

**Submission of
OXFORDSHIRE MINERALS AND
WASTE LOCAL PLAN**

PART 1 – CORE STRATEGY

**Statement on Compliance with the
Duty to Cooperate**

December 2015



Contents

| Section | Title | Page |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Introduction | 3 |
| 2 | Relevant Issues | 5 |
| 3 | Key Bodies | 8 |
| 4 | Cooperation with Mineral Planning Authorities on Strategic Minerals Planning Issues | 12 |
| 5 | Cooperation with Waste Planning Authorities on Strategic Waste Planning Issues | 28 |
| 6 | Cooperation with District Planning Authorities | 43 |
| 7 | Cooperation with Prescribed Bodies | 45 |
| Appendix 1 | Extracts from Minutes of SEEAWP Meetings and Letters from SEEAWP | 48 |
| Appendix 2 | Note of Meeting with Adjoining Authorities 27 November 2009 | 61 |
| Appendix 3 | Background Paper for Report to Cabinet on Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document 13 March 2012: Summary of Engagement with other Mineral Planning Authorities, January / February 2012 | 67 |
| Appendix 4 | Duty to Cooperate Engagement on Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 | 70 |
| Appendix 5 | Other Minerals Planning Authorities contacted in April 2015 about Imports or Exports of Aggregate in 2009 | 75 |
| Appendix 6 | South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) Memorandum of Understanding | 77 |

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 (the Localism Act) introduced a new requirement – the Duty to Cooperate (DtC), which applies to planning authorities preparing local plans. Authorities are required to ‘engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis’ with other local planning authorities, county councils and other prescribed bodies¹ in ‘maximising the effectiveness’ with which plans are prepared, so far as this relates to a ‘strategic matter’. It came into force on 15 November 2011. The DtC is intended to address the strategic role previously played by regional plans.
- 1.2 ‘Strategic matters’ include sustainable development or use of land having a significant impact on at least two planning areas; and within two-tier areas they include ‘county matters’ i.e. minerals and waste development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)² advises that provision of minerals and waste management are strategic priorities; and that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those that relate to strategic priorities.
- 1.3 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy (the Plan) includes strategic matters that impact on the district councils within Oxfordshire and on a number of authority areas beyond Oxfordshire. The County Council has sought to engage with relevant local authorities and other bodies on strategic issues of common interest. The Duty to Cooperate is not a duty to agree but authorities are expected to make every effort to secure appropriate cooperation before a plan is submitted for examination.
- 1.4 This statement has been prepared to show the work undertaken during the preparation of the plan to meet DtC requirements. It should also be read in conjunction with the Council’s Statement on Consultation and Representations³ (prepared under Regulation 22(1)(c)), which sets out how relevant bodies and persons have been involved in and consulted on the plan in its preparation, in accordance with the wider consultation requirements of planning legislation and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement⁴.
- 1.5 Preparation of the Plan began in July 2013 when the previous Minerals and Waste Core Strategy was withdrawn. The Plan builds on the content and the work that went into the preparation of that previous plan. Reference is therefore made throughout this statement to engagement and liaison undertaken in the preparation of the previous Core Strategy.

¹ Prescribed Bodies are defined in Regulation 4 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

² National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, paragraphs 156 & 178

³ Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy: Statement on Consultation and Representations December 2015

⁴ Revised Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement, Adopted March 2015

- 1.6 Documents relating both to the previous Core Strategy and to the 2015 Plan are referred to in this statement. Table 1 (below) sets out the plan documents that the Council has produced from 2011 in preparing the Plan.

Table 1: Key Documents relevant to the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy

| Document | Abbreviation | Context |
|---|---------------|---|
| Minerals Planning Strategy – Consultation Draft, September 2011 | MPS-CD-2011 | Produced in connection with preparation of the Minerals & Waste Core Strategy 2012 |
| Waste Planning Strategy -- Consultation Draft, September 2011 | WPS-CD-2011 | Produced in connection with preparation of the Minerals & Waste Core Strategy 2012 |
| Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document, May 2012 | MWCS-PSD-2012 | Published in May 2012 and submitted for examination in October 2012 but withdrawn in July 2013 |
| Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Core Strategy – Consultation Draft, February 2014 | MWLP-CD-2014 | Produced in connection with preparation of the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy 2015 |
| Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy – Proposed Submission Document, August 2015 | MWLP-PSD-2015 | Published in August 2015 |

- 1.7 The Localism Act requires that the Duty to Cooperate is an on-going process; and the NPPF⁵ states that “cooperation should be a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation”. A draft of this statement was prepared by the Council and published on the Council’s website in September 2015, setting out the position at that time. This was not one of the Council’s ‘proposed submission documents’ published under Regulation 19 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 but was made available as the Council considered it could be of interest and assistance to people reading and responding to the Published Plan. It stated that the statement may be updated and added to prior to the examination of the Plan.
- 1.8 This updated Statement on Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate has been prepared to set out the position up to the point of submission of the Plan, to inform the examination of the Plan. The Council considers that the evidence in this statement demonstrates that it has met the duty to cooperate in the preparation of the Plan.

⁵ National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, paragraph 181

2. Relevant issues

- 2.1 Over the next 20 years significant growth is expected in Oxfordshire as a result of new housing and commercial development. Associated investment in infrastructure will also take place to address related traffic growth⁶. Such growth will impact on the demand for and supply of minerals and also on the production of waste and how it is managed. It will be necessary to balance the impacts of the minerals and waste development that is needed in Oxfordshire against the need to protect and enhance the county's environment, both urban and rural.
- 2.2 Figure 2 in the Published Plan (August 2015) shows the Oxfordshire growth areas and other locations for development, including the following key locations for growth and development:
- Didcot Garden Town and Wantage & Grove, which are within the Science Vale UK area which also includes Milton Park, Harwell Science and Innovation Campus and Culham Science Centre, where there are plans for around 20,000 new homes and 20,000 new jobs;
 - Bicester Garden Town, where further major housing and employment growth is planned, including the North West Bicester Eco-town which will deliver up to 6,000 new homes, and for which a masterplan will provide a long-term vision and framework for integrating growth of the town; and
 - Oxford, which remains a world class centre of education, research and innovation.
- 2.3 Large housing developments (1000+ homes) are also proposed at Banbury, Upper Heyford, Witney and Carterton. Just over half of planned growth in Oxfordshire is in the southern part of the county, with the remainder in the northern part.

'Strategic Matters' for Minerals

- 2.4 The Published Plan (para 2.44) identifies the following four 'strategic' issues for minerals, which are addressed by policies in the plan.
- i. The provision that should be made for working primary aggregate minerals (sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock) in Oxfordshire to meet the needs of the county for construction materials through the plan period, taking into account the supply of aggregates that may be expected from mineral working in other areas and the contribution that should be made from mineral working in Oxfordshire towards the aggregate supply needs of other areas. (addressed by policy M2)

⁶ Oxfordshire's population is forecast to grow by a further 14% over the next 15 years. Road traffic has grown rapidly in Oxfordshire, particularly on the M40 and A34, and congestion is a significant problem; and growth in all traffic on Oxfordshire roads is predicted to be over 25% over the period to 2026.

- ii. The approach that should be taken to supply of aggregates from outside Oxfordshire, particularly by rail through aggregate railhead depots. (addressed by policy M6)
 - iii. The contribution towards meeting overall aggregate supply requirements in Oxfordshire that could be made by secondary and recycled aggregate and how that contribution could be best secured. (addressed by policy M1)
 - iv. Where the mineral working that will be required in Oxfordshire over the plan period should broadly be located, taking into account existing quarries and permitted working areas, the availability of potentially workable mineral resources and the distribution of demand for aggregate minerals across the county. (addressed by policies M3, M4 and M5)
- 2.5 Work relevant to each issue is detailed in section 3. Other mineral issues are identified in the Plan but these are not of a strategic nature and therefore not covered in this DtC statement.

‘Strategic Matters’ for Waste

- 2.6 The Published Plan (para 2.48) identifies the following four ‘strategic’ issues for waste, which are addressed by policies in the plan.
- i. The types and quantities of waste that are expected to be produced in Oxfordshire over the plan period and the extent to which provision can be made for this waste to be managed or disposed at facilities within Oxfordshire. (addressed by policies W1, W7, W8, W9 and W10)
 - ii. How waste produced in Oxfordshire that cannot be managed or disposed within the county is to be managed or disposed, including consideration of:
 - The types and quantities of waste involved;
 - The reasons why this waste cannot be managed or disposed in Oxfordshire;
 - Options for management or disposal of this waste outside Oxfordshire; and
 - Any barriers to the management or disposal of this waste outside Oxfordshire.(addressed by policies W7 and W9)
 - iii. The extent to which demand for waste produced outside Oxfordshire to be managed or disposed at facilities within the county should be met, including consideration of:

- The types and quantities of waste involved;
- The reasons why this waste cannot be managed or disposed in or closer to the area of waste arising;
- Whether the waste could be managed at existing facilities or whether additional provision would be required;
- Any barriers there might there be to managing or disposing of the waste.

(addressed by policies W3 and W6)

- iv. Where any new waste management or disposal facilities that will be required in Oxfordshire over the plan period should broadly be located. (addressed by policies W4 and W5)

2.7 Work relevant to each issue is detailed in section 4. Other waste issues are identified in the Plan but these are not of a strategic nature and are therefore not covered in this DtC statement.

3. Key Bodies

Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities

- 3.1 Oxfordshire formed part of the South East region, but its location is such that it also adjoins the former South West, West Midlands and East Midlands regions. The strategic issues (or matters) identified for both minerals and waste are such as to have a potential relevance to all of the minerals and waste planning authorities in the former South East region and to the minerals and waste planning authorities adjoining Oxfordshire that lie outside the South East. Each of these authorities has been engaged with and invited to make comment at key stages in the process of preparing the Plan. Some matters relating to minerals (particularly the supply of hard crushed rock aggregate to Oxfordshire) and to waste (particularly the export of certain wastes from Oxfordshire) impact on minerals and waste planning authorities further afield. These authorities have also been engaged with and consulted. The key authorities concerned are listed in table 2.

Table 2: Key Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities

| Authority | Former Region |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Former South East Region | |
| Bracknell Forest Council | South East |
| Brighton and Hove Borough Council | South East |
| Buckinghamshire County Council | South East |
| East Sussex County Council | South East |
| Hampshire County Council | South East |
| Isle of Wight Council | South East |
| Kent County Council | South East |
| Medway Council | South East |
| Milton Keynes Council | South East |
| Portsmouth City Council | South East |
| Reading Borough Council | South East |
| Slough Borough Council | South East |
| Southampton City Council | South East |
| Surrey County Council | South East |
| West Berkshire Council | South East |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| West Sussex County Council | South East |
| Windsor & Maidenhead Royal Borough | South East |
| Wokingham Borough Council | South East |
| Other Adjoining Authorities | |
| Gloucestershire County Council | South West |
| Northamptonshire County Council | East Midlands |
| Swindon Borough Council | South West |
| Warwickshire County Council | West Midlands |
| Wiltshire Council | South West |
| Other Authorities | |
| Cumbria County Council | North West |
| Dorset County Council | South West |
| Leicestershire County Council | East Midlands |
| Somerset County Council | South West |
| South Gloucestershire Council | South West |

- 3.2 The outcome of the work undertaken with these authorities is covered in sections 4 (for minerals) and 5 (for waste). The NPPF⁷ states that “joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas” and that authorities “should consider producing joint planning policies on strategic matters”. Engagement with other mineral and waste planning authorities has not led to any need for formal joint working arrangements on either minerals or waste strategic matters being identified.
- 3.3 The NPPF⁸ also states that “authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts and says that this could be done by way of a memorandum of understanding. The Council is party to a memorandum of understanding agreed by the member authorities of the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (see section 5) but otherwise engagement with other mineral and waste planning authorities has not identified a need for such arrangements. The outcome of engagement and consultation to date has indicated that the policies in the Published Plan adequately provide for the minerals and waste development requirements of other areas that cannot be met in those areas

⁷ National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, paragraph 179

⁸ National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, paragraph 181

and that it may be appropriate to be met in Oxfordshire. It has also indicated that the minerals and waste development requirements of Oxfordshire that cannot be met in the county can be adequately met in other areas.

District Planning Authorities

- 3.4 The strategic minerals and waste issues identified in the Plan also have an impact on planning within Oxfordshire’s district council areas, which are listed in table 3. The district councils are responsible for preparing local plans and determining planning applications for development other than minerals and waste within their areas. The strategic minerals and waste matters that are addressed in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan can have significant implications for planning for other forms of development; and vice versa. The outcome of engagement and cooperation with the Oxfordshire district councils is covered in section 6.
- 3.5 No strategic minerals or waste issues have been identified that impact specifically on any of the district councils adjoining Oxfordshire such that they cannot be addressed through cooperation with the relevant county council (i.e. the mineral and waste planning authority). The neighbouring authorities in Berkshire, Swindon and Wiltshire are unitary councils and these are all included in table 2 above, as being mineral and waste planning authorities.

Table 3: Key District Planning Authorities

| Authority | County |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Cherwell District Council | Oxfordshire |
| Oxford City Council | Oxfordshire |
| South Oxfordshire District Council | Oxfordshire |
| Vale of White Horse District Council | Oxfordshire |
| West Oxfordshire District Council | Oxfordshire |

Other Prescribed Bodies

- 3.6 The strategic minerals and waste identified and addressed in the Plan also have potential implications for some of the prescribed bodies listed in Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The Localism Act 2011 requires the Council to ‘have regard to the activities’ of prescribed bodies ‘so far as they are relevant’ to the preparation of the plan. The prescribed bodies that the Council has identified as being relevant to for the purposes of the duty to cooperate are listed in table 4. The outcome of engagement and cooperation with prescribed bodies is covered in section 7.

Table 4: Prescribed Bodies relevant for the purposes of the Duty to Cooperate

| Prescribed Body | Relevant to DtC |
|--|------------------------|
| Environment Agency | Yes |
| Natural England | Yes |
| Historic England (formerly English Heritage) | Yes |
| Mayor of London | Yes |
| Office of Road and Rail (formerly Office of Rail Regulation) | Yes |
| Highway Authority *: Highways England (formerly Highways Agency) | Yes |
| Marine Management Organisation | Yes |
| Local Enterprise Partnership: Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP) | Yes |
| Local Nature Partnership: | Yes |

* For most roads within Oxfordshire, the County Council itself is the Highway Authority

3.7 The Council considers that the following of the prescribed bodies are not relevant for the purposes of the duty to cooperate in relation to the preparation of the Plan:

- Civil Aviation Authority;
- Homes and Communities Agency;
- Clinical Commissioning Group (formerly Primary Care Trust);
- National Health Service Commissioning Board;
- Transport for London;
- Integrated Transport Authority (not relevant to Oxfordshire).

Where appropriate, these bodies have been consulted in the preparation of the Plan, under Regulations 18 and 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

4. Cooperation with Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) on Strategic Minerals Planning Issues

South East England Aggregate Working Party (SEEAWP)

(formerly the South East England Regional Aggregates Working Party – SEERAWP)

- 4.1 SEEAWP is a technical advisory group on planning for aggregates supply, the purpose of which is to produce data on aggregate demand and supply in the South East and provide advice to mineral planning authorities and the national Aggregate Co-ordinating Group. It is responsible to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and comprises officer representatives from the MPAs within the former South East region and representatives of the minerals industry (Mineral Products Association, British Aggregates Association and British Marine Aggregate Producers Association). Meetings are also attended by representatives from DCLG, the Port of London Authority, The Crown Estate, the East of England Aggregate Working Party and the London Aggregate Working Party. The NPPF requires MPAs to participate in the operation of an Aggregate Working Party and National Planning Practice Guidance advises that Active membership of the Aggregate Working Party
- 4.2 SEEAWP undertakes an annual monitoring survey of aggregate sales and reserves across the South East and other studies that individual authorities could not undertake on their own. It has contributed to work that has been undertaken on national and regional requirements for the supply of aggregates, including the sub-regional apportionment of land-won aggregate supply in the South East. Previously, this work informed preparation of the (now revoked) South East Plan.
- 4.3 The NPPF⁹ requires MPAs to participate in the operation of an Aggregate Working Party and to take its advice into account when preparing their Local Aggregate Assessment. National Planning Practice Guidance¹⁰ advises that Active membership of the Aggregate Working Party will help MPAs demonstrate compliance with the duty to cooperate. Oxfordshire County Council is a member of SEEAWP and a regular attender at meetings, which are usually held twice a year. Following the abolition of the South East Regional Assembly and revocation of the South East Plan, and the changes to the Managed Aggregate Supply System brought in by the NPPF, the role of SEEAWP changed. In accordance with the NPPF, it now has a key role in advising MPAs on the preparation of their Local Aggregate Assessments (LAA). These establish the levels of provision that should be made in the authority's Minerals Local Plan for aggregate mineral supply, which is a

⁹ National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG, March 2012, paragraph 145

¹⁰ Planning Practice Guidance, DCLG, March 2014, paragraph 075 reference ID: 27-075-20140306

strategic issue for this Plan. The Council's involvement in SEEAWP is, therefore, very relevant to the requirements of the DtC.

- 4.4 A first LAA for Oxfordshire was prepared for the County Council by consultants Atkins in January 2011, prior to the requirement for LAAs that was brought in by the NPPF in March 2012. This was reported to SEEAWP on 16 February 2011; SEEAWP was informed that Atkins had put forward four alternative methods of assessing Oxfordshire's future aggregate requirements and that at a meeting that same day the Council's Cabinet were being recommended to adopt locally derived figures based on an average of two of the alternatives as the basis of the Council's preferred spatial approach for mineral working. It was noted that these figures were lower than the Oxfordshire apportionment figures in the Proposed Changes to Policy M3 of the South East Plan (March 2010). SEEAWP made no comment on either the Atkins' report or the figures the Council proposed to use. (Minutes of Meeting of SEERAWP held on 16 February 2011, paragraph 5.4.)
- 4.5 The approach that the Council proposed to take in MWCS-PSD-2012 was considered by SEEAWP on 28 March 2012. It was noted that Oxfordshire had consulted on its LAA (a summary of the responses was included in the meeting paper SEEAWP 12/04) and intended to adopt levels of provision below the apportionment figures. The Oxfordshire LAA was requested to be provided in a revised before comments were provided by SEEAWP. (Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 28 March 2012, paragraphs 6.1 – 6.4.)
- 4.6 The first draft of a post NPPF Oxfordshire LAA was considered by SEEAWP on 24 October 2012. This showed the 10 year average sales figure for sand and gravel to be lower than the provision level in the Core Strategy that was due to be submitted that month. The draft LAA was incomplete, but comments were nevertheless requested. It was agreed that SEEAWP members should send comments on to the Secretary by 15 November, and that a final response on the basis of replies would then be drafted and signed off by the Chairman. (Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 24 October 2012, paragraph 5.6.)
- 4.7 The response of SEEAWP was received in a letter dated 21 November 2012, which made the following points:
- The draft LAA is incomplete with critical elements missing; this means SEEAWP will not be able to comment on the full LAA before the Core Strategy is submitted;
 - Basing provision for land-won sand and gravel on a rolling 10 years sales average is an initial approach but the LAA should give more weight to South East Plan policy M3 and the relatively extensive sand and gravel resources in Oxfordshire; and the LAA does not adequately address 'other relevant local information';

- The Oxfordshire plan to make land-won sand and gravel provision for over the 10 year sales average is welcomed but the LAA does not provide compelling and robust evidence to support a figure significantly lower than in the revised South East Plan policy M3.
- The LAA should be modified to: reflect the DCLG Guidance on the Managed Aggregate Supply System; establish the reasons for decline in sand and gravel sales and how and why these might change over the plan period; not place undue reliance on production of recycled and secondary aggregates; and set out how cooperation has been achieved with other MPAs within and beyond the South East.

4.8 This response was taken into account in subsequent work on the preparation of the Oxfordshire LAA. A further draft LAA, prepared by consultants Atkins, was considered by SEEAWP on 03 July 2013. This contained options for land-won sand and gravel based on: 10 year sales averages; an alternative methodology which applied consumption per capita and past sales to forecasts of Oxfordshire's future population; and the provision figures in the Core Strategy submitted in 2012. A response had been received from one MPA in advance of the meeting, supporting the LAA in principle but seeking clarification on certain aspects. A representative of the Mineral Products Association supported the adjusted figures rather than the previous 10 year average as these took into account the wider economy and future growth. The Oxfordshire CC representative stated that if the adjusted LAA figures were close to those in the Core Strategy, it may well be that Oxfordshire would stick with the Core Strategy provision. No response was made by SEEAWP to the draft LAA at that stage. (Minutes of meeting of SEEAWP held on 3 July 2013, paragraphs 5.3 – 5.4.)

4.9 Preparation of a new Oxfordshire LAA was considered again by SEEAWP on 13 November 2013. In the light of criticism of the draft LAA suggesting a higher figure, the County Council was considering use of the 10 year sales average, which was higher than the 2012 sales level and would therefore provide headroom for growth. The views of SEEAWP on use of the 10 year sales average were requested. Representatives of the Mineral Products Association raised concerns that temporary mothballing sites accounted for low sales in recent years; a methodology devised by independent consultants was to be dropped due to local pressures; and no further data had been supplied to show that the technically justified figure in the draft LAA was flawed. The representative of one MPA said he found the methodology proposed by Oxfordshire's consultants to be unsatisfactory and now supported use of the 10 year sales average. This view was supported by the representatives of other MPAs. Since Oxfordshire had not submitted a further draft LAA revision explaining the current thinking, SEEAWP decided that it could not give a written response. (Minutes of meeting of SEEAWP held on 13 November 2013, paragraphs 3.24 – 3.27.)

- 4.10 On 27 October 2014, SEEAWP considered the draft Oxfordshire LAA 2014, which had been prepared for the Council by consultants LUC. This used a different methodology from that employed by Atkins, based on an adjustment of the 10 year sales average to compensate for exceptionally low sales in Oxfordshire during the recession years, to produce levels of provision higher than the 10 year sales average for sharp sand and gravel and crushed rock. The LAA was accepted by SEEAWP. (Minutes of meeting of SEEAWP held on 27 October 2014, paragraphs 3.1 – 3.3.) This was confirmed by letter from the Chairman of SEEAWP dated 5 November 2014. The LAA 2014 was finalised with the provision levels as in the draft.
- 4.11 This feedback from SEEAWP informed the Council's decision to use the provision levels in the LAA 2014 in the MWLP-PSD-2015 (policy M2), rather than the straight 10 year sales average figures used in the MWLP-CD-2014.
- 4.12 A draft Oxfordshire LAA Interim Update 2015, incorporating data available to date from the DCLG Aggregate Minerals Survey 2014, was considered by SEEAWP on 10 November 2015. This showed that the 10 year sales average figures for soft sand and sharp sand and gravel had fallen, and that the average for crushed rock had increased, but concluded that on the basis of this information no changes should be made to the provision levels in the LAA 2014. The limited reference to demand in the update was questioned; this would be addressed when the full LAA is produced. A representative from the Mineral Products Association considered the LAA 14 provision figures to be a sensible approach. (Draft minutes of meeting of SEEAWP held on 10 November 2015, paragraph 3.2.) The agreement of SEEAWP to the Oxfordshire LAA update for 2015 was confirmed in a letter from the Chairman dated 20 November 2015.
- 4.13 Relevant extracts from minutes of meetings of SEEAWP and letters from SEEAWP, as referred to in the preceding paragraphs, are at Appendix 1.

Cooperation with Mineral Planning Authorities

- 4.14 In addition to the liaison that takes place with other South East MPAs through SEEAWP, meetings of officers from all the South East MPAs have been held on a regular basis since September 2013. These meetings take place on the morning of the day that a meeting of SEEAWP is held. These meetings have discussed draft LAAs, emerging new minerals local plans and other strategic minerals issues affecting the South East of England. Meetings have been held on:
- 27 September 2013;
 - 13 November 2013;
 - 12 March 2014;
 - 27 October 2014;

- 23 February 2015;
- 10 November 2015.

Oxfordshire County Council has been represented at all these meetings.

4.15 More specific, direct liaison has taken place with a number of MPAs. To assist in the preparation of the earlier plan (Core Strategy 2012), all adjoining MPAs were invited to a meeting on 27 November 2009, which was attended by officers from the Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit, Buckinghamshire CC, Gloucestershire CC and Warwickshire CC. The meeting discussed the progress on and timetables for preparation of plans and strategic issues, including current and potential future cross-boundary movements of aggregates. A note of this meeting is at Appendix 2.

4.16 In January/February 2012, the County Council wrote to all adjoining and other South East MPAs to explain why the Council was proposing the levels of aggregates provision in the Core Strategy 2012 (policy M2), based on the Local Aggregate Assessment report produced by Atkins for the Council in January 2011, and to seek agreement to this approach or the reasons for any disagreement and invite any other comments. Responses were received from the following five authorities:

- Buckinghamshire County Council – consider the approach to the proposed level of provision is unsound;
- Gloucestershire County Council – reduction in the level of provision could have implications for adjacent authorities: lack of coordination and piecemeal planning; sand and gravel resources in Gloucestershire close to the Oxfordshire border are sensitive to exportation, potentially leading to unsustainable movements of aggregates by road;
- Surrey County Council – object to proposed level of provision on the grounds that basing the figure on past sales is backward looking; and that the figure should provide an increasing contribution to the wider regional supply of aggregates;
- Wiltshire Council – cautious support for the approach;
- Warwickshire County Council – concerned the approach could lead to pressure on Warwickshire to increase provision.

4.17 At the same time the County Council also wrote to those more distant authorities which were known to be, or had been, significant exporters of crushed rock aggregates to Oxfordshire by rail: Leicestershire CC, Somerset CC and South Gloucestershire Council. They were asked to confirm whether the past flows of aggregates from their areas to Oxfordshire could be maintained over the period to 2030. All three authorities responded:

- Leicestershire County Council – confirmed that the flow of aggregates from Leicestershire to Oxfordshire should be able to continue to 2030;

- Somerset County Council – confirmed that the landbank in Somerset for supply of aggregates by rail to Oxfordshire is more than sufficient to continue supply to 2030;
- South Gloucestershire Council – production capacity is not expected to decrease over the next 15-20 years.

4.18 A summary of all the responses to the January/February 2012 engagement on the proposed levels of aggregate provision was produced as a background paper to a report to Cabinet in March 2012. This is at Appendix 3.

4.19 In July/August/September 2013, following the withdrawal of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2012, meetings were held with all adjoining and certain other MPAs to discuss strategic mineral issues of common concern, including draft new LAAs, cross boundary mineral supply issues and emerging new local plans. These meetings are listed in Table 5 and are referred to in the following sections on engagement with individual MPAs.

Table 5: Duty to Cooperate Meetings July – September 2013

| Mineral Planning Authority | Meeting Date |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Gloucestershire County Council | 05 July 2013 |
| Surrey County Council Hampshire County Council | 05 July 2013 (joint meeting) |
| Warwickshire County Council | 10 July 2013 |
| Northamptonshire County Council Milton Keynes Council | 24 July 2013 (joint meeting) |
| Buckinghamshire County Council | 25 July 2013 |
| Bracknell Forest Council Reading Borough Council West Berkshire Council Wokingham Borough Council | 25 July 2013 (joint meeting) |
| Wiltshire Council Swindon Borough Council | 29 August 2013 (joint meeting) |
| Slough Borough Council Windsor & Maidenhead Borough Council | 18 September 2013 (joint meeting) |

4.20 In addition to consultation with SEEAWP (see paragraphs 4.8 – 4.9), during 2013 the Council undertook specific engagement with adjoining MPAs and other (adjoining) Aggregate Working Parties on the preparation of an Oxfordshire LAA. Individual responses were also received from some other South East MPAs, which had been consulted on the draft LAA through SEEAWP. The responses received are listed in Table 6 (which also records responses following engagement with other bodies and groups).

Table 6: Responses to Engagement on Local Aggregate Assessment 2013

| Mineral Planning Authority | Response |
|---|---|
| Buckinghamshire County Council | Email 30 August 2013 |
| Gloucestershire County Council | Emails 06 August 2013 and 22 November 2013 |
| Warwickshire County Council | Email 31 July 2013 |
| Wiltshire and Swindon Borough Councils | Emails 12 September 2013 and 28 November 2013 |
| Isle of Wight Council | Email 02 July 2013 |
| Kent County Council | Email 08 July 2013 |
| West Sussex County Council | Email 30 August 2013 |
| East of England Aggregate Working Party | Email 09 August 2013 |
| East Midlands Aggregate Working Party | Email 23 September 2013 |
| South West Aggregate Working Party | Emails 19 August 2013 and 20 November 2013 |
| South Oxfordshire District Council | Email 04 October 2013 |
| West Oxfordshire District Council | Email 20 September 2013 |
| Environment Agency | Email/Letter 06 September 2013 |
| Mineral Products Association | 27 August 2013 |
| Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group | Email/Letter 12 November 2013 |
| Oxfordshire Against Gravel Extraction (OXAGE) | Report 03 October 2013 |

- 4.21 In October – November 2014, the County Council undertook a further round of engagement with duty to cooperate bodies on the preparation of the LAA 2014. This included all adjoining and other South East MPAs and certain other relevant MPAs, including through SEEAWP and other AWP. This was mainly done by email but also involved meetings with particular bodies, as listed in Table 7. A full schedule of engagement on the preparation of the LAA 2014 with summaries of the responses received and outcomes is at Appendix 4.
- 4.22 In April 2015 the County Council contact by emailed letter all other MPAs identified in the 2009 Aggregates Monitoring Survey as either having received aggregate from or sent aggregate to Oxfordshire in 2009. In all cases the amounts of aggregate involved were relatively small: less than 40,000 tonnes imported into Oxfordshire; or less than 10,000 tonnes exported from Oxfordshire. This contact sought to secure the agreement of these MPAs to the Council's view that this movement of aggregate is not strategically significant and that minerals supply is not a strategic issue that requires further engagement between the two authorities under the duty to co-operate at this time. In all cases either a response was received agreeing with this or no reply was received within the timescale set, in which case the Council's

letter had stated it would be assumed that the MPA concerned agreed with the Council’s view. The MPAs contacted are listed in Appendix 5, subdivided between those from which Oxfordshire imported aggregate in 2009 and those to which Oxfordshire exported aggregate.

Table 7: Duty to Cooperate Meetings September 2014 – January 2015

| Mineral Planning Authority / Body | Meeting Date |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Bracknell Forest Council Reading Borough Council Slough Borough Council West Berkshire Council Wokingham Borough Council | 08 October 2014 (joint meeting) |
| West Berkshire Council | 07 November 2014 |
| Buckinghamshire County Council | 09 October 2014 |
| South East Aggregate Working Party (SEEAWP) | 27 October 2014 |
| South East Mineral Planning Authorities (Officer Group) | 27 October 2014 |
| Gloucestershire County Council | 22 October 2014 |
| Oxfordshire Growth Board (Executive) | 04 September 2014 |
| Oxfordshire Growth Board (Shadow Board) (including all Oxfordshire Local Authorities) | 12 September 2014 |
| Oxfordshire Planning Policy Officers Group (including all Oxfordshire Local Authorities) | 14 November 2014 |
| Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP) | 06 January 2015 |

Cooperation with adjoining Mineral Planning Authorities

- 4.23 More detail of the more specific liaison and engagement that has taken place with the Mineral Planning Authorities that adjoin Oxfordshire is given in the following paragraphs.

Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)

- 4.24 BCC was represented at the meeting with adjoining authorities held on 27 November 2009 (see meeting note at Appendix 2).
- 4.25 In response to the January/February 2012 invitation to comment on the level of aggregate provision, BCC considered the approach to the provision for aggregate to be unsound, questioning both the methodology and the evidence base. Policy M2 was also considered inflexible as it didn’t allow for future review or updating. BCC was concerned at future pressure for the extraction

of higher levels of aggregate from its area to meet the overall levels of extraction required by the former South East Plan.

- 4.26 A meeting was held with BCC officers of on 25 July 2013, following the withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD-2012, as part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. Progress on and issues involved in the preparation of the two authorities' plans were discussed. OCC explained the methodology used in its draft LAA 2013, being prepared by Atkins. This produced a figure for provision above the 10 year sales average, to compensate for the mothballing of some quarries in recent years. BCC expressed concern that the methodology was statistically unsound and unlikely to adequately provide for maintenance of the existing built fabric as well as future growth; and that a more robust methodology was needed to justify figures that were lower than the South East Plan apportionment for Oxfordshire.
- 4.27 The level of provision in the BCC draft LAA, based on the 10 year sales average, was agreed as appropriate for Buckinghamshire and did not raise any concern for Oxfordshire. It was noted that movements of sand and gravel between the two counties are small but that movements of crushed rock from Oxfordshire to Buckinghamshire appear to be more significant and this could be an issue where cooperation is required. The possible implications of future sand and gravel supply problems in Surrey were discussed but significant movement from Oxfordshire to Surrey seemed unlikely in view of the distances concerned and this would be an issue for SEEAWP to consider. It was agreed that need for further meetings should be considered following exchanges of information and that that the possibility of joint working on evidence bases should be considered.
- 4.28 A further meeting was held with BCC officers on 9 October 2014. The different methodology to be used in the Oxfordshire LAA 2014 (prepared by LUC) was explained. This still sought to compensate for the anomaly in sales caused by mothballing of some of Oxfordshire's sand and gravel quarries and gave provision levels above the 10 year sales average. BCC did not raise any concerns over this approach (and subsequently supported the LAA at the SEEAWP meeting on 27 October 2015). BCC proposed to continue with an LAA based solely on the 10 year sales average. No concerns were raised by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) to this approach. Discussion also took place on inter-county movements of aggregate; movements from Oxfordshire to Buckinghamshire were likely to be the greater but these were unlikely to be significant strategically. There are significant movements of crushed rock into Oxfordshire but these are mainly hard rock moved by rail from Leicestershire and Somerset. Oxfordshire's crushed rock is lower grade but it is likely that limestone from Ardley will supply Buckinghamshire due to its proximity. It was agreed that available data is currently insufficient to decide whether or not movements between the two counties are of strategic importance and that any information that is available should be exchanged.

- 4.29 On 28 May 2015 BCC held another officer meeting, which also involved Northamptonshire County Council. Respective LAAs and related issues of aggregate provision, significant additional demand from housing and projects like HS2 and East West Rail and cross boundary movement were discussed. No concerns were raised about the 2014 LAAs. In the absence of data for 2015, preparation of LAAs for 2015 could not yet commence. OCC re-affirmed that its LAA forecast differed from the others in being higher than the 10 year sales average, to compensate for exceptionally low sales that had resulted from mothballing of quarries and increased imports.

Berkshire Unitary Authorities (BUAs)

- 4.30 The BUAs were represented by the (former) Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit at the meeting with adjoining authorities held on 27 November 2009 (see meeting note at Appendix 2). Although the BUAs have not raised specific concerns about the level of provision being made for the supply of aggregate in Oxfordshire, this matter has been discussed at subsequent meetings arranged by OCC to discuss the emerging plan.
- 4.31 An officer meeting was held between OCC and West Berkshire on 22 June 2012 to discuss progress on preparing local plans and related strategic issues. It was identified that soft sand supply may reduce in West Berkshire due to AONB policy. No specific issues were raised on the level of provision and minerals supply strategy for Oxfordshire in the MWCS-PSD-2012 which had recently been published.
- 4.32 A meeting on 25 July 2013 was attended by four of the six BUAs (Bracknell Forest, Reading, West Berkshire and Wokingham). This following the withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD-2012, and was intended as part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. The approach to Oxfordshire LAA 2013 discussed. Detailed comments were made but the BUAs generally considered the approach to be appropriate for Oxfordshire. It was also acknowledged that Oxfordshire is a major supplier of sand and gravel to Reading (from Caversham) and a policy for further working in this area in the emerging Oxfordshire plan was supported. had, and was unlikely to have, active aggregate workings and was reliant on the local supply from the Caversham area in Oxfordshire. The closure of quarries and lack of further permitted reserves and of operator interest in local resources was identified as an issue in Wokingham. In West Berkshire, resistance to further working of soft sand in the AONB could lead to pressure on neighbouring counties to make up a supply shortfall. It was recognised that the soft sand resource in Oxfordshire is not close to West Berkshire but is not generally subject to high-level planning constraints.

- 4.33 The main minerals issues identified were:
- Continuation of supply from Oxfordshire to Reading and Wokingham; and
 - Future approach to soft sand extraction in AONB in West Berkshire and possible consequent pressure on Oxfordshire to increase supply
- 4.34 A separate meeting was held on 18 September 2013 with the other two BUAs (Slough and Windsor & Maidenhead) but no further strategic minerals issues or concerns emerged.
- 4.35 A further meeting was held on 8 October 2014 and was attended by five of the six BUAs (only Windsor & Maidenhead did not attend). Comments that had been made on the MWLP-CD-2014 were discussed. Future soft sand supply from West Berkshire was again raised as an issue that could impact on Oxfordshire; for the shortfall in West Berkshire to be made up entirely in Oxfordshire would require a significant increase in supply. It was agreed this should be discussed separately by OCC and West Berkshire. Wokingham had raised concern about the impact of proposed further working in the Caversham area but this was also the subject of a planning application which OCC had recently permitted. It was agreed that the issue of funding a third river crossing at Reading would not be resolved through the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
- 4.36 Discussion took place on the revised methodology to be used in the Oxfordshire LAA 2014, which would still produce a figure higher than the 10 year sales average. This was to be considered by SEEAWP on 27 November 2014 and no specific concerns were raised. It was agreed that, apart from the supply from Caversham to Reading, there do not appear to be any significant movements of sand and gravel between Oxfordshire and Berkshire. It is likely that some crushed rock imported by rail into Berkshire is then supplied into Oxfordshire, but it was agreed this is unlikely to be strategically significant.
- 4.37 A separate meeting with West Berkshire Council (WBC) was held on 7 November 2014. WBC had no comments to make on the Oxfordshire LAA 2014. OCC had no concerns about the West Berkshire LAA. The main issue considered was future provision for soft sand in the light of the AONB constraint on resources in West Berkshire. A draft paper prepared by WBC was discussed. No conclusions were reached and it was recognised that this issue needs ongoing consideration and that it is a wider issue involving other counties within the South east and in the South West; and it has been taken up by SEEAWP. No concerns were raised over the emerging policy for soft sand supply in the Oxfordshire MWLP Core Strategy, but it was agreed there should be ongoing discussion between the two authorities.

Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council (WC&SBC)

- 4.38 WC&SBC were invited to but did not attend the meeting with adjoining authorities on 27 November 2009. A meeting with WC&SBC was held on 29 August 2013, following the withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD-2012, as part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. The Oxfordshire LAA 2013 being prepared by Atkins was discussed. It was acknowledged that Gloucestershire CC and the South West AWP had expressed concerns about the approach being used. WC&SBC thought the assessment appeared to be mathematically sound but questioned whether it was sufficiently flexible to deliver what would be required. The WC&SBC LAA was based solely on a 10 year sales average for sand and gravel and had led to a significant drop in the level of provision previously required. OCC did not raise any concerns about this.
- 4.39 It was agreed that movements of aggregate between the two counties were relatively small and not strategically important. However, they could be influenced significantly by strategic decisions taken by the some mineral companies to supply wider areas from particular quarries and to mothball others. Specific sites and their respective reserves were discussed in some detail.
- 4.40 Crushed rock and soft sand resources were also discussed. It was agreed that cross-boundary movements of crushed rock are not of strategic importance are unlikely to become so. Both Wiltshire and Oxfordshire have sizeable soft sand resources but because of their locations there is some movement of sand from Oxfordshire to Wiltshire and Swindon and OCC expect this to continue. WC&SBC raised a possible concern over deliverability of the Oxfordshire minerals strategy if areas for future working are in the control of one company. OCC acknowledged this as an issue for the site allocations stage of the plan. WC&SBC have also questioned the approach to further working in the AONBs being advanced by OCC, as to whether this is overly restrictive in relation to national policy. It was agreed there was no case for formal joint working arrangements but that the need for further, possibly annual meetings should be considered.

Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)

- 4.41 GCC was represented at the meeting with adjoining authorities held on 27 November 2009 (see meeting note at Appendix 2).
- 4.42 An officer meeting was held with GCC on 2 October 2012 to discuss concerns that had been raised on the MWCS-PSD-2012, including the level of provision being made for aggregate supply and the location of proposed sand and gravel working areas and allocation of sites. GCC were concerned that this could lead to pressure to increase provision in Gloucestershire. It was noted

that Gloucestershire was a net exporter to Oxfordshire in 2009, with aggregate being transported long distances, but the Upper Thames area of Gloucestershire and Wiltshire lacks resources for the future, beyond the next round of local plans.

- 4.43 A further meeting was held on 5 July 2013. It was expected that Oxfordshire CC would resolve on 9 July to withdraw the MWCS-PSD-2012 and this meeting formed part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. The Oxfordshire LAA 2013 being prepared by Atkins was discussed; in particular the methodology used to adjust the 10 years sales average to take account of the exceptionally low sales that had resulted from mothballing of some quarries and the consequent increase in imports. GCC questioned the use of population to forecast aggregate demand and suggested housing growth may be a better, but if not totally reliable approach; and thought the methodology needs to be more strongly justified in the report. GCC suggested that an increase in imports of crushed rock by rail into Oxfordshire could reduce the movements of sand and gravel from Gloucestershire. OCC agreed that use of the 10 year sales average seemed a reasonable approach for Gloucestershire. It was agreed that written comments would be made on the two LAAs. It was recognised that the current movement from Gloucestershire to Oxfordshire was strategically significant and would need to be discussed further.
- 4.44 A further meeting was held on 22 October 2014. Objections raised by GCC to MWLP-CD-2012 were discussed, in particular the level of provision made for aggregate minerals; the locational strategy for aggregate minerals; and the production capacity of preferred areas for working. The draft Oxfordshire LAA 2014, produced by LUC, was discussed; this used a revised but still produced a figure higher than the 10 year sales average. GCC thought the approach now being taken appeared to be heading in the right direction, although it would still be for OCC to justify the methodology. GCC agreed to send written comments.
- 4.45 Some significant sites in the Cotswold Water Park area of Gloucestershire have closed or are nearing exhaustion, or now seem unlikely to be brought forward, such that sand and gravel production in the Upper Thames Valley is likely to decline significantly. It was agreed that with the reopening of Sutton Courtenay Quarry, the movement of aggregate from Gloucestershire to Oxfordshire is likely to have declined significantly. The small movements of crushed rock from Gloucestershire to Oxfordshire are not strategically significant.
- 4.46 OCC would now be seeking a better balance of provision between west and south Oxfordshire in the new Minerals and Waste Local Plan. GCC had previously pointed to the potential to use sand and gravel resources in the Clanfield/Bampton area, close to Gloucestershire, but it was likely that

working in this area would continue not to be favoured due to distance from markets and poor infrastructure.

- 4.47 It was agreed there was no case for formal joint working between GCC and OCC and the benefit of a memorandum of understanding was not clear, but that further meetings should be held approximately annually.

Warwickshire County Council (WCC)

- 4.48 WCC was represented at the meeting with adjoining authorities held on 27 November 2009 (see meeting note at Appendix 2). This had not identified any strategic minerals issues between the two authorities and WCC had not raised any objection to subsequent consultations on the emerging new Oxfordshire Plan.
- 4.49 A meeting was held on 10 July 2013, following the withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD-2012, as part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. The Oxfordshire LAA 2013 being prepared by Atkins was discussed; in particular the methodology used to adjust the 10 years sales average to take account of the exceptionally low sales that had resulted from mothballing of some quarries and the consequent increase in imports. WCC agreed to provide comments on the LAA but agreed that there do not appear to be issues of strategic importance between the two counties. This reflects that the areas of sand and gravel extraction in both counties are some distance from the common boundary. It was noted that there are movements of crushed rock from Oxfordshire to Warwickshire.

Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)

- 4.50 NCC were invited to but did not attend the meeting with adjoining authorities on 27 November 2009. However, no strategic minerals issues had not identified between the two authorities at that time and NCC had not raised any objection to subsequent consultations on the emerging new Oxfordshire Plan.
- 4.51 A meeting with NCC was held on 24 July 2013, following the withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD-2012, as part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. The Oxfordshire LAA 2013 being prepared by Atkins was discussed; in particular the methodology used to adjust the 10 years sales average to take account of the exceptionally low sales that had resulted from mothballing of some quarries and the consequent increase in imports. NCC indicated it was unlikely that any issues would be raised on the Oxfordshire LAA. The Northamptonshire LAA was based on the straight 10 year sales average. OCC indicated that this was well justified and it was unlikely that any objection would be raised.

- 4.52 It was noted that movements of sand and gravel between the two counties are very small and that there are small movements of crushed rock from Oxfordshire to Northamptonshire but these are not significant. In view of the current reserves situation and the locations of working areas and resources in the two counties, it was agreed that the present pattern of limited cross-boundary movement is unlikely to change and it is unlikely that issues of strategic importance will be raised.
- 4.53 NCC were also involved in the meeting with Buckinghamshire CC on 28 May 2015 (see paragraph 4.29 above).

Cooperation with other South East Mineral Planning Authorities

- 4.54 Consultation on MPS-CD-2012 had resulted in objection from one other MPA – Surrey County Council.

Surrey County Council (SCC)

- 4.55 In its response to the MPS-CD-2011, SCC expressed concern that the proposed level of supply for aggregates was below the sub-regional apportionment for Oxfordshire in the South East Plan Policy M3 and the Proposed Changes to it. SCC re-iterated this concern in February 2012 in a response to OCC, that the Plan should make an increased contribution to the region's needs. SCC carried forward its objection to the provision for supply for aggregates in representations on the MWCS-PSD-2012.
- 4.56 An officer meeting was held with SCC on 5 July 2013, which was also attended by Hampshire County Council (HCC). It was expected that Oxfordshire CC would resolve on 9 July to withdraw the MWCS-PSD-2012 and this meeting formed part of work at that time to inform preparation of a new plan. The Oxfordshire LAA 2013 being prepared by Atkins was discussed; in particular the methodology used to adjust the 10 years sales average to take account of the exceptionally low sales that had resulted from mothballing of some quarries and the consequent increase in imports. The draft LAA had been considered at the SEEAWP meeting on 3 July and had generally been well received. SCC and HCC both agreed to provide comments but SCC indicated that it would review its earlier objection to the level of provision made in the MWCS-PSD-2012 in the light of the changed circumstances.
- 4.57 The potential for Oxfordshire to supply markets in Hampshire and Surrey was discussed, given that current movement of aggregates between the areas were not significant. It was agreed that the distances that sand and gravel is transported may increase in future years as production areas decreased in size and number. OCC acknowledged that the Caversham area might be capable of supplying Surrey but in practice the area was more likely continue

to provide for the needs of the Reading area. HCC saw a possibility of Oxfordshire supplying sand and gravel to parts of Hampshire. It was agreed there was no need for formal joint working arrangements or regular meetings but that mineral movements should continue to be monitored and specific meetings arranged should the need arise.

Outcome of cooperation with Mineral Planning Authorities

- 4.58 The main focus of the Council's cooperation with other MPAs, though both engagement on an individual basis and through SEEAWP or other Aggregate Working Parties, has been the Local Aggregate Assessment for Oxfordshire. The Council has taken the views of other MPAs and the AWP's into account, along with the views of other duty to cooperate bodies and other groups, in developing the different iterations of the LAA in 2011, 2013 and 2014, and also in 2015. This has led to an Oxfordshire LAA (the LAA 2014) which has wide support. MPAs and AWP's which had objections to or concerns over earlier versions of the LAA and the plan, including Buckinghamshire, Gloucestershire and Surrey County Councils, now support the LA 2014 and have raised no objections to the approach to and policies for provision for aggregate supply in the published MWLP-PSD-2015.
- 4.59 Likewise, where previously there were concerns about the spatial approach to provision for mineral working, e.g from Gloucestershire and Surrey County Councils and some of the Berkshire Unitary Authorities, there is also now a general acceptance of the Council's approach in the MWLP-PSD-2015. This includes both the two-stage approach to identifying areas for working, of strategic resource areas in the Core Strategy and sites in the Site Allocations Document, and the spatial distribution of provision within the county. There are some ongoing concerns around provision for soft sand and policy on mineral working within AONBs and these will be picked up in on-going engagement, in particular in relation to preparation of the Site Allocations Document.
- 4.60 Engagement with more distant MPAs which export hard crushed rock to Oxfordshire (in particular by rail from Leicestershire and Somerset) has established that these counties have the capability to supply Oxfordshire throughout the plan period and lends support to policy M6 on the provision and safeguarding of aggregate rail depots.

5. Cooperation with Waste Planning Authorities (WPAs) on Strategic Waste Planning Issues

South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG)

- 5.1 SEWPAG is a voluntary, subscription-based technical group comprising officer representatives from the waste planning authorities in the South East the Environment Agency; representatives from the waste industry and the environmental sector also sometimes attend meetings. It has evolved from the South East Regional Technical Advisory Body (SERTAB), which was set up in accordance with previous government policy on waste planning, related to the former regional planning system. It provides an opportunity for member authorities to share information, discuss strategic cross-boundary and other common issues, review emerging waste plans within the South East and consider the impact of emerging waste management policies and decisions in adjoining areas – in particular London. Oxfordshire is a member of SEWPAG and regularly attends meetings, which usually take place quarterly.
- 5.2 Progress on preparation of Oxfordshire’s Minerals and Waste Plan is regularly reported at SEWPAG meetings, and notable discussions took place at the meetings of 29 March 2012, 5 July 2012, 18 October 2012, 22 April 2013. At the meeting on 31 January 2014 OCC confirmed that a new plan was being prepared along with a new Waste Needs Assessment (with appropriate provision for waste from outside Oxfordshire, particularly London). There was support for the fact the Plan would now consist of two parts – to include site allocations. SEWPAG has played an important role in helping to shape the policies included in the plan that address the strategic issues identified (paragraph 2.6 above).

Issue 1 – Waste to be managed

- 5.3 SEWPAG is close to completing a working model to help with forecasting needs at a sub-regional (county) level. Previous models have also helped in identifying data on waste arisings and forecasts, existing waste management capacity and additional capacity requirements. These have, in particular, helped inform the waste forecasts used in the plan although OCC has generally provided its own forecasts and sought advice from SEWPAG on their voracity.
- 5.4 Consideration of how much of the waste likely to be produced can be managed in Oxfordshire has been assisted by the recent development of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the SEWPAG constituent authorities. This is at Appendix 5. With only one exception, the MoU has been signed by all constituent authorities. The MoU includes an overall aspiration towards net self-sufficiency in the management of waste by the constituent authorities but it leaves open the potential for separate agreement to be

reached by individual authorities where the strategic needs of a particular authority may need to be met by another. This has helped in discussions between OCC and other authorities (below) on the accommodation of needs that cannot be met in the authority of origin. The MoU confirms that authorities should aim for net self-sufficiency in meeting their own needs for municipal waste, commercial and industrial waste and construction, demolition and excavation waste (the principal waste streams). This is reflected in the policy approach (policy W1) taken in the Plan with more specialist waste needs being accommodated as far as possible (policy W7 and W9).

Issue 2 – How to deal with waste that cannot be accommodated in Oxfordshire

5.5 SEWPAG has assisted by setting thresholds to help decide where movements of waste across local authority boundaries may be of strategic importance. At the meeting on 31 January 2014 OCC tabled a paper on the number of authorities that OCC may need to engage with, depending on the threshold that might be adopted for strategic relevance. At the meeting on 10 April 2014 SEWPAG adopted thresholds for use by all authorities, as shown in Table 8. This confirms that movements below the threshold levels need not be considered as being of strategic significance. OCC undertook a round of DtC engagement in spring / summer 2014 using these thresholds.

Table 8: Thresholds to help determine movements of strategic importance

| Waste type | Movement (tonnes per annum) |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Non-hazardous | 5,000 |
| Inert | 10,000 |
| Hazardous | 100 |

5.6 Although there are currently movements of the principal waste streams from Oxfordshire to other areas that exceed these thresholds, engagement with the authorities concerned has not identified a need for special working arrangements as OCC plans to provide capacity equivalent to the amounts of waste to be generated. Cross boundary movements of waste will still occur and this is recognised by the MoU in its emphasis on the concept of net self-sufficiency. Some specialist waste needs will need to be met by other authorities, in some cases outside the south east. Direct engagement has taken place with relevant authorities (below).

Issue 3 – Waste imports

- 5.7 Oxfordshire’s approach to the management of waste from outside Oxfordshire has been discussed on several occasions. The approach taken to landfill has generally been supported, but comment has been made on the approach to the treatment of residual non-hazardous waste. This has also been reflected in separate discussions with individual authorities and the approach has been refined throughout plan preparation. OCC has been consistent in accepting the disposal of waste from other areas in existing landfill. The policy initially sought to husband existing resources to assist in making the best use of the resource, in line with former regional policy, but market forces have changed as a new treatment plant have opened in and around Oxfordshire. OCC reported a need to change its approach, to drop the requirement for husbanding of existing landfill capacity (policy W6), to SEWPAG and after discussion (10 July 2014) this was generally accepted and supported.
- 5.8 SEWPAG has proved to be a valuable forum for discussing the approach to be taken to London waste, particularly in the earlier stages of plan preparation when engagement with the London authorities was proving more difficult. Through the involvement of SEWPAG, engagement with London authorities has become more effective (see also below). SEWPAG has recently made representations on the North London Plan and the Further Alterations to the London Plan. SEWPAG has similarly helped in liaison with the Berkshire Unitary Authorities, some of which acknowledge that they are unlikely to be able to be net self-sufficient in meeting waste needs and will be reliant for some aspects of waste management (in particular disposal of non-hazardous waste).

Issue 4 – broad locational strategy for waste facilities

- 5.9 OCC previously put forward a locational strategy based on safeguarding existing waste sites and meeting additional needs through sites delivered through criteria based policy, including that sites be located in or close to main towns. Comments were received on the need for a more proactive approach and to identify specific sites. The Council has taken these comments into account and now proposes to prepare a two part plan, with sites allocated in a part 2 document. This change has been welcomed. The broad locational strategy has not changed and has also been generally supported.
- 5.10 OCC has raised the difficulty of reconciling the spatial strategy with meeting the waste management needs of Oxford, given that no sites have come forward for waste development within the city but proposals have been put forward for sites close to the City but in the Green Belt. The locational strategy previously provided the possibility of development on suitable sites in the Green Belt, as government policy allowed for waste needs to be considered in special circumstances. The new national planning policy for waste seems to

take a stronger stance on protecting Green Belt from inappropriate development, although discussion at SEWPAG initially suggested that it brought about little change to the previous approach. OCC was not persuaded of this and informed SEWPAG in Jan 2015 that the plan's policy on waste facilities in Green Belt was being tightened: this approach was subsequently supported by the dismissal of an appeal for a waste transfer facility on a site close to Oxford in the Green Belt (also reported to SEWPAG).

Local Government Association Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum (NuLeAF)

- 5.11 NuLeAF is a voluntary, subscription-based grouping of waste planning authorities with a common interest in the future management of radioactive waste arising from decommissioning of nuclear facilities. A Steering Group of officers and councillors meets quarterly as does a Radioactive Waste Planning Group (RWPG) comprised of officers. Ad hoc meetings are also arranged to bring together representatives from waste planning authorities, the nuclear industry, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, Environment Agency and other regulators. As a full member OCC is a regular contributor to and attendee at meetings of RWPG and also attends some Steering Group meetings.
- 5.12 Oxfordshire has two nuclear research establishments (Culham and Harwell) that generate or have produced radioactive waste that requires management. RWPG meetings provide regular opportunity to discuss strategic radioactive waste management issues and the preparation of waste plans and policies for nuclear waste. Membership of NuLeAF has enabled discussion with authorities that may be affected by or have interests in the management of nuclear waste arising at Culham and Harwell – in particular Northamptonshire, Dorset and Cumbria County Councils. It has proved to be a valuable forum for developing plan policy W9 (radioactive waste) given that Oxfordshire is currently reliant on other areas to help manage and dispose of this form of waste (see issue 2).
- 5.13 OCC has reported the plan's approach to radioactive waste at each stage and had dialogue with the Executive Director of NuLeAF on the approach to low level radioactive waste (LLW) and interim level radioactive waste (ILW). RWPG agendas now include a regular item on DtC providing opportunity to raise relevant issues for discussion. NuLeAF 's guidance has helped in improving policy W9, which initially aimed to see waste disposed in Oxfordshire only if there were no other facilities available elsewhere. Discussion at RWPG has been instrumental in developing the policy approach now proposed (policy W9), which allows for the development of facilities provided they would help manage Oxfordshire's waste but which also allows for disposal of low level waste from elsewhere where this can be justified as the best option.

Identification of Waste Planning Authorities relevant to Oxfordshire

- 5.14 OCC has had direct discussion on the emerging plan with various other WPAs who have responded to consultation on its draft policies; this included an inaugural meeting with all adjoining WPAs on 27 November 2009 to discuss current levels of cross-boundary movement and the potential for future strategic flows (Appendix 2). In 2014-2015 a focussed liaison exercise sought to identify areas from which waste was sent to Oxfordshire for management, or to which waste from Oxfordshire was sent for management. This was with a view to ensuring that strategic issues 2 and 3 were addressed.
- 5.15 All WPAs to which Oxfordshire exported waste or from which waste was imported into Oxfordshire in 2011 or 2012 were contacted. Over the course of this exercise data for 2013 was released by the Environment Agency and this was also introduced into any dialogue that developed. During 2011 and 2012, movements of waste into and out of Oxfordshire were recorded from/to 183 WPAs. Many of these movements involved relatively small amounts of waste which did not appear to be of strategic importance. The thresholds adopted by SEWPAG in April 2014 (Table 8) were used to determine whether movements may be considered of strategic importance and the type of communication to be sent to each authority.

Table 9: Number of WPAs sending waste to or receiving waste from Oxfordshire in 2011 & 2012

| Waste | Strategic Movements | | | Non-strategic movements | | | All* |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------------|---------------|-----|------|
| | Inert/C+D | Hhold/Ind/Com | Haz | Inert/C+D | Hhold/Ind/Com | Haz | |
| Imported (2011) | 10 | 11 | 15 | 23 | 69 | 117 | 140 |
| Exported (2011) | 7 | 12 | 28 | 25 | 57 | 53 | 171 |
| Imported (2012) | 8 | 13 | 12 | 25 | 57 | 89 | 115 |
| Exported (2012) | 6 | 15 | 32 | 38 | 61 | 49 | 170 |

* Many authorities sent or received more than one type of waste to/from Oxfordshire

- 5.16 Where movements fell below the SEWPAG threshold, none of the WPAs concerned disagreed with the Council's view that these are not movements of strategic significance and that further engagement was not required at the current time but should be over a longer timescale. Dialogue with those authorities (57) where movements fell *above* these thresholds concentrated on the following issues:
- Verification of the relevant data;
 - Whether any movement(s) is of strategic importance;
 - Whether the trend is likely to continue;

- Whether there is scope to reduce the amounts of waste concerned;
 - If so, how this might be achieved (for example any facilities planned to add to the capacity available locally);
 - If not, whether there are any reasons (e.g. short term planning permission) why the movements could not continue.
- 5.17 Meetings were arranged with adjoining authorities (see below), all of whom either sent waste to or received waste from Oxfordshire at levels above the SEWPAG thresholds and which were potentially of strategic importance. In other cases communication was by email/letter and/or telephone. OCC provided clarification on the planned lifetime of various facilities serving wide catchments, including Ardley landfill, Finmere landfill, Sutton Courtenay landfill, Dix Pit landfill, Shellingford Quarry landfill, Cassington AD, Agrivert AD, Ewelme hazardous waste recycling, Worsham Tyre Recycling and ASM auto recycling. This alerted many authorities to the fact that current disposal routes to landfill were only short term.
- 5.18 Sites in other areas and to which Oxfordshire sends notable tonnages of wastes have also been discussed in detail. These include Shotton Paper Mill (Flintshire), Transport Avenue Transfer Station (West London), East Northants Resource Management Facility (Northamptonshire), Billingham Treatment Plant (Suffolk), Sims Metals, Dunton Recycling Centre, Cross Hands Quarry (Warwickshire), Poundbottom Landfill, Parkgate Farm (Wiltshire) and Star Works landfill site (Wokingham). Whilst it is hoped that movements to such distant facilities can be reduced by the Plan's policies on net self-sufficiency, it has also been established that in most cases there is no practical reason why movements should not continue if required.
- 5.19 A particular example involves the movement of approximately 12,000 tonnes of HIC wastes to the Shotton Paper Mill in Flintshire. This facility is one of the UK's largest paper mills and takes waste from the entire country and can accept paper which might be contaminated with other wastes. By taking in this contaminated paper feedstock the practice of either using contaminated paper as feedstock for incineration or export to destinations such as China has significantly reduced, and more of the paper consumed in the UK is able to be recycled. It is almost certain that most of the waste that travels to this facility from Oxfordshire will already have been separated through transfer or pre-treatment at a materials recycling facility locally.
- 5.20 Discussion with all of the authorities included consideration of the need for joint plan making arrangements or formal working arrangements through a mechanism such as a specific memorandum of understanding. No such needs were identified. In the case of adjoining authorities it was agreed that the frequency of further exchanges will be determined by the complexity of the issue(s) (see below). With most of the other authorities it has been agreed

that tonnages be reviewed on an annual basis so that any significant changes can be discussed as necessary.

- 5.21 The exercise has helped to reinforce the view that specialist wastes (hazardous and radioactive) travel much longer distances and that a different policy approach to these wastes is required, as the net self-sufficiency approach is generally not appropriate in these cases (policy W7 and W9).

Cooperation with adjoining Waste Planning Authorities

Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC)

- 5.22 BCC expressed concern at the approach taken to imported waste in the WPS-CD-2011. Although there was support for Oxfordshire aiming to take declining amounts of waste from London, it was suggested that target amounts of waste should be included in the policy and that there should be better engagement with the London Authorities to identify the amounts of waste likely to be involved. It was also considered there was a flaw in the plan in that it provided for no contingency in the event that the Ardley EfW plant, on which meeting the plan's residual waste and landfill targets relied, was not built. Although no specific meeting took place at this stage, joint discussion on the approach to London waste was taking place at meetings of SEWPAG.
- 5.23 BCC made no comment on the MWCS-PSD-2012, but a meeting was arranged with BCC on 25 July 2013 to discuss the withdrawal of that document and OCC's intentions regarding the preparation of a new plan. Waste data provided by OCC indicated that movements between the two areas were currently in balance and did not merit any special plan making arrangements.
- 5.24 A further meeting was held on 9 October 2014. It was noted that BCC had not made comment on MWLP-CD-2014. The most recent data showed that movements of waste were greater from Oxfordshire to Buckinghamshire. Although the differences were not significant the movements were above SEWPAG thresholds and of potential strategic importance. It was agreed that respective plans should ensure that they provide for sufficient capacity as both areas are planning for net-self-sufficiency in the principal waste streams. It was noted that there is still landfill space in both areas and both are making provision for management of residual non-hazardous waste at large EFW facilities. The likelihood was that the scale of cross-boundary movement would reduce rather than increase. It was noted that, with the exception of residual waste treatment facilities, OCC policies did not impose a burden of need on waste recovery facilities: BCC indicated they may take a more restrictive approach.

Berkshire Unitary Authorities

- 5.25 In 2008 OCC expressed concern at the provision made for the management of residual waste in the Berkshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (since withdrawn). Movements of waste from Berkshire into Oxfordshire for disposal in landfill has increased in recent years and earlier discussion with the former Joint Strategic Planning Unit for Berkshire (now disbanded) suggested these movements were likely to continue.
- 5.26 This issue was thus identified as a matter to be considered by the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan at an early stage. The Berkshire Unitary Authorities were provided with OCC's estimates of imported waste in the Waste Needs Assessment 2011 and of the approach to waste imports in the WPS-CD. Reading Borough Council advised it had no comment on the strategy; West Berkshire Council advised that the amount of waste exported to Oxfordshire should decline over the plan period, consistent with the draft strategy. No other comments were received.
- 5.27 The Berkshire Unitary Authorities were notified of a review of the rate at which waste might be imported to Oxfordshire in February 2012. Concerns were received from the Re3 authorities (Wokingham Borough, Reading Borough and Bracknell Forest Councils), the Royal Borough of Maidenhead and Windsor and West Berkshire Councils. Meetings were held with the various authorities to discuss an intended policy approach. Of these authorities, only Wokingham Borough Council made representation on the approach to waste imports (then policy W2) put forward in the MWCS-PSD-2012.
- 5.28 On 25 July 2013, OCC met four of the Berkshire Unitary Authorities (Windsor and Maidenhead and Slough Borough Council did not attend) to discuss the new 2 part plan that was to be prepared following withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD. It was agreed that the central Berkshire (Re3) authorities were unlikely to be able to achieve net self-sufficiency and that the disposal of their waste in Oxfordshire was a strategic issue (a long term contract having been entered). West Berkshire aimed to be net self-sufficient although planned capacity was unlikely to be able to provide for long term disposal. Although OCC believed the previous policy approach adequately catered for Berkshire needs it was agreed to review this for clarity.
- 5.29 Wokingham Borough Council objected further to the policy approach to imported waste put forward in the MWLP-CD-2014. West Berkshire also made comment but this was not considered to amount to an objection. A further meeting was held on 8 October 2014 with a view to reaching an agreed position in relation to the emerging Oxfordshire plan. It was confirmed that, as expected, exports of waste from West Berkshire to Oxfordshire had dropped significantly as a result of a new municipal waste contract involving facilities in Hampshire rather than Oxfordshire. Movements of waste between

the authority areas in both directions exceeded SEWPAG thresholds but with the exception of disposals to Oxfordshire landfill were not considered to be of strategic importance. Waste continued to be received from central Berkshire (Re3) authorities as expected and these movements were considered to be of strategic importance.

- 5.30 A revised draft set of waste policies was circulated and explained at the meeting and comment invited subsequently. A number of scenarios had also been prepared to estimate the expected capacity of Oxfordshire's landfills to accommodate other areas' waste needs – including specific forecasts previously made available by the Re3 authorities - and these were also made available. Comments were made by West Berkshire and have been taken into account in developing the policies now included in the MWLP-PSD-2012. No other comments were made on the draft policies, but in subsequent correspondence the Re3 authorities queried the data that had been sent separately on waste movements between the two areas in 2011 and 2012. Discussion also took place with Windsor and Maidenhead on these figures but no serious issues were identified that had not been previously addressed.
- 5.31 A further meeting was held with the Re3 authorities on 24 June 2015 to seek resolution of outstanding issues. OCC explained that former policy W2 (waste imports) had now been absorbed into two separate policies (policies W3 and W6), but the approach to imports remained unchanged. Policy W6 (landfill) now made specific reference to waste from Berkshire being accepted at existing landfills (for the avoidance of doubt). It was agreed that confusion had arisen over data on cross boundary movements because the Re3 figures were solely for municipal waste, whereas the OCC data was for all waste streams. Movement of waste from Re3 to Oxfordshire remained an issue of strategic importance. OCC believed this had been adequately catered for in policies W3 and W6. Wokingham had not put forward an alternative policy to adequately address the objection previously raised. It was noted that movement of hazardous waste from Oxfordshire to Wokingham currently exceeds the SEWPAG threshold (albeit marginally) and that this is capable of being accommodated by the facility concerned for the foreseeable future.

Wiltshire Council and Swindon Borough Council (WC&SBC)

- 5.32 Movements of waste between the two areas are roughly in balance and of the nature that would be expected between neighbouring areas with facilities close to the common boundary. Both areas are planning for net self-sufficiency in the principal waste streams and for WC&SBC also hazardous waste. A meeting was held on 29 August 2013 to discuss OCC's planned approach to waste in the new Local Plan. No issues emerged that required further consideration. Because of the tendency for hazardous waste to move longer distances it was agreed that it would be appropriate to keep a watch on

movements between the two areas but that no special arrangements were required.

Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)

- 5.33 GCC has previously objected to the approach put forward in the MWCS-PSD-2012 to the management of hazardous waste, believing this to be over-reliant on waste management facilities in other areas, the future of which cannot be guaranteed (in particular a facility in Gloucestershire). At a meeting on 2 October 2012 OCC explained how the policy on hazardous waste (then policy W8) was intended to apply. At this meeting other work undertaken by OCC was discussed, including an exercise with operators of existing non-hazardous landfills in Oxfordshire designed to establish whether there was scope for their adaption to take hazardous or low level radioactive waste. GCC drew attention to its recently adopted policy on hazardous waste.
- 5.34 A further meeting was held on 5 July 2013, when the withdrawal of the MWCS-PSD-2012 was imminent and OCC was expected to commence work on the new plan. Discussion took place on figures compiled by OCC on waste movements between the two areas for 2011. Although there was movement from Oxfordshire above the SEWPAG threshold, this appeared to be inert waste and was considered unlikely to be part of a regular pattern. The main conurbations in both counties are not near the common boundary and movements of waste between each were unlikely to be significant in future. There was uncertainty over the future of a hazardous waste facility in Gloucestershire to which Oxfordshire might send the APC residues from the Ardley EFW plant (when built). (This was the subject of legal challenge.) It was agreed there was no need for joint working arrangements.
- 5.35 A further meeting took place on 22 October 2014. GCC had made no adverse comment on the waste policies in the MWLP-CD and changes to the hazardous waste policy appeared to address GCC's earlier comments. Discussion therefore focussed on data compiled by OCC on waste movements between the two areas for 2011 and 2012. It was agreed that movement of HIC waste from Oxfordshire to Gloucestershire were exaggerated due to a key Oxfordshire facility (Showell Farm) being incorrectly listed as being located in Gloucestershire; the Environment Agency had previously been asked to correct this. Movements of hazardous waste were slightly above SEWPAG thresholds: although not a matter of strategic concern, discussion took place on the facilities receiving waste and their respective planning status. The future of the Wingmore Farm hazardous waste facility in Gloucestershire was now more certain and the legal challenge had been rejected. No new plan issues were identified. Consideration was given to the possibility of GCC waste going to the Ardley facility in Oxfordshire if the Javelin Park EFW facility in Gloucestershire was not built but it was

recognised that new facilities at Avonmouth would be closer to Gloucestershire waste arisings if an out of county solution was ever required.

Warwickshire County Council (WCC)

- 5.36 Movements of waste between the two areas are not significant and are unlikely to change materially in the plan period. WCC has not made comment on the plan's emerging waste policies. A meeting was held on 10 July 2013 to discuss the approach likely to be taken in the new Local Plan and no issues emerged that required further consideration.

Northamptonshire County Council (NCC)

- 5.37 NCC has previously expressed concern over Oxfordshire's policy for the management of hazardous and radioactive wastes, believing the approach first put forward in WPS-CD-2011 to be insular and confusing (at that stage radioactive waste was also included in the policy on hazardous waste). In the preparation of the MWCS-PSD-2012, discussion took place on the re-wording of these policies and at a meeting on 24 July 2013 this dialogue continued. OCC confirmed the intention to be net self-sufficient in the major waste streams, but not for hazardous or low level radioactive waste as this was not considered to be a deliverable option. It has been agreed that this is a strategic issue: there are no other strategic waste issues between the two authorities.
- 5.38 NCC confirmed that it had no issue with the approach to hazardous and radioactive waste as previously amended, subject to it being made clearer that the former policy W8 covered both hazardous and low level radioactive waste (if this was still intended). In consultation on the MWLP-CD-2014, NCC requested that the positive tone of Policy W8 (hazardous waste) be carried over to Policy W9 (radioactive waste). OCC has changed the approach to radioactive waste (see paragraphs on NuLeAF above) and has removed any reference to radioactive waste in the policy on hazardous waste, to provide clear distinction between the two policies for these different waste streams. The approach to planning for radioactive waste is now set out entirely in a single policy (policy W9): although this provides for the development of facilities to manage LLW waste in Oxfordshire, if required, it is recognised that the likelihood is that LLW waste from Oxfordshire will continue to be managed in Northamptonshire, at a facility that has permission to operate to 2026.
- 5.39 At a meeting on 28 May 2015, which also included Buckinghamshire CC, NCC's partial review of a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan was discussed together with progress on the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plan. No new issues were raised.

Cooperation with other relevant Waste Planning Authorities

Surrey County Council (SCC)

- 5.40 SCC commented that the WPS-CD-2011 was too insular in its approach to hazardous waste (former policy W8) and not sufficiently flexible in its approach to the treatment of residual waste from other areas (former policy W2). Discussion took place on how these policies might be revised and this informed the subsequent development of these policies. It was agreed that movements of waste between the two areas were low.
- 5.41 A meeting was held on 5 July 2013, also attended by Hampshire County Council, at which OCC's approach to planning for waste was discussed in the light of the expected withdrawal of MWCS-PSD-2012 and commencement of a new plan. The concept of net self-sufficiency and husbanding of key landfill sites was discussed along with emerging plans for waste treatment facilities, including Ardley. OCC confirmed that there appeared to be no demand for further (new) landfill capacity within Oxfordshire, with no indication that operators are looking to open new sites or extend the life of existing facilities. It was agreed that a husbanding policy may prove difficult to implement and that a change to policy W6 (landfill) to reflect this would be justified. SCC had objected to the application of a needs test for additional residual waste treatment capacity and a presumption against such plant taking significant quantities of waste from other areas. Consideration of this has informed the revision of policy W4 (now policy W3), to accord with government policy.
- 5.42 In comment on the MWLP-CD-2014, SCC remained concerned that the Part 1 Plan does not identify specific sites and that waste management elsewhere, including in the north and north-west of Surrey, may have to take up any shortfall. In subsequent correspondence with SCC it was agreed that the nature of movements of waste between the two areas was not of strategic importance and that further dialogue was not required.

London

- 5.43 Oxfordshire has historically received significant volumes of waste from London (in particular West London) for disposal in landfill and has therefore sought to engage in plan preparation with the London Waste Partnerships (see Table 10) and the Mayor of London over this strategic issue – in particular what provision should be made for such waste in the future.
- 5.44 The London Waste Planning Partnerships and the Mayor of London were consulted on the Waste Needs Assessment (May 2011) and the WPS-CD-2011. Prior to publication of the MWCS-PSD-2012 they were also invited to comment on a paper that was to inform a revised Waste Needs Assessment and which reviewed the amount of waste that might be exported from London for disposal. North London Waste Partnership (NLWP) commented that it did

not understand the basis for the figures produced and that they did not appear to have any basis from published information in the London Plan.

Table 10: London Waste Planning Areas/Partnerships

| |
|-------------------------|
| North London Waste Plan |
| West London Waste Plan |
| East London Waste Plan |
| South London Waste Plan |
| City of London |

Not all of the London Boroughs are members of a Waste Partnership

- 5.45 The West London Waste Planning Partnership (WLWP) subsequently commented that the approach being taken to London waste in the MWCS-PSD was consistent with its emerging waste planning policies. The South London Planning Partnership (SLPP) also advised that the aim to reduce the amount of waste exported from London was acceptable, and that it hoped to be self-sufficient in managing its own waste by 2021. No representations were received from other London Waste Planning Partnerships or the Mayor of London.
- 5.46 In comment on the MWLP-CD-2014, WLWP advised that the approach to London waste was consistent with the published West London Waste Local Plan and supported the fact that the draft plan recognised the need for capacity for the disposal of London waste. Former policy W8 (hazardous waste) was also supported as it did not rule out the possibility of capacity being provided that may meet a need for waste arising beyond the Plan area.
- 5.47 The NLWP also made comment and supported the provision made for waste coming to Oxfordshire from London. The North London Boroughs will be seeking to reduce waste going to landfill but North London has no landfill sites and hence Oxfordshire's policy to continue to manage waste from outside the county was welcomed. Comment was also made on the need to provide a definition for self-sufficiency (and this has been recognised in the published plan).
- 5.48 No comments on the MWLP-CD-2014 were received from the South London Waste Plan or the East London Waste Plan. However, the Mayor of London welcomed continued engagement as London moves to self-sufficiency and asked that consideration be given to the implications of lower waste exports from London for on-going policy development. The City of London similarly supported the approach being taken to London waste.

- 5.49 Discussion with WLWP has helped to identify that Oxfordshire may expect to receive much less waste from London following a change to the West London municipal waste disposal contract. Liaison has taken place on the volumes of waste recently transferred with a view to identifying whether or not this ceases to be a strategic issue. OCC has also commented (September 2012) on the extent to which the West London Waste Plan made provision for its future net self-sufficiency and it is particularly helpful that a representative from WLWP has attended meetings of SEWPAG to inform discussion on London waste.
- 5.50 Comments by the NLWP (above) have been particularly helpful in identifying how the plan might best make provision for London waste. Projections in the Waste Needs Assessment have been included that take account of the adopted Further Alterations to the London Plan and recognise the difficulties of providing clear estimates of the amounts of waste likely to need to be accommodated in Oxfordshire, particularly following the change in the West London municipal waste disposal contract. Although some have commented that target amounts should be included in policy to confirm the intention to receive declining amounts of waste from London, this has not been taken up and indeed no suggestion has been made by any of the London authorities. This would not be realistic. Instead, scenarios have been produced that show how much provision could be made for London waste in Oxfordshire landfill once the known needs of Oxfordshire and Berkshire have been taken into account. The capacity remaining is not insignificant but it remains to be seen whether this will be used (historically East London waste has travelled to Essex and East Anglia and movements from North London to Oxfordshire have been very low).

Dorset County Council (DCC)

- 5.51 Discussion with RSRL (now Magnox Ltd) indicated that there would be a need for additional facilities for the future management of intermediate level radioactive waste (ILW) at Harwell and that there may be a need to consider accommodating waste from other sites – in particular from Winfrith (Dorset). Discussion has taken place with DCC, both through the NuLeAF Radioactive Waste Planning Group and separately, on the approach that OCC should take on management of radioactive waste (policy W9). DCC initially expressed concern at the approach taken in the WPS-CD-2011. In the light of these concerns, the policy was subsequently amended and DCC has been supportive of the approach subsequently.

Cumbria County Council (CCC)

- 5.52 Some low level radioactive waste from Oxfordshire is taken to the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) near Drigg in Cumbria and this is likely to continue. More recently transfer of higher level radioactive wastes have occurred from Harwell to Sellafield. OCC has engaged with CCC both through the NuLeAF

Radioactive Waste Planning Group and separately. CCC has not raised concern to the continued movement of waste to the LLWR which is a national facility but concern was initially raised to OCC's approach to the management of low level radioactive waste that does not need to go to LLWR (as set out in WPS-CD-2011). In the light of this, Policies W8 and W9 were reconsidered and additional supporting text was drafted with a view to reaching agreement with CCC prior to further formal consultation. Despite this CCC maintained an objection to MWCS-PSD-2012 (including concern that the DtC obligation had not been met).

- 5.53 After considering the comments made, further changes were made to policy W9 in the MWLP-CD-2014. CCC have now welcomed the overall approach taken in the plan with regard to radioactive waste, both in Policy W9 and the explanatory text. Engagement with CCC has helped in leading to a more positive policy approach to the management of radioactive waste in Oxfordshire (see also Environment Agency below).

6. Cooperation with District Councils

- 6.1 Liaison with the District Councils has been continuous throughout the plan preparation process, both through meetings and written communication. This has confirmed a need for engagement on all of the strategic issues identified for both minerals and waste but in particular on the spatial strategies developed for these two forms of development. Following the introduction of the Duty to Cooperate, the five Oxfordshire District Councils and the County Council have signed up to a joint Oxfordshire Statement of Cooperation.
- 6.2 Officer-level meetings have taken place from time to time with individual districts to discuss specific issues. These have included meetings with Cherwell District Council on the residual waste treatment facility now developed at Ardley; with Oxford City Council on the scarcity of locations for waste management in the city and possible opportunities arising from development of the Oxford Core Strategy and the Housing and Site Allocations Plan; and with South Oxfordshire, Vale of White Horse and West Oxfordshire District Councils on the provision to be made for sand and gravel extraction and the balance of provision to be made in each area of the county.
- 6.3 The district councils have been consulted on draft strategy documents and have also been involved in more focussed informal consultation exercises in the earlier stages of plan preparation, including a series of meetings of a stakeholder forum held between 2005 and 2007. Views expressed on the MWLP-CD-2014 indicated that it was not possible to reach agreement on all issues but the dialogue that has taken place has helped to provide better understanding of relevant issues and to resolve some matters of concern. Of particular note are comments made on the MWCS-CD-2014 that welcomed the cooperation that has taken place but regretted that the plan did not intend to deliver specific sites for development. Although others also made this criticism, these comments have been influential in the change of approach to a two-stage plan, with provision for specific sites to be allocated in a Part 2 document.
- 6.4 The former **Oxfordshire Spatial Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP)** was a member-level forum for liaison on spatial planning, economic development, housing, transport, and infrastructure issues across Oxfordshire. SPIP prepared the Oxfordshire Local Investment Plan, which set out a shared vision and priorities for delivering housing growth, economic development, regeneration, and infrastructure; and integrated district local plans with other strategies, including those prepared by OCC, the Highways Agency, Network Rail, the Environment Agency and the Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust. Aggregates supply and waste management were identified as strategic issues for Oxfordshire at a SPIP workshop on Duty to Cooperate held on 29 October 2012.

- 6.5 SPIP has been superseded by the **Oxfordshire Growth Board**. This is a Joint Statutory Committee of the six councils of Oxfordshire charged with the delivery of projects that the councils are seeking to deliver collaboratively, including projects agreed in the City Deal and Local Growth Deals that fall to the councils. A report on the main issues in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan, including preparation of the LAA, was considered by the Growth Board Executive on 04 September 2014 and the (Shadow) Oxfordshire Growth Board on 12 September 2014. The need to take growth in housing (SHMA figures) and other development into account in the LAA was raised at the Executive meeting; no issues were raised at the Board meeting.
- 6.6 The **Oxfordshire Planning Policy Officers Group (OPPO)** comprises officers from the five District Councils and the County Council and meets approximately quarterly to discuss strategic and inter-authority issues relating to the preparation of local plans and other planning policy matters of common interest. OCC has raised minerals and waste issues for discussion at these meetings as and when appropriate. For example, consultation responses to the draft plan were discussed at the meeting in July 2014, in particular site identification (following a discussion on spatial strategy in February 2014) and the need for forecasts of need to be informed by the latest population and employment estimates and the work of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. District councils subsequently provided details of potential housing developments to help inform judgements about the balance of aggregate provision within the county. The Waste Need Assessment was also revised to include forecasts that took account of the SHMA. More recently, in October 2014, the waste strategy was discussed in the light of the new national waste policy and the implications for the Oxford Green Belt. There was also discussion on a draft Topic Paper produced by OCC on safeguarding waste sites and this has been influential in shaping the final policy on waste site safeguarding (policy W11).

7. Cooperation with Prescribed Bodies

- 7.1 This section covers liaison that has taken place with relevant prescribed bodies on strategic issues. This does not necessarily represent the full extent of the involvement of these bodies with the development of the plan as non-strategic issues are not covered in this DtC statement. These bodies are in any case all bodies that OCC has consulted (informally and formally) at the various stages in the preparation of the plan.

Environment Agency

- 7.2 Regular liaison meetings (approximately bi-monthly from 2013) on minerals and waste issues are held with officers of the Environment Agency. These meetings provide an informal forum for, exchange of information, reporting progress on plan development, raising issues of relevance to the Environment Agency for discussion as they arise and seeking resolution of problems where this is appropriate. The Environment Agency's main interest in the plan has related to the locations being identified for mineral extraction and waste management and the extent to which these affect flood risk (issue 4). The Agency has been closely involved in the development of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment that forms part of the evidence base and informs the sequential testing of sand and gravel options that is included in the Topic Paper on the Water Environment.
- 7.3 Much of the data used to assess waste needs (informing issue 1) is drawn from the Environment Agency's Waste Data Interrogator and discussion has taken place throughout plan preparation on the interpretation and accuracy of this data. This has been important in assessing the capacity and number of facilities required to enable Oxfordshire to be net self-sufficient in its waste management needs. The Environment Agency has also provided a key input to shaping the policy on radioactive waste (issue 2), one of the waste streams for which net self-sufficiency is not appropriate. Objection to policy W9 as presented in the MWLP-CD-2014 was made and subsequent discussion has led to its amendment to address technical deficiencies and provide a more positive approach.

Historic England (formerly English Heritage)

- 7.4 Engagement with Historic England has been undertaken through meetings and written correspondence as required through the plan preparation process. Historic England has shown particular interest in the potential impact of further sand and gravel working on archaeological interest in parts of the Thames Valley (issue 4) and discussion has therefore taken place on the potential value of assets in specific areas. As a result Historic England was satisfied with the spatial strategies for minerals and waste as outlined in the MWCS-PSD-2012. Detailed comment was made to some of the areas identified for

extraction in the MWLP-CD-2014 – in particular the Lower Windrush Valley - and discussion has taken place with a view to the current proposals being presented in a way that do not harm assets of agreed archaeological value. Core Policy C9 has also been developed in discussion with Historic England to ensure that specific proposals are not approved where harm to important assets may occur.

Natural England

- 7.5 Engagement with Natural England has been undertaken through meetings and written correspondence as required through the plan preparation process. Natural England has been keen to ensure that the spatial strategies for minerals and waste (issue 4) do not unacceptably impact on designated sites and, in particular, Special Areas of Conservation (SACs). To that end discussion has focussed on preparation of a Habitats Regulations Screening Report and the definition of the boundaries of the principal locations for mineral working to exclude SACs. In particular, it was agreed that a high level traffic assessment should be included in the Habitats Regulations Assessment, to demonstrate there would be no harm in terms of air quality to SACs. Core Policy C7 has also been developed in discussion with Natural England to ensure that specific proposals are not approved where such harm may occur.

Highways England (formerly Highways Agency)

- 7.6 Engagement with Highways England has been undertaken as required through the plan preparation process, mainly through written correspondence. Highways England contributed to early discussion on minerals spatial options. Comments included a preference for options that avoided extraction taking place in a few concentrated places and policy M3 reflects this in providing a spread of broad locations within which future sites may be identified. Similar views were expressed in relation to waste spatial strategy options, based on the Agency's desire to avoid a concentration of lorry movements on key interchanges on the strategic road network. Again, a flexible locational strategy has been developed allowing for development of facilities of different sizes at a spread of locations (policy W4).
- 7.7 Comments made on the core policy for transport (policy C10) have led to some changes in wording being made. Again this policy seeks to ensure that specific proposals do not cause harm to highway safety in areas identified as generally suitable for development.
- 7.8 To assist in developing a robust spatial strategy the Highways England initially requested that a full Traffic Impact Assessment be undertaken for the Core Strategy. Subsequent discussion has led to agreement that this is not necessary at the Core Strategy stage of the plan, but that the requirement

should be deferred to the Part 2 Site Allocations stage of the plan, when specific locations development have been identified.

Mayor of London

- 7.9 The Mayor of London has made comment on waste (see paragraph 5.48) and these have been taken into account, although no specific meetings have taken place.

Marine Management Organisation

- 7.10 The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) was notified of the first Local Aggregate Assessment through SEEAWP and commented (letter dated 4 December 2012) that, as Oxfordshire does not have a coast line and is unlikely to be focusing on marine won aggregates, the Local Aggregates Assessment does not have consequences for the MMO work and they have no comments. The MMO has not made any response to subsequent consultation on either the LAA or the plan.

Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership

- 7.11 The Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP) was established in January 2011 and covers the county area of Oxfordshire. OxLEP has been made aware of the preparation of the plan at its various stages but generally has not commented. An officer meeting was held with the Chief Executive of OxLEP on 10 November 2014; and the main issues in the plan of relevance to the interest of OxLEP, including the level of provision for aggregate supply in the LAA, were reported to The OxLEP Board on 6 January. The Board agreed to:
- a) Support the approach being taken by Oxfordshire County Council in the emerging Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy to the planning of minerals and waste development in Oxfordshire over the period to 2031 as being consistent with economic objectives and the growth agenda for the county;
 - b) Support the levels of provision, based on the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014, and the planning strategy for aggregate minerals supply in Oxfordshire in the emerging Core Strategy;
 - c) Support the levels of provision and the planning strategy for the management of waste in Oxfordshire in the emerging Core Strategy.

Appendix 1

Extracts from Minutes of SEEAWP Meetings and Letters from SEEAWP

A. Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 16 February 2011
at Eland Hose, Bressenden Place, London

Present:

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| John Kilford | Chairman | | |
| Bryan Lyttle | West Berks & JSPU | Bob Smith | mpa (Hanson) |
| Chris Colbourn | Bucks CC | Simon Treacy | mpa (Tarmac) |
| Tony Cook | E Sussex CC | Keith Frost | mpa (CEMEX) |
| Richard Read | Hants CC | Nigel Jackson | mpa |
| Lillian Harrison | Kent CC | David Payne | mpa |
| Bryan Geake | Medway | Steve Cole | BAA (RBMR) |
| Lois Partridge | Oxfordshire CC | Mark Plummer | DCLG (for part of meeting) |
| David Lamb | Surrey CC | Drew Williams | DCLG |
| Mark Wrigley | Crown Estate | Andrew Lipinski | DCLG |
| Chris Waite | Secretary | | |

- 5.4 A consultants report to Oxfordshire on a 'Local Assessment of Aggregate Supply Requirements' had been issued with the agenda papers. LP said that the report set out four alternative methods of assessing Oxfordshire's future aggregate requirements, with the results ranging from 1.23mtpa to 1.58mtpa for land-won sand and gravel, and 0.62mtpa to 0.81mtpa for crushed rock. The officer recommendation to the Council was to take forward an average between two of the alternatives which would result in 1.26mtpa for sand and gravel and 0.63mtpa for crushed rock. This compares with the 'Proposed Changes' figures of 2.1mtpa for sand and gravel and 0.66mtpa for crushed rock.

B. Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 28 March 2012
at Eland Hose, Bressenden Place, London

Present:

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| John Kilford | Chairman | | |
| Matt Meldrum | West Berks | Bob Smith | mpa |
| Richard Read | Hants CC | Keith Frost | mpa |
| Tony Cook | E Sussex CC | Nigel Jackson | mpa |
| John Prosser | Kent CC | Ken Hobden | mpa |
| Brian Geake | Medway | Steve Cole | BAA |
| Peter Day | Oxfordshire CC | Mark Wrigley | The Crown Estate |
| David Lamb & | Surrey CC | David Cowell | MMO |
| Karen Hearnshaw | | Mark Plummer | DCLG |
| Mike Elkington | West Sussex CC | Chris Mills | Isle of Wight |
| Claire Potts | S Downs NPA | Chris Waite | Technical Secretary |

- 6.1 SEEAWP MPAs have updated a November 2011 table setting out their approach to apportionment in their plans, and the Key Milestones chart. The March 2012 updates were included as an Appendix to SEEAWP 12/04 report. The approach to apportionment confirms the earlier position with four MPAs not applying the apportionment in the proposed changes to Policy M3. The Milestones chart can be updated for W Berks, and shows slippage in a number of plan dates.
- 6.2 Oxfordshire and Hampshire have each undertaken a local aggregate assessment leading to a reduced apportionment. Oxfordshire has consulted on its assessment and intention to adopt a reduced apportionment figure, and a summary of the responses was included in SEEAWP 12/04. A summary of the Hampshire assessment was also included in the report, and the full draft assessment circulated before SEEAWP met.
- 6.3 In view of the role of AWP's now set out in NPPF, SEEAWP was invited to give advice to Oxfordshire and Hampshire on their local aggregate assessments. The format of the Hampshire assessment was commended for being clear and easy to read and comprehensive in covering all sources of supply. However, it was not possible in the time available for SEEAWP to make a suitable response (although ME said that he was not happy with the figure assumed for West Sussex in the regional table).
- 6.4 It was agreed that members would send their comments to the Secretary, ideally by 5 April, in order that a response can be drawn up for circulation and comment, and a letter sent to Hampshire by the end of the month. PD said that he would set out Oxfordshire assessment in the same format as that for Hampshire and then supply to the Secretary to seek comments from SEEAWP.

C. Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 24 October 2012
at Eland House, Bressenden Place, London

Present:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|
| John Kilford | Chairman | | |
| Matt Meldrum | West Berks | Bob Smith | MPA |
| Paul Pinkney | Bucks CC | Ken Hobden | MPA |
| Tony Cook | E Sussex CC | Mike Pendock | MPA |
| Adrian Flavell | Hants CC | Richard Ford | MPA |
| Lillian Harrison | Kent CC | Mark Russell | BMAPA |
| Catherine Smith | Medway | | |
| Peter Day | Oxfordshire CC | Mark Plummer | DCLG |
| Paul Sanderson | Surrey CC | Graham Ward | DCLG |
| Mike Elkington | West Sussex CC | Chris Mills | Isle of Wight |
| Chris Waite | Technical Secretary | | |

- 5.5 It was agreed that members should send their comments on Kent Draft LAA to the Secretary by 15 November. He would then draft a response from the views and circulate. A final response on the basis of replies would then be drafted and signed off by the Chairman.
- 5.6 The first draft of the Oxfordshire LAA had been issued with the agenda. PD said that provision for land-won sand and gravel was based upon the earlier decision by the authority for a figure of 1.26mtpa. He recognised that the draft LAA was incomplete, but he would welcome comments upon the draft as it stands. It was agreed the same procedure as set out in paragraph 5.5 above would apply.

D. Letter from Chairman of SEEAWP 21 November 2012

SEEAWP

South East England Aggregates Working Party

Technical Secretary : C R Waite, 22 Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone, Kent ME14 5LW
: Tel: 01622 764335 e-mail: chriswaiteplanning@blueyonder.co.uk

Peter Day

Team Leader Minerals & Waste Policy

Environment & Economy

Oxfordshire CC

Speedwell House, Speedwell St

Oxford OX1 1NE

21 November 2012

Draft Local Aggregates Assessment for Oxfordshire

Dear Peter,

SEEAWP thanks you for making the draft of your Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) available at its October meeting in accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Guidance on the Managed Aggregates Supply System (MASS). SEEAWP welcomed the opportunity to comment. However it was decided that there was not sufficient time for members at the meeting to give a considered response to the draft LAA. Views were asked to be sent to the Secretary in time for a draft SEEAWP response to be circulated to its members before being sent to you. This letter, therefore, is sent after consideration by all SEEAWP members.

This letter seeks to distil out the key points raised and comprises advice from SEEAWP in fulfilment of the role it is given in paragraph 145 of the NPPF and paragraph 8a) of the Guidance on the Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS).

- The draft LAA is incomplete with critical elements, including 'Total Aggregates Supply', 'Future Aggregate Supply and Demand' and 'A Local Approach to Making Provision for Aggregates Supply' missing. It is regretted that this means that SEEAWP will not be able to comment on the full LAA before the Core Strategy is submitted.
- Basing provision for land-won sand and gravel on a rolling average of 10 years sales data is an initial approach, but the draft LAA
should give more weight to the RSS Policy M3 and the extensive sand and gravel resource in Oxfordshire compared with other MPAs, and does not adequately address 'other relevant local information' such as the impacts of no up-to-date Minerals Plan, the amount of permitted

reserve in the hands of few operators and constraints on productive capacity.

- The sub regional apportionment set out in Proposed Changes Policy M3 has been exceeded by Surrey in its local plan in order to provide an element of flexibility, and is proposed to be exceeded by Kent and Buckinghamshire. Hampshire propose a figure of more than 20% below their apportionment figure, but have more options should there be additional demand and/or the allocated sites do not deliver. Oxfordshire plan to make provision for over the 10 year mean of sales. This is welcomed, but without modification the draft LAA alone does not provide compelling and robust evidence to support such a significantly lower figure of 1.29mtpa for land-won sand and gravel compared with the revised RSS Policy M3 figure of 2.1mtpa.

Oxfordshire CC should modify the LAA to:

- Update the LAA to reflect the Guidance on the MASS, including the requirements set out in paragraph 10, the requirement to prepare an annual LAA and explain how a regular review of the Plan will be triggered.
- Establish the reasons for decline in sand and gravel sales, and how & why these might change over the Plan period
- In revisiting recycling and secondary aggregates and other sources than land-won, undue reliance should not be placed on provision of throughput capacity leading to the same levels of actual production or supply.
- Clearly set out how cooperation has been achieved with other MPAs, including those outside the South East, such as in the South West and East Midlands from which crushed rock is received.

We hope that this advice will be of assistance. In due course, please let SEEAWP know how far this advice has been taken on board.

Yours sincerely,

John Kilford
Chairman

E. Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 3 July 2013
at Park Plaza Hotel, Wilton St, London

Present:

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| John Kilford | Chairman | | |
| Matt Meldrum | West Berks | Alan Everard | MPA |
| Roger Kirkham | Slough | Bob Smith | MPA |
| Darl Sweetland | Bucks CC | Ken Hobden | MPA |
| Shereen Ansari | Bucks CC | Richard Ford | MPA |
| Tony Cook | E Sussex CC | Mark Russell | BMAPA |
| Peter Chadwick | Hants CC | Mark Plummer | DCLG for item 6 |
| John Prosser | Kent CC | Eamon Mythen | DCLG |
| Martin Tugwell | Oxfordshire CC | Mark Wrigley | The Crown Estate |
| David Maxwell | Surrey CC | | |
| Chris Mills | Isle of Wight | Russell Gadbury | MMO |
| Mark Chant | Milton Keynes | Nat Percival | MMO |
| David Payne | London AWP | Sue Marsh | East of England AWP |
| Chris Waite | Technical Secretary | | |

5.3 The Secretary said that the draft LAA had been circulated, and he had received one response from CM supporting the LAA in principle but seeking clarification on certain aspects. The response would be sent to Oxfordshire to respond. The draft LAA concluded with options for the land-won sand and gravel comparing the 10 year average sales with the figure adopted in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (M&WCS). However, in addition Oxfordshire proposed a figure derived from an alternative methodology which applies consumption per capita and of past balance of sales against consumption to forecasts of Oxfordshire's population. The LAA did not say which figure would be recommended for inclusion in a Minerals Plan.

5.4 KH said that he supported the adjusted figures rather than the previous 10 year average as these took into account the wider economy and future growth, which resulted in figures not dissimilar to the M&WCS provision. JP said that the import/export balance in 2009 might have changed in 2012. BS asked which of the options in the conclusion would be recommended? MT replied that if the adjusted LAA figures were close to those in the M&WCS, it may well be that Oxfordshire would stick with the M&WCS provision.

F. Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 13 November 2013
at Eland House, Bressenden Place, London

Present:

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| John Kilford | Chairman | | |
| Matt Meldrum | West Berks | Mark Worringham | Reading BC |
| Lester Hannington | Bucks CC | Tony Cook | E Sussex CC |
| Peter Chadwick | Hants CC | John Prosser | Kent CC |
| Catherine Smith | Medway | Peter Day | Oxfordshire CC |
| Paul Sanderson | Surrey CC | Alethea Evans | W Sussex CC |
| Chris Mills | Isle of Wight | Mark Chant | Milton Keynes |
| Claire Potts | S Downs NPA | Bob Smith | MPA |
| Richard Ford | MPA | David Payne | MPA |
| Mark Russell | BMAPA | Steve Cole | BAA |
| Eamon Mythen | DCLG | Chris Waite | Technical Secretary |

- 3.24 PD said that Oxfordshire had received criticism of the draft LAA suggesting a figure of 1.2mtpa for land-won sand and gravel. Objectors draw attention to the NPPF asking authorities to plan for an annual LAA based on a rolling average of 10 years sales data, and saw no reason why Oxfordshire should deviate from this. They questioned whether the methodology used in arriving at 1.2mtpa was robust enough to justify the figure. The 10 year average is 1.0mtpa whereas the 2012 sales in Oxfordshire were 0.7Mt. The 10 year average would therefore provide headroom for growth. What were the AWP's views on Oxfordshire adopting the 10 year average figure?
- 3.25 DP said that the temporary mothballing of three aggregate sites accounted for the low sales in recent years. Having adopted a local methodology devised by independent consultants, this was about to be dropped due to local pressures. BS said that the draft LAA submitted to SEEAWP gave the technical justification for the 1.2mtpa figure. No further data had been supplied to show the logic was flawed or to discount this finding.
- 3.26 JP said that he had attempted to use the methodology adopted by Oxfordshire's consultants in revising the Kent LAA. He had found it most unsatisfactory, utilising national population consumption figures from the 2009 national survey applied to the MPA area. He had changed his mind since the previous consideration of the draft LAA and supported using the 10 year provision. This gained support from some other MPA members.
- 3.27 The Chairman sought to find a response that would encompass the views of SEEAWP. However, it was pointed out that Oxfordshire had not consulted on a further draft LAA revision to explain the current thinking. As no such draft had been submitted to the AWP for it to consider, SEEAWP decided that it could not give a written response.

G. Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 27 October 2014
at Local Government House, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ

Present:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| John Kilford | Chairman | | |
| Matt Meldrum | West Berks | Mark Worringham | Reading |
| Shereen Ansari | Bucks CC | Tony Cook | E Sussex CC |
| Lisa Kirby | Hants CC | John Prosser | Kent CC |
| Catherine Smith | Medway | Peter Day | Oxfordshire CC |
| Paul Sanderson | Surrey CC | Alethea Evans | W Sussex CC |
| Chris Mills | Isle of Wight | Mark Chant | Milton Keynes |
| Peter Wilsdon | S Downs NPA | Bob Smith | MPA |
| Stewart Mitchell | MPA | David Payne | MPA |
| Mark Russell | BMAPA | Steve Cole | BAA |
| Chris Waite | Technical Secretary | | |

- 3.1 The Chairman asked the Secretary to introduce paper SEEAWP 14/05, and to comment on whether the LAA updates raised any issues at the regional level. The Secretary thanked the 11 MPAs which had submitted updated LAAs. He considered that the LAAs were of a high standard, and that in many cases the depth and breadth of the assessments provided just about everything one needed to know about aggregates in an MPA area. All the LAAs were comprehensive in covering alternative materials, imports and exports, and land-won workings, and had used AM2013 data. It was pleasing to see MMO and Crown Estate documents being referred to, and the importance of safeguarding wharves and rail depots. Local Plan figures and those proposed in the updated LAAs confirmed the AM2013 summary that, with figures well in excess of the 10 and 3 year averages, the region was proposing to make a full contribution to national and local needs.
- 3.2 The report SEEAWP 14/05 also drew attention to Kent saying it would not be able to maintain a 7 year landbank for sharp sands and gravel beyond 2017, and resources could be exhausted by 2024; and neighbouring Surrey saying there was little prospect of additional sites beyond those in their Minerals Plan. This raised the issue as to how a shortfall within the Plan period might be met - potentially by an increased supply of marine dredged material or by cross boundary movements of land-won sand and gravel, ideally from within the region.
- 3.3 The Chairman suggested that those LAAs over which members had issues should be dealt with after those which were not contentious. SEEAWP agreed, and on this basis **Bucks, Hants, Isle of Wight, Medway, Milton Keynes and Oxfordshire LAAs** were dealt with first. SEEAWP approved these LAAs, and only detailed matters were raised seeking clarity or corrections to certain figures. A number of the points were agreed at the

meeting, or were to be dealt with in correspondence rather than as a SEEAWP view. The other LAAs were then considered in turn, and again detailed matters were raised in addition to the views given below, and were agreed or to be dealt with in correspondence (a note on such points and a response from members of the East of England AWP is attached).

H. Letter from Chairman of SEEAWP 21 November 2012

SEEAWP

South East England Aggregates Working Party

Technical Secretary: C R Waite, 22 Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone, Kent ME14 5LW
: Tel: 01622 764335, e-mail: chriswaiteplanning@blueyonder.co.uk

Peter Day,
Minerals & Waste Policy Team Leader,
Oxfordshire CC
Oxford OX1 1NE

5 November 2014

2014 Draft LAAs to SEEAWP

Dear Peter

SEEAWP thanks you for consulting its members on your authority's draft LAA for 2014 at its meeting on 27 October. This was one of 11 LAAs considered at the meeting. Detailed comments were made on a number of the drafts which were either responded to at the meeting, or to be the subject of correspondence. As those were detailed comments they did not constitute SEEAWP views, but you will no doubt have regard to them.

SEEAWP approved the Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014.

There were two wider issues raised on 27 October in discussion on the LAAs – the provision to be made for soft sand, and the movement of aggregate across MPA boundaries to overcome anticipated shortfalls in supply. Your assistance may be sought to aid in reporting on these issues at the next SEEAWP meeting

Yours sincerely,

John Kilford
SEEAWP Chairman

I. Draft Minutes of Meeting of SEEAWP held on 10 November 2015
at Hampshire County Council, Winchester

Present:

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Tony Cook | Chairman – East Sussex | | |
| Richard Read | Secretary | | |
| Peter Day | Oxfordshire | Rupy Sandhu | West Sussex |
| Bryan Geake | Kent | Alan Everard | Tarmac |
| Lester Hannington | Buckinghamshire | Bob Smith | Hanson |
| Lisa Kirby-Hawkes | Hampshire | David Payne | MPA |
| Matt Meldrum | West Berkshire | Mark Russell | BMAPA |
| Chris Mills | Isle of Wight | Steve Cole | RBMR |
| Claire Potts | South Downs | Eamon Mythen | DCLG |
| Paul Sanderson | Surrey | Nick Everington | The Crown Estate |

3.2 Oxfordshire

RR questioned the limited reference to demand in the update provided. PD indicated that this would be addressed when the full LAA is produced.

DP considered the 'LAA 14 Provision Figures', Oxfordshire's alternative to the average sales indicator, to be a sensible approach. There is a need for common sense in the use of land banks as they are not a full reflection on demand. Demand forecasting at local level is difficult. Sales data is a proxy.

J. Letter from Chairman of SEEAWP 21 November 2012

SEEAWP

South East England Aggregates Working Party

Technical Secretary: Richard Read BA, MRTPI .

Address: 2 Windermere Gardens, Alresford, Hampshire SO24 9NL

Tel: 07786977547

Email: readplanning@btinternet.com

Peter Day
Minerals & Waste Policy Team Leader
Oxfordshire County Council
Oxford, OX1 1NE

20 November 2015

Dear Peter

Oxfordshire Draft Local Aggregate Assessments (LAA)

SEEAWP thanks you for consulting its members on your Authority's LAA update. It is understood that a full LAA will be produced when the full results of AM14 are available. At its meeting on 10 November this was one of eight LAAs considered by SEEAWP.

The evidence from the LAAs 2015 so far submitted to SEEAWP clearly indicates that the south east was continuing to make an appropriate contribution to aggregate supply regionally and nationally.

During the discussion at the meeting some general points arising from the LAAs were made. An issue was that south east England would in due course depend increasingly on alternatives to local extraction. This matter stressed the need to safeguard appropriate infrastructure. Additionally some mineral planning authorities would require more supply from its neighbours and this need to be taken into account in mineral plans. Finally, it was recognised that the supply of soft sand was becoming a challenge as significant proportion of the resource is within designated land.

It was also agreed that once all the LAAs had been submitted a short summary would be provided by the Secretary on all the key statistics to provide an overall picture for the south east of England

Additionally some specific comments arising from your authority's update were recorded in the Minutes that have now been circulated. I trust that these will be taken into account by you when you draft your Authority's LAA for next year.

Nevertheless, the Oxfordshire LAA update for 2015 was agreed. .

Yours sincerely

Tony Cook
SEEAWP Chairman

Appendix 2

Note of Meeting with Adjoining Authorities 27 November 2009

Cross-Boundary Issues – Minerals and Waste

Note of Meeting 27.11.09

Present

Peter Day, Trevor Brown, Lois Partridge, Raakhee Patel – Oxfordshire C.C.

Lorraine Brooks – Gloucestershire C.C. (Minerals)

David Ingleby – Gloucestershire C.C. (Waste)

Rosemary Morton – Berkshire Joint Strategic Planning Unit

Chris Colbourn & Rebecca Williams – Buckinghamshire C.C.

Adam James – Warwickshire C.C. (Minerals)

1. Authority updates on respective MWDFs

Gloucestershire

Waste

- Currently consulting on site options for possible inclusion in the Core Strategy (C/S), following a preferred options consultation in January 2008. Likely to include strategic sites in the C/S for residual waste treatment, primarily for MSW but also for C&I waste, following encouragement by their Government Office to do so.
- Submission of the C/S is envisaged in August 2010, but there is also a need to try to time this effectively with the procurement process (currently at stage of narrowing down to about 5 bidders).
- The timetable is subject to the submission and approval of a revised MWDS.

Minerals

- No significant progress on the C/S Preferred Options since Jan 2008, when consultation took place on preferred options. Work has been held back by slow progress on the Waste Strategy, and in particular by preparation of a revised minerals apportionment for the South West region.
- Consultation on revised Preferred Options is not expected until late in 2010.

Berkshire

- A M&W C/S examination hearing was held in the summer but was adjourned as it revealed major problems with the evidence base, and a failure to effectively identify and address a potential landfill deficit (possibly as large as 11 million tonnes).
- All 6 Unitary authorities had to agree a course of action and they have only just now all agreed that the C/S should be withdrawn. A new LDS to prepare the C/S is being produced for submission to GOSE.
- Formal consultation on a revised C/S will not be taking place until July/ August 2010 (after the General Election) but informal/selective consultation with operators on matters relating to the evidence base is likely sooner, in particular consultation with waste operators on matters raised by the Inspector in the examination hearing.
- The JSPU is raising concerns about the operation and effectiveness of the South East waste capacity model (ERM model) which, in particular, does not appear capable of calculating a revised landfill requirement if an authority proposes to treat more waste than is required by the South East Plan landfill diversion targets. Resolution of this is crucial to determining the landfill provision required in the Berkshire C/S. Rosemary Morton is writing a note on the regional capacity model to explain these issues and prompt discussion within the region; she does not agree with the solution to problems with the model that have been proposed by SEEPB.

Buckinghamshire

- Currently preparing a joint C/S for M&W.
- Provision for strategic sites for MSW and C&I treatment will be made in the C/S, but site provision will not be made for minerals as there is already a land bank of 13 years.
- Consultation on C/S Preferred Options took place in February 2008, but further work has been held up until the result of their MSW waste treatment procurement process became clearer.
- A preferred bidder was selected in September 2009 (Covanta), who proposes an out of county solution to dispose of Bucks' residual MSW in a 500,000 tpa efw plant located in Central Bedfordshire. The C/S is being amended to include this as the preferred option. However, they are also looking to make contingency provision within the County for MSW and C&I should the Covanta proposal fail, with 3 contingency options currently being looked at. GOSE has advised that a focussed consultation with Bedfordshire stakeholders be undertaken before submission of the C/S: this consultation is likely to take place in June 2010. They will also carry out further technical work and engagement with operators to establish the number of C&I waste facilities that

may be needed and the suitability of site options; and also to look at the feasibility of rail transfer from South Bucks to Calvert. They want to test whether a strategy of 2 or 3 C&I waste treatment sites is realistic/deliverable. [Previous engagement in 2007 involved holding informal, half day workshops with operators individually; this is recorded on the website.].

- A new LDS is being prepared.

Warwickshire

Minerals

- They are currently reviewing their approach to the initial Issues & Options and Preferred Options.
- A call for strategic mineral site nominations was put out in October 2008.
- Consultation on spatial options and nominated sites (27 sites put forward, majority sand & gravel) took place in February 2009 generating a high response rate (1,150 individual responses). However, the number of nominated sites is not enough to meet the apportionment. They are currently addressing the main issues from the consultation responses.
- Following further advice from their Government Office, and in the light of the Surrey (Capel) case, it is likely that they will now pull back from including strategic sites in the C/S and allocate them in a separate sites DPD instead. The C/S would focus on a strategy for sand and gravel and safeguarding of other minerals.
- The preferred strategy consultation is likely to take place after the general election, possibly in June 2010.

Waste

- Work on the waste C/S is currently being delayed by the procurement process for the treatment of residual MSW.
- Warwickshire is working jointly with Coventry and Solihull on a proposal for a residual waste treatment plant in Coventry.
- Consultation on revised spatial options may be carried out in 2010.
- The 2 planning applications for 'climafuel' plants have been to Planning Committee, one was approved and one refused.

2. Minerals Issues

Berkshire

- Unable to provide hard evidence on cross- boundary minerals movements. They are aware of south to north movements, but this knowledge is limited. Most of the working is now taking place further west in Kennet Valley, with limited activity near Reading.
- Berkshire currently has a S&G landbank of approx. 8 years.
- Reading will continue to be the main centre of demand for aggregates in Berkshire, and there remains a reasonable S&G resource within 25 miles to serve this demand.
- However, an important part of the S&G supply to the Reading market area has traditionally come from Caversham, in Oxfordshire, and Berkshire see a continuing need for S&G supply from Caversham to meet the .needs of Reading. Otherwise significant additional strain would be put on the remaining resources in Berkshire.
- The two railheads at Theale import crushed rock for use in Berkshire; unsure if any comes into Oxfordshire but will ask the operator.

Gloucestershire

- Gloucestershire think that cross-boundary movements of aggregates between there and Oxfordshire are limited. But PHD understood that Hansons are currently bringing S&G into Oxfordshire from the Cotswold Waterpark area of Gloucestershire / Wiltshire because their Oxfordshire quarries are exhausted.
- Huntsman's Quarry in E Gloucestershire may export hard limestone and recycled aggregate into Oxfordshire.
- Raised the issue of availability and quality of inert fill for restoration. General agreement that this appears to be a common problem, although Gloucestershire remarked that they had experienced a number of bunds being constructed on farmland adjoining M5, ostensibly for noise screening, but was this evidence that there is surplus inert material on the market? The proposers of these bunds say there is a shortage of disposal sites for inert waste
- Suggested that it might be useful to ask operators in Oxfordshire for information of where their products go. But also recognise that markets change over time and are often regarded as commercially sensitive.
- TB suggested that much of the fill available tends to be used on sites that are exempt from licensing, and that it is difficult to quantify the amounts of material coming onto the market.

- Revision of the south west sub-regional regional aggregates apportionment has been delayed by the need to carry out SA/SEA and HRA. HRA may constrain working in the North.
- A new planning application for S&G extraction at Fairford, in the Cotswold Water Park, seeks to provide 5 million tonnes over the next 12 years, but this could rise to 10 million tonnes over a longer period. A proportion of this material could be used in markets in Oxfordshire.

Buckinghamshire

- There is little evidence of cross-boundary movements into or out of Oxfordshire.
- As far as is known, cross boundary movement in Bucks tend to be in a north/south direction.

Warwickshire

- Cross-boundary flows are not thought to be significant. There are possible movements of limestone into Oxfordshire from a quarry near the southern boundary of the County.

There was general agreement that the movement of sand and gravel from quarry to market is unlikely to be more than 25/30 miles by road.

3. Waste Issues

Waste monitoring

- TB suggested that there are differences in the way that operators categorise waste facilities, particularly transfer and recycling facilities. Some transfer facilities do more recycling, and some recycling facilities do more transfer. Oxon have found this to be a common occurrence with many operators. Composting is another area of uncertainty, with some being categorised as treatment. There also seem to be differences in practice on categorisation between WPAs. This has led to a lack of consistency in the SE regional waste model.
- TB advised that the CDE recycling figure reported in the most recent Annual Monitoring Report was from Capita Symonds data, but questioned its validity.
- Berkshire have found the EA's 'Waste Interrogator' useful in providing and analysing waste data (if you know how to work it). It is based on site level data and uses an Excel programme. The EA (Andrea Purdie) have offered to run a

programme to provide consistent data for WPAs on inter-authority waste movements across the region and between regions. Agreement would be needed between WPAs on what data is needed for development of waste strategies and what is significant in terms of cross-boundary movements. The idea would be to generate a set of tables of data that paints a better picture of cross boundary waste flows.

- It would be helpful to obtain the EA's view on what might be 'significant' in terms of cross-boundary movement of waste; Oxfordshire would take this up with EA as part of their current discussion on waste data and circulate any advice received.

Hinterland Agreements

- Gloucestershire are sceptical that Section 106 agreements are workable as they are difficult to enforce. There was general agreement that it is difficult to seek to control the waste market in this way and that it may be better for WPAs to seek to get the right number of facilities in the right places to reduce the need for significant waste flows across boundaries. The need for some form of control should reduce as new residual waste treatment facilities come on stream over a period of years. But there may continue to be justification for hinterland controls on landfill sites, particularly as non-hazardous landfills become scarcer.
- Buckinghamshire suggested that if there was a case for hinterland agreements they should be based on a calculation of distance relative to the size and location of the facility.
- Berkshire were not convinced of the need for hinterland agreements and had no experience in implementing them.

Location of Landfill Sites

- Rosemary Morton referred to work being done by the EA on locations for landfill based on groundwater vulnerability mapping. A systematic pilot study is currently being undertaken to locate suitable sites for particular types of landfill facilities. They are using a 'traffic light' approach to this work.

Appendix 3

Background Paper for Report to Cabinet on Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document 13 March 2012

Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Provision for Aggregates Supply

Summary of Engagement with other Mineral Planning Authorities, January/February 2012

Consultation on the Council's draft minerals strategy took place in September 2011. Consultation responses to Policy M2 on the provision to be made for aggregates mineral working ranged from respondents who thought that the figures were too high to those who thought they were too low, and there was criticism of the methodology in the report by Atkins on Local Assessment of Aggregates Supply Requirements.

The Atkins report and the conclusions that the Council drew from it have been reviewed by County Council officers. This review has not led to any different conclusion being reached on the levels of provision that should be made for aggregates mineral working in the Core Strategy.

Under the Localism Act's duty to cooperate, the County Council has written to adjoining mineral planning authorities other mineral planning authorities in the south east of England, explaining why the Council has proposed the levels of provision in Policy M2 and requesting any further comments. The Council's letter was copied to bodies representing the aggregates industry (Mineral Products Association and British Aggregates Association) and to the District Councils covering the main sand and gravel resource areas of Oxfordshire. The Council has also written to mineral planning authorities which export significant quantities of crushed rock aggregates to Oxfordshire by rail.

Table 1 provides a summary of the responses received.

Only one clear alternative to the County Council's approach has been offered. The Mineral Products Association recommends that, should the level of provision be based on past sales, it should be based on a 10 year mean (taken from the last 12 years' data) with an additional 10% contingency added.

Table 1: Summary of responses

| Respondent | Summary of Comments |
|--|---|
| Responses from Mineral Planning Authorities | |
| Wiltshire Council | Cautious support for the approach, subject to appropriate measures being developed in policy terms to address local impacts associated with any increased importation of aggregate minerals from neighbouring authority areas. Robust approach to monitoring required. Would welcome closer working arrangements to ensure that long term supply matters are planned appropriately. |
| Gloucestershire County Council | Reduction in the level of provision could have implications for adjacent MPAs; lack of coordination, piecemeal planning. Sand and gravel resources in Gloucestershire are close to the Oxfordshire border and are sensitive to exportation, potentially leading to unsustainable movements of aggregates by road. |
| Warwickshire County Council | Concern that reducing Oxfordshire’s provision could lead to pressure on Warwickshire to increase provision; Warwickshire has consistently not been able to meet its own apportionment in recent years. Request to be kept updated. |
| Buckinghamshire County Council | Considers that the approach to the proposed level of provision is unsound because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Not in conformity with RSS and associated proposed changes; 2) Locally based supply requirements are not based on sufficiently new or different information; 3) Using average of 2 methodologies is not sound. |
| Surrey County Council | Formal objection to proposed level of provision on the grounds that basing the figure on past sales is backward looking. The figure should provide an increasing contribution to the wider regional supply of aggregates. |
| Somerset County Council | Confirmation that landbank in Somerset for supply of aggregates by rail to Oxfordshire is more than sufficient to continue supply to 2030. |
| South Gloucestershire Council | Production capacity is not expected to decrease over next 15-20 years but the demand for aggregates in South Gloucestershire and the West of England may increase; 24,600 new dwellings planned in South Gloucestershire, and two nationally significant infrastructure projects (new nuclear power station and a gas turbine power station). |
| Leicestershire County Council | Confirmation that the flow of aggregates from Leicestershire to Oxfordshire should be able to continue to 2030 but notes that an East Midlands Aggregates working party report questions the long term ability of igneous quarries in Leicestershire to provide aggregates to the South East by rail. |

| Responses from District Councils | |
|---|--|
| West Oxfordshire District Council | Fully supports the reduced overall level of provision but has concerns that, under the proposed strategy, West Oxfordshire will continue to be the main supplier of sand and gravel in the County and notes this has potential environmental impacts on communities, the local economy and traffic movements. |
| Responses from Aggregates Industry | |
| Mineral Products Association | Level of provision should be based on a forward looking approach. If using past sales, should be based on a 10 year mean from the last 12 years' data and an additional 10% should be added. Strategy should be flexible. Duty to cooperate; consultation should be with and on the advice of the Aggregates Working Parties. |
| Hills Quarry Products Ltd | Provision for mineral working is not justified nor based on firm evidence. Endorses the recommendation by MPA that if using past sales, should use a 10 year mean from the last 12 years' data with an additional 10% contingency added. But this approach should only be applied if consistently applied by mineral planning authorities throughout the region and on advice from the Aggregates Working Party. |
| Land & Mineral Management | Provision for mineral working is not justified nor based on firm evidence. Endorses the recommendation by MPA that if using past sales, should use a 10 year mean from the last 12 years' data with an additional 10% contingency added. But this approach should only be applied if consistently applied by mineral planning authorities throughout the region and on advice from the Aggregates Working Party. |
| Alliance Planning on behalf of Lafarge Aggregates | Welcomes Oxfordshire CC's decision to consult adjoining and south east minerals planning authorities. Concerned that proposed provision may lead to a shortfall of aggregate supply over the plan period. The Mineral Products Association's suggested use of past sale data over a longer period represents a more robust, evidence-based approach. |

Appendix 4

Duty to Cooperate Engagement on Local Aggregate Assessment 2014

| Body | Date / Method | Response / Outcome |
|--|--|---|
| South East England Aggregate Working Party (SEEAWP) (includes all SE MPAs) | LAA circulated to SEEAWP members 20.10.2014 and considered at meeting 27.10.2014 – attended by: Buckinghamshire CC East Sussex CC Hampshire CC Isle of Wight Council Kent CC Medway Council Milton Keynes Council Oxfordshire CC Reading BC South Downs NPA Surrey CC West Berkshire Council West Sussex CC | LAA approved at meeting. Some detailed comments by individual (industry) SEEAWP members at meeting. Approval of LAA confirmed by letter 05.11.2014. |
| South East MPAs Officer Group: | LAA circulated 20.10.2014 and discussed at meeting 27.10.2014 – attended by: East Sussex CC Hampshire CC Isle of Wight Council Kent CC Medway Council Milton Keynes Council Oxfordshire CC South Downs NPA Surrey CC West Berkshire Council West Sussex CC | No concerns raised at meeting. |
| Buckinghamshire CC | Meeting held 09.10.2014 LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 19.11.2014: No concerns raised. |
| Bracknell Forest Council | Meeting held 08.10.2014 LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 21.11.2014: Support stance taken in the LAA. |
| Reading BC | Meeting held 08.10.2014 LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | No response received. |
| Slough BC | Meeting held 08.10.2014 LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | No response received. |

| | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| West Berkshire Council | Meeting held 08.10.2014 LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 and discussed at meeting 07.11.2014 | Response by email 19.11.2014: No concerns raised; would support adoption of the LAA. |
| Windsor & Maidenhead BC | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | No response received. |
| Wokingham BC | Meeting held 08.10.2014 LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 20.11.2014: No concerns raised; some detailed queries. |
| Gloucestershire CC | LAA sent by email 17.10.2014 and discussed at meeting 22.10.2014 Further email 24.10.2014 | Response by email 07.11.2014: Generally support the LAA as it recognises there is limited potential to continue current supply patterns from Gloucestershire to Oxfordshire and has adjusted provision accordingly. |
| Wiltshire Council | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014. Further email sent 24.11.2014 seeking clarification of response. | Response by email 21.11.2014: Concerns raised over assumptions used and effect on limiting supply; complex methodology; and reliance on mothballed sites reopening. |
| Swindon BC | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | As for Wiltshire Council – combined response |
| Warwickshire CC | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 21.11.2014: No objection to methodology used to calculate LAA figures; some detailed comments. |
| Northamptonshire CC | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 07.11.2014: LAA generally compliant with NPPF; no concerns raised; some detailed comments. |
| Milton Keynes Council | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 07.11.2014: LAA generally compliant with NPPF; no concerns raised; some detailed comments. |
| Somerset CC | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email and letter 06.11.2014: No objections to LAA or concerns about future supply |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | of aggregate from Somerset to Oxfordshire; some detailed comments. |
| South Gloucestershire Council | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 04.12.2014: No concerns about level of provision of crushed rock in LAA as there is no reliance on South Gloucestershire quarries to increase supply; current pattern of market distribution may change if there is increased demand within the West of England. |
| Leicestershire CC | LAA sent by email 23.10.2014 | Response by email 12.11.2014: No comments on level of provision in LAA. Movement of aggregate from Leicestershire to Oxfordshire could be affected over period to 2031 depending on outcome of a current planning application. |
| Rutland CC | Not consulted directly | Response by email 07.11.2014: LAA generally compliant with NPPF; no concerns raised; some detailed comments. |
| East of England Aggregate Working Party | LAA sent by email 28.10.2014 | Response by email 06.11.2014: No issues raised. |
| East Midlands Aggregate Working Party | LAA sent by email 28.10.2014 | Response by email 12.11.2014: No concerns or objections. |
| West Midlands Aggregate Working Party | LAA sent by email 28.10.2014 | No response received. |
| South West Aggregate Working Party | LAA sent by email 24.10.2014; considered at SWAWP meeting 29.11.2014 | Response by email 13.12.2014: SWAWP is happy with the LAA. |
| London Aggregate Working Party | Email sent 28.10.2014 | Response by email 28.10.14: Agreed no need to consult as unlikely to be cross-boundary aggregate movements. |
| Mayor of London | LAA sent by email 28.10.2014 | Response by email 25.11.2014: |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | Does not wish to comment on LAA. There are no strategic issues concerning supply and demand of aggregates that require further engagement between Oxfordshire CC and the Mayor under the duty to cooperate at this time. |
| Marine Management Organisation | LAA sent by email 28.10.2014 | No response received. |
| Oxfordshire Growth Board (includes all five Oxfordshire City / District Councils) | Report on main issues in Minerals & Waste Local Plan, including preparation of LAA, reported to: Growth Board Executive meeting 04.09.2014; and (Shadow) Oxfordshire Growth Board meeting 12.09.2014. | The need to take growth in housing (SHMA figures) and other development into account in the LAA was raised at the Executive meeting 04.09.2014; No issues raised at Board meeting 12.09.2014. |
| Cherwell DC | LAA sent by emails 28.10.2014 & 12.11.2014; LAA discussed at Oxfordshire Planning Policy Officers (OPPO) meeting 14.11.2014. | No significant concerns raised at meeting over approach used in LAA or conclusions reached. No written response. |
| Oxford City Council | LAA sent by emails 28.10.2014 & 12.11.2014; LAA discussed at OPPO meeting 14.11.2014. | No significant concerns raised at meeting over approach used in LAA or conclusions reached. No written response. |
| South Oxfordshire DC | LAA sent by emails 28.10.2014 & 12.11.2014; LAA discussed at OPPO meeting 14.11.2014. | No significant concerns raised at meeting over approach used in LAA or conclusions reached. No written response. |
| Vale of White Horse DC | LAA sent by emails 28.10.2014 & 12.11.2014; LAA discussed at OPPO meeting 14.11.2014. | No significant concerns raised at meeting over approach used in LAA or conclusions reached. No written response. |
| West Oxfordshire DC | LAA sent by emails 28.10.2014 & 12.11.2014; LAA discussed at OPPO meeting 14.11.2014. | No significant concerns raised at meeting over approach used in LAA or conclusions reached. Response by email 17.11.2014 making detailed comments on the LAA and the emerging plan. |
| Oxfordshire Local | Officer meeting 10.11.2014; | Agreed at Board meeting to |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP) | report to OxLEP Board meeting 06.01.2015. | support the approach in the emerging plan and support the levels of provision in the LAA as being consistent with the economic objectives and growth agenda for county. |
| Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group (OMPG) (this is not a duty to cooperate body) | LAA sent by email 17.10.2014 and discussed at meeting held 17.10.2014. OMPG members also represented at SEEAWP meeting 27.11.2014. | Discussion at meeting indicated support for approach taken in LAA and the conclusions. Subsequently confirmed by Mineral Products Association and British Aggregates Association in support for LAA at SEEAWP meeting. |

Appendix 5

Other Minerals Planning Authorities contacted in April 2015 about Imports or Exports of Aggregate in 2009

A. MPAs from which Oxfordshire imported small quantities of aggregate (Less than 40,000 tonnes)

South East

Hampshire County Council
Kent County Council

East of England

Bedford Borough Council
Cambridgeshire County Council
Central Bedfordshire Council
Hertfordshire County Council

South West

Bristol City Council
Dorset County Council
North Somerset Council

East Midlands

Derbyshire County Council

West Midlands

Shropshire Council
Solihull Council
Staffordshire County Council
Walsall Council

Wales

Caerphilly County Borough Council
Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council
Powys County Council
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council

B. MPAs to which Oxfordshire exported small quantities of aggregate (Less than 10,000 tonnes)

South East

East Sussex County Council
Hampshire County Council
Kent County Council
Surrey County Council
West Sussex County Council

East of England

Essex County Council
Hertfordshire County Council

London

Barnet London Borough Council
Camden London Borough Council
Enfield London Borough Council
Hackney London Borough Council
Haringey London Borough Council
Islington London Borough Council
Waltham Forest London Borough Council

South West

Dorset County Council

West Midlands

Herefordshire Council

North West

Cheshire East Council
Cheshire West and Chester Council
Greater Manchester (10 Unitary Authorities)
Halton Borough Council
Knowsley Council
Lancashire County Council
Liverpool City Council
Sefton Council
St Helens Council
Wirral Council

Yorkshire and Humber

Barnsley Council
Doncaster Council
Rotherham Council
Sheffield City Council

Wales

Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council
Bridgend County Borough Council
Caerphilly County Borough Council
Cardiff City Council
Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council
Monmouthshire County Council
Newport City Council
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council
Torfaen County Borough Council
Vale of Glamorgan Council

Appendix 6

South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) Memorandum of Understanding

Memorandum of Understanding between the Waste Planning Authorities of the South East of England

April 2013

Updated June 2015 for publication of National Planning Policy for Waste in place of PPS10

1. Introduction

1.1 The Waste Planning Authorities of the South East of England comprise the following authorities:

- Bracknell Forest Council
- Brighton & Hove Council
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Hampshire County Council (incorporating Southampton City, Portsmouth City and New Forest National Park Waste Planning Authorities)
- Isle of Wight Council
- Kent County Council
- Medway Council
- Milton Keynes Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Reading Council
- Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
- Slough Council
- South Downs National Park Authority
- Surrey County Council
- West Berkshire Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Wokingham Council

1.2 These authorities are each responsible for planning for sustainable waste management in their areas and in particular for the preparation of waste local plans. A waste local plan can cover the area of a single waste planning authority or a larger area administered by more than one waste planning authority where they decide to act together.

1.3 Section 110 of the Localism Act sets out a duty to cooperate in relation to planning of sustainable development, under which planning authorities are required to engage constructively, actively, and on an ongoing basis in any process where there are cross-boundary issues or impacts. This includes the preparation of development plan documents so far as relating to a “strategic matter” such as waste management. This duty to cooperate therefore applies to the preparation of waste local plans.

1.4 In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) refers to planning authorities having a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic priorities defined in paragraph

156 which includes waste management infrastructure. The NPPF expects local planning authorities “to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts” (paragraph 181). The ‘tests of soundness’ (paragraph 182) also require planning authorities to work with their neighbours: to be “positively prepared” a plan should seek to meet “unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so”; and to be “effective” a plan should be “based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities”.

2. Purpose

2.1 The purpose of this Memorandum is to underpin effective cooperation and collaboration between the Waste Planning Authorities of the South East of England in addressing strategic cross-boundary issues that relate to planning for waste management.

2.2 It sets out matters of agreement, reflecting the spirit of co-operation between the Parties to the Memorandum. It is, however, not intended to be legally binding or to create legal rights.

3. Parties

3.1 The Memorandum is agreed by the following Councils listed in Appendix A.

4. Aims

4.1 The memorandum has the following broad aims:

- to ensure that planned provision for waste management in the South East of England is co-ordinated, as far as is possible, whilst recognising that provision by waste industry is based on commercial considerations; and
- to ensure that the approach to waste planning throughout the South East is consistent between authorities.

5. Limitations

5.1 The Parties to the Memorandum recognise that there will not always be full agreement with respect to all of the issues on which they have a duty to cooperate. For the avoidance of doubt, this Memorandum shall not fetter the discretion of any of the Parties in relation to any of its statutory powers and duties, and is not intended to be legally binding.

5.2 The Parties recognise that for a majority of existing waste management facilities, there are no restrictions on the handling of waste that has arisen outside their authority area.

6. Background

6.1 The disposal of waste is at the bottom of the Waste Hierarchy as defined in the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW, October 2014). It is the least desirable form of waste management in environmental terms.

6.2 The NPPW recognises that there will be a need for new waste management facilities and that these need to be planned for. Paragraph 1 states that positive planning plays a pivotal role in delivering this country’s waste ambitions through:

- delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency, including provision of modern infrastructure, local employment opportunities and wider climate change benefits, by driving waste management up the waste hierarchy;
 - ensuring that waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns, such as housing and transport, recognising the positive contribution that waste management can make to the development of sustainable communities;
 - providing a framework in which communities and businesses are engaged with and take more responsibility for their own waste, including by enabling waste to be disposed of or, in the case of mixed municipal waste from households, recovered, in line with the proximity principle;
 - helping to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment.
- 6.3 There will continue to be a need for some landfill capacity to deal with residual waste in the South East, particularly in the short and medium term before new recycling and treatment facilities are built and become operational.
- 6.4 Paragraph 263 of the Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011 states that “there is the need for councils to work together and look at waste management needs across different waste streams and across administrative boundaries.” It further states that “There is no requirement for individual authorities to be self-sufficient in terms of waste infrastructure and transporting waste to existing infrastructure to deliver the best environmental solution should not be considered a barrier.”
- 6.5 Paragraph 3 of the NPPW further states that Waste planning authorities should prepare Local Plans which identify sufficient opportunities to meet the identified needs of their area for the management of waste streams. It further states that, in preparing Local Plans, waste planning authorities should:
- identify the tonnages and percentages of municipal, and commercial and industrial, waste requiring different types of management in their area over the period of the plan
 - consider the need for additional waste management capacity of more than local significance and reflect any requirement for waste management facilities identified nationally;
 - take into account any need for waste management, including for disposal of the residues from treated wastes, arising in more than one waste planning authority area but where only a limited number of facilities would be required;
 - work collaboratively in groups with other waste planning authorities, and in two-tier areas with district authorities, through the statutory duty to cooperate, to provide a suitable network of facilities to deliver sustainable waste management;
 - consider the extent to which the capacity of existing operational facilities would satisfy any identified need.

There is an aspiration to achieve net self-sufficiency within each waste planning area for the management of non-hazardous waste.

7. Agreement between the Parties

- 7.1 The Parties recognise that there will be a degree of cross-boundary movement of waste. In light of this the Parties will plan on the basis of net self-sufficiency which assumes that within each waste local plan area the planning authority or authorities will plan for the management of an amount of waste which is equivalent to the amount arising in that plan area. All parties accept that when using this principle to test policy, it may not be possible to meet this requirement in full, particularly for hazardous and other specialist waste streams.
- 7.2 In keeping with the principle of net self-sufficiency for each area, the Parties will plan on the basis that no provision has to be made in their waste local plans to meet the needs of any other authorities which are basing their waste policies on achieving the principle of net self-sufficiency.
- 7.4 There may be cases where some waste will not be planned to be managed within a waste plan area because of difficulty in delivering sufficient recovery or disposal capacity. Provision for unmet requirements from other authority areas may be included in a waste local plan, in line with paragraph 182 of the NPPF, but any provision for facilities to accommodate waste from other authorities that cannot or do not intend to achieve net self-sufficiency will be a matter for discussion and agreement between authorities and is outside the terms of this Memorandum.
- 7.5 The parties note that there may be some kinds of waste that cannot be managed within their own plan area, either in the short term or within the relevant plan period. These may include hazardous wastes and radioactive wastes. Where provision for the management of these wastes will be planned for in a different waste planning authority area, this will need to be considered between the relevant authorities.

The Parties will work together in the consideration of how to plan for the implications arising from the management of waste from London and any other authority areas that are not party to this Memorandum.

- 7.7 The Parties agree that the challenge to be addressed is to implement the waste hierarchy and to enable better, more sustainable, ways of dealing with waste to reduce the current dependence on landfill.
- 7.8 The Parties agree to continue to positively plan to meet any shortfalls in recovery and disposal capacity in their areas and to enable the delivery of new facilities. This includes making appropriate provision in their local plans, including, as required, the allocation of sites for new recycling and other recovery facilities.
- 7.9 The Parties recognise that private sector businesses (and, therefore, commercial considerations) will determine whether new merchant waste management recycling and treatment facilities will be built and what types of technology will be used.

8. Actions and Activities

- 8.1 The Parties to this Memorandum will continue to share knowledge and information relevant to strategic cross-boundary issues relating to waste planning including the matters set out in the Agreement in Section 7.

- 8.2 The Parties will seek to ensure that the matters in the Agreement are reflected in the waste local plans that they prepare (including, in the case of unitary authorities, any local plans that include waste policies); this includes the allocation of sites.
- 8.3 The Parties will take account of the matters in the Agreement in the consideration of planning applications for waste management.
- 8.4 The Parties will continue to liaise with each other in relation to the general matters set out in the Agreement, in particular, the implications of the decline in permitted landfill capacity in the region.

9. **Liaison**

- 9.1 Appropriate officers of each Party to this Memorandum will liaise formally through the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group (SEWPAG) which normally meets four times a year. As appropriate, the Memorandum will be formally discussed at SEWPAG meetings and any decisions and actions relating to it will be recorded in the minutes.
- 9.2 In addition, there are other cross boundary groups within the South East of England (e.g. SE7). Any liaison on waste planning matters between Parties to this Memorandum within such groups will be undertaken with due regard to this Memorandum.

10. **Timescale**

- 10.1 The Memorandum of Understanding is for a three-year period to December 2016.
- 10.2 It will be reviewed annually by the Parties to establish how effective it has been and whether any changes are required. The results of the review will be reported at SEWPAG meetings and recorded in the minutes.

11. **Signature:**.....

Date:.....