environmentally sensitive sites has been properly taken into account at the strategic level. The assessment of sites for possible allocation in the part 2 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Site Allocations Document, will have appropriate regard to environmentally sensitive sites at the more detailed level.
Not stated	Sally Rowley-Williams 0078	The strategy contradicts existing policies: M4 (4.35), M5 (4.38), W2 (2.13 and 5.21), W3 (5.25 and 5.28), W7 (5.70) and W11 (5.100)	The policies cited are part of the consultation draft plan, and therefore part of the proposed minerals and waste strategies, and are not approved policies. These policies have now been revised to form part of the Core Strategy that is to be published for further consultation and submitted for examination.
Not stated	Mrs Wilkinson 0079	The proposal is unacceptable due to: high water table, flooding, noise, smells, increased traffic, huge and hideous buildings, loss of natural light, upset of wildlife and people.	It is not clear whether this comment relates to a particular area or the strategy as a whole. The Core strategy includes policies on all these matters, designed to ensure that these interests are adequately safeguarded or protected and that mineral and waste developments that would have unacceptable impacts do not go ahead.
Not stated	Jennifer Harland 0083	It is worrying that planning for gravel and sand extraction can apparently be bulldozed past local people. If local support is required total clarity is paramount and the case should be presented openly and with scrupulous honesty.	The purpose of the consultation on the draft Core Strategy was to get the views of people on draft proposals so that they could be taken into account by the County Council before making any decisions on the strategy and policies. The Council has been open and honest in setting out draft proposals for comment.

Not stated	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	The strategy is worded ambiguously which means it could be interpreted quite liberally.	The strategy and policies have been revised to provide greater clarity, whilst retaining the high-level approach to policy that is necessary and appropriate for a Core Strategy. The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites.
Not stated	Sutton Courtenay Parish Council 0085	Would like firm assurances that the level of monitoring and enforcement will be upgraded from its present level, which the Parish Council considers to be inadequate.	This is an operational issue for the Council and not a planning policy matter that it would be appropriate to cover in this plan.
Not stated	South Oxfordshire District Council 0089	It might be useful to summarise the changes made between iterations of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the reasons for them.	This helpful suggestion will be taken into account when the evidence base is updated.
Not stated	Richard Bakesef 0099	Figures 1, 3a, 3b and 10 are fuzzy and of poor quality making it impossible to identify specific towns and villages. The colours used in the key of Figure 3a are far too similar.	The maps have been improved but these are small-scale maps presenting strategic level information and are not intended to show detail. The areas of search in policy M3 have been replaced by strategic resource areas within which sites for mineral working will subsequently be allocated in part 2 of the plan. The maps of the areas of search have been deleted and the strategic resource areas are instead shown on a new minerals key diagram, which is more appropriate to a Core Strategy.

Not stated	Alvescot Parish Council 0100	It is unclear how long quarries may be left idle once permission has been granted and whether there is a time limit on permissions. It is unclear what construes 'working' – we have heard of a site where 1,000 tonnes of gravel dug and left on the side constituted working. Such a situation is clearly unacceptable and provision should be made to combat it.	Planning permissions for mineral working have conditions requiring commencement of development within a specified period and cessation of working by a specified date. There will also normally be an agreed scheme of working. But within these parameters it can be legitimate for operators to leave quarries idle for periods of time.
Not stated	Alvescot Parish Council 0100	The practice of digging gravel and other minerals is clearly indefensible; it destroys farmland and creates unusable eyesores. Research should start to find an alternative.	At present, notwithstanding the availability of alternative sources of aggregate such as recycled and secondary materials, and alternative construction techniques and materials, the continued supply of primary aggregates is essential for construction and some of this has to come from sand and gravel resources.
Not stated	Anne Wrapson 0102	The draft plan is too bulky and the publicity of the consultation process was poor.	It is not possible for a plan of this nature to be a smaller document if it is to address all the relevant issues and include justified and effective policies. The comment about publicity is noted.
Not stated	Lynda Hillyer 0104	The plan was presented in Eynsham with minimum publicity, which is regrettable.	This comment is noted.
Not stated	Cotswold District Council 0107	No comment at this stage of the consultation but would welcome on-going dialogue and consultation.	Noted. The County Council will continue to engage with adjoining authorities on preparation of the plan.
Not stated	Robin Draper 0113	The Core Strategy is lacking in detail and too broad brush. As a result it is open to interpretation and consequently leaves a number of loopholes which commercial providers may capitalise which will be to the detriment of local communities.	The strategy and policies have been revised to provide greater clarity, whilst retaining the high-level approach to policy that is necessary and appropriate for a Core Strategy. The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: this Core Strategy is part 1 and will identify broad locations for development; and it will be followed

			by part 2, which will allocate specific sites.
Not stated	Thames Water 0119	In accordance the NPPF, a key sustainability objective for the preparation of the Local Plan and Development Plan Documents should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure.	This relates more to district local plans, which deal with wider range of development, than minerals and waste plans but it is covered by policy C10 in relation to transport infrastructure and will be addressed in relation to specific sites at the more detailed stage 2 of the plan, the Site Allocations Document.
Not stated	R H Atkinson 0120	I profoundly disagree with the change of criteria used to produce this report, compared to those used previously. The attempt to ram through a policy using such dishonest tactics will cause much distress.	It is not clear which criteria this comment relates to. The format of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan has been changed. It is now being prepared in two parts: the Core Strategy (part 1) will identify broad locations for development; and will be followed by part 2, which will allocate specific sites. Amended policy M3 now identifies strategic mineral resource areas within which sites will be allocated subsequently in accordance with policy M4.
Not stated	Vale of White Horse District Council – Environmental Health Team 0122	No comments to make.	Noted.
Not stated	Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council 0131	The emerging strategy has been prepared positively and in accordance with current policy and guidance, reflecting similar policy themes as set out in the Wiltshire and Swindon Development Framework.	Noted.

OMWLP: Part 1 (Core Strategy) – Statement on Consultation and Representations December 2015
 Summary of Comments on Consultation Draft Core Strategy February 2014 and County Council Responses

Not stated	Oxfordshire County Council Archaeologist 0137	No significant problems with the document and the policies which relate to the historic environment. English Heritage may have comments on the text, which we should look at together and assess whether there is a need for any revision.	Noted.
Not stated	Grundon 0047	Endorse the comments of Oxfordshire Minerals Producers Group. Our comments should be read in conjunction with theirs.	Noted.

