



**Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste
Development Framework**



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Minerals & Waste Core Strategy

MINERALS & WASTE ISSUES AND OPTIONS

CONSULTATION PAPER

June 2006

Published for consultation in accordance with Regulation 25 of the
Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004



**OXFORDSHIRE
COUNTY COUNCIL**

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk

Contents

Section	Title	Page
1	Introduction	2
2	Background and Context	4
3	Aims and Objectives of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework	7
4	Issues and Options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework	9
5	General Issue	10
	Issue 1 – Plan Period	10
6	Key Minerals Issues and Options	11
	Issue 2 – Mineral Supply	11
	Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings	14
	Issue 4 – Strategy for Location of Limestone and/or Ironstone Workings	15
	Issue 5 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	16
	Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots	18
	Issue 7 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Areas or Sites for Mineral Working	19
	Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings	20
	Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impact of Mineral Working and Supply	21
	Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals	21
7	Key Waste Issues and Options	23
	Issue 11 – Waste Management Facilities	27
	Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy	32
	Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management	33
	Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities	34
	Issue 15 - Landfill	35
	Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management	36

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The County Council is reviewing the planning policies covering mineral working and waste management in Oxfordshire. This will result in a new policy framework for minerals and waste development in the County – the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF).
- 1.2 An important stage in preparing the MWDF is this consultation paper on issues and options. The purpose of this paper is to set out the Council's strategic aims and objectives for minerals and waste planning in Oxfordshire; what the County Council sees as the key issues that need to be addressed in preparing the documents that will make up the MWDF; and possible options for addressing the issues identified.
- 1.3 The Council wants to get as wide a range of views as possible on the issues and options that should be looked at before it puts forward any proposals for comment. Responses to this paper will inform the preparation of preferred options and proposals for the minerals and waste core strategy, and will also feed into the preparation of site proposals documents for minerals and waste.
- 1.4 This document has been published for consultation in accordance with Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

How to respond to this consultation paper

- 1.5 The consultation paper poses a series of questions after the aims and objectives and each of the issues. We would like to have your views on these aims, objectives, issues and options. It would be very helpful if you could do this by answering the questions in the paper.
- 1.6 Please use the response form that accompanies this document. Further copies of the response form can be downloaded from the County Council website or obtained from the address below. Please send your response by post, fax or email to:

Issues and Options Consultation
Minerals & Waste Policy (SPED)
Environment & Economy
Oxfordshire County Council
Speedwell House
Speedwell Street
Oxford OX1 1NE

Fax No: 01865 814085
Email: minerals.wasteplan@oxfordshire.gov.uk

The closing date for responses is Friday 11th August 2006.

- 1.7 For any further information, please contact the Minerals and Waste Policy Team on 01865 810428, or at the email or postal address above.

What happens next

- 1.8 This is the first opportunity to make your views known on the content of the development documents for the MWDF. The Council will consider carefully all comments received in preparing the preferred options and proposals for the core strategy, for consultation later this year. Submission of the core strategy to Government is programmed for July 2007 and it is hoped the Council can adopt it in October 2008, following independent examination.
- 1.9 The comments received will also be considered by the Council in the initial stages of preparing the minerals and waste site proposals documents. Consultation on preferred options and proposals for these two documents is programmed for May – June 2007. These documents are programmed to be submitted to Government in February 2008 and it is hoped the Council can adopt them in July 2009, again following independent examination.

Nomination of sites for the MWDF

- 1.10 A key part of initial work on preparing the minerals and waste site proposals documents is identifying site options for mineral working and waste management development for assessment. A wide range of site options should be identified as early as possible in the process so that all potential sites can be properly assessed. In November 2005 the Council issued an invitation to the minerals and waste industries, landowners and other interested parties to nominate potential mineral working and waste management sites for consideration.
- 1.11 The Council is still accepting site nominations. Forms for nominating sites are available on the County Council website or from the address above. These should be completed and returned, with a map of the proposed site and any other relevant information, to the Minerals and Waste Policy Team. The Council would like to receive any further nominations by 31 August 2006. All sites put forward will be made public.

2. Background and Context

- 2.1 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 and Minerals and Waste Local Plan provide the current policy framework for minerals and waste planning in Oxfordshire. The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 sets the broad policy context for preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.
- 2.2 The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted by the County Council in 1996. It contains more detailed policies for mineral working and supply and for the provision of waste management facilities and identifies specific sites for working of sharp sand and gravel. Policies for waste management are less specific.
- 2.3 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 local plans are being replaced by local development frameworks. The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF) when adopted will be a portfolio of local (minerals and waste) development documents setting out policies and proposals for a period of at least 10 years, against which planning applications for minerals and waste and related development will be considered.
- 2.4 The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, as revised in March 2006, sets out the programme for the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework and explains what each development document will cover.
- 2.5 Development plan documents, which together with the regional spatial strategy will form the statutory development plan, must include a core strategy; site specific allocations; development control policies; and a proposals map.
- 2.6 The purpose of this paper is to set out the Council's strategic aims and objectives for minerals and waste planning in Oxfordshire; what the County Council sees as the key issues that need to be addressed in preparing its core strategy and other development plan documents; and possible options for addressing the issues identified.
- 2.7 In preparing this document account has been taken of the existing and emerging national, regional and local policy framework provided by national planning policy guidance notes and statements, regional planning guidance (including the Government's proposed changes to minerals and waste guidance) and the Oxfordshire Structure Plan.
- 2.8 Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) says that the core strategy should set out the key elements of the planning framework for the area and should comprise a spatial vision and strategic objectives for the area; a spatial strategy; core policies; and a monitoring and implementation framework with clear objectives for achieving delivery.

- 2.9 For minerals and waste, PPS12 says that the core strategy:
- for minerals should take account of the need to contribute appropriately to national, regional and local requirements at acceptable social, environmental and economic costs; and
 - for waste should set out a planning strategy for sustainable waste management which enables provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations.
- 2.10 At this stage in the plan-preparation process, these matters are looked at in a general, strategic manner; this is not yet the time for considering detailed site options.
- 2.11 All policies and proposals in development plan documents must be subject to sustainability appraisal, including strategic environmental assessment. A Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report has been prepared, setting a framework for the appraisal of policies and proposals. The Scoping Report will be updated as and when necessary.
- 2.12 The options in this report have been subject to sustainability appraisal (including strategic environmental assessment). An appraisal workshop was held, involving interest groups, technical bodies and council officers. The outcomes of this appraisal are available on the County Council website.
- 2.13 All development plan documents must be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination to test the soundness of the document and ensure that necessary legal requirements for its preparation have been undertaken. When preparing local development documents for inclusion in a development framework, planning authorities are required to carry out consultation at an early stage, before drawing up proposals. Government policy and advice is that issues and alternative options should be drawn up and consulted on. A Statement of Community Involvement which sets out how the Council will involve and consult organisations and individuals has been submitted to Government for independent examination and is expected to be adopted in December 2006.
- 2.14 As part of the process of community involvement a small stakeholder group – the Minerals and Waste Forum – has been set up to provide input and views from a range of interest groups. Meetings of the Forum have been held to discuss the development of aims and objectives, issues and options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. These meetings were independently facilitated by Proteus Public Relations. Reports of the meetings are available on the County Council website.

Oxfordshire MWDF Issues and Options

- 2.15 All documents are on the County Council website:
www.oxfordshire.gov.uk, at planning policy.

3. Aims and Objectives of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework

3.1 A draft set of minerals and waste aims and objectives were considered by the County Council Cabinet in September 2005. These are set out for comment below.

3.2 Minerals Aim

To strike an appropriate balance between on the one hand providing a contribution towards society's needs for minerals and on the other hand conserving resources and protecting the environment and quality of life in Oxfordshire.

3.3 Minerals Objectives

M1. To provide for the supply of minerals in accordance with national and regional policy.

M2. To conserve mineral resources by encouraging the most efficient use of materials and avoiding the sterilisation of mineral deposits by development.

M3. To encourage and provide for increased use of recycled and secondary materials in place of primary aggregates.

M4. To minimise the impact of transportation of minerals by seeking to minimise the distance materials need to be transported by road and encouraging the use of other modes of transport where practicable.

M5. To ensure working and supply of minerals is carried out in an environmentally acceptable way by minimising impacts on local communities, the landscape and natural environment.

M6. To ensure good restoration of mineral workings for appropriate after-uses and secure enhancement of the environment, in particular through long-term benefits for nature conservation, landscape, recreation and local communities.

3.4 Waste Aim

To provide for the safe and economic treatment and disposal of waste produced in Oxfordshire in a way that makes the best practical use of resources and protects the environment and quality of life in Oxfordshire.

3.5 **Waste Objectives**

- W1. To provide for sufficient capacity for the treatment and disposal of waste equivalent to the quantity produced in Oxfordshire plus a contribution to national and regional waste management requirements in accordance with national and regional policy.
- W2. To promote reduced production of waste and increased recognition of waste as a resource, with an increase in recycling, composting and other recovery of resources from waste and a decrease in landfill of waste, to ensure that national and regional targets are at least met.
- W3. To ensure waste management objectives and requirements are taken into account in the planning and design of other development, in particular to encourage provision for re-use, recycling and recovery of resources from waste in new development.
- W4. To minimise the impact of transportation of waste by seeking to minimise the distance materials need to be transported by road and encouraging the use of other modes of transport where practicable.
- W5. To ensure the management of waste is carried out in an environmentally acceptable way by minimising impacts on local communities, the landscape and natural environment.
- W6. To ensure good restoration of landfills for appropriate after-uses and secure enhancement of the environment, in particular through long-term benefits for nature conservation, landscape, recreation and local communities.

Question 1a:

Are these the right aims and objectives for the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework?

Question 1b:

If not, how do you think they should be changed?

Question 1c:

Are there any other objectives that should be included? (please specify)

4. Issues and Options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework

- 4.1 In preparing the Minerals and Waste development documents it will be necessary first to develop the strategy and key policies for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework as a whole and to then identify site options that accord with that strategy and key policy framework. This report therefore focuses on the key issues that need to be addressed in preparing the MWDF as a whole and the options that the County Council has identified as being possible ways of addressing those key issues. It does not cover specific site options for development or more detailed matters relating to specific proposals. Those are matters to be considered in the subsequent more detailed stages of site identification and assessment and development of detailed policies for minerals and waste development, or in the planning application process.

5. General Issue

Issue 1 – Plan Period

- 5.1 A key issue for the preparation of the development documents is the time period that the overall strategy, policies and specific proposals should cover.
- 5.2 The main options are: to 2016, the period covered by the Oxfordshire Structure Plan and Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9); to 2018, which is 10 years from the proposed adoption date of the core strategy; and to 2026, the period to be covered by the new South East Plan (the new regional spatial strategy). It may be appropriate for the core strategy to cover a longer period than the minerals and waste sites proposals and policies documents.
- 5.3 Government policy is that a core strategy should cover a period of at least 10 years from the date of adoption but should also look ahead to any longer-term horizon set in the regional spatial strategy. The expected date of adoption of the core strategy is October 2008, therefore a 10 year period would be to 2018. This is reflected in the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, which says the core strategy, will cover a period of at least 10 years.
- 5.4 Waste development documents should make provision for waste management capacity equivalent to at least 10 years at the rate set in the regional spatial strategy. There is no equivalent Government policy on provision for mineral supply in minerals development documents. The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme says the Minerals and Waste Site Proposals and Policies documents will both make provision and identify sites for a 10 year period. The expected date of adoption of these two documents is July 2009.

Question 2a:

What period should the Core Strategy cover?

- (i) to 2018 or
(ii) to 2026 or
(iii) to another date (please specify and give reasons).

Question 2b:

What period should the Minerals and Waste Sites Proposals and Policies documents cover?

- (i) to 2016 or
(ii) to 2018 or
(iii) to 2026 or
(iv) to another date (please specify and give reasons).

6. Key Minerals Issues and Options

Issue 2 – Mineral Supply

Issue 2 a) Provision for mineral supply

- 6.1 Aggregate minerals account for most of Oxfordshire's mineral production: in 2004 the county produced about 1.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel (including soft sand) and 0.6 million tonnes of crushed rock (limestone and ironstone).
- 6.2 The Government provides advice on the quantities of aggregate minerals for which provision should be made in each region. Based on the guidance in MPG6 'Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England' (1994), the former London and South East Regional Planning Conference (SERPLAN) in 1994 agreed a sub-regional apportionment of the supply requirement. Oxfordshire's agreed apportionment (or share) for sand and gravel was 2 million tonnes a year. There was no sub-regional apportionment for crushed rock.
- 6.3 The Government published new guidelines for aggregates provision in June 2003. The South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) published a draft sub-regional apportionment of the regional guideline figures for the South East for consultation in March 2004, as part of its proposed Regional Minerals Strategy. This was the subject of an Examination in Public in October 2004 and the subsequent report of the Panel (December 2004) recommended a revised apportionment. The Secretary of State included this in Proposed Changes to Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals (August 2005). The decision of the Secretary of State on the Proposed Changes is expected shortly.
- 6.4 With a few amendments, the Proposed Changes to RPG9 have been included in the draft South East Plan (March 2006). This includes the proposed revised sub-regional apportionment of the land-won aggregates provision required in the South East over the period to 2016. The proposed level of provision for Oxfordshire is 1.82 million tonnes a year of sand and gravel and 1.0 million tonnes a year of crushed rock.
- 6.5 Production of all aggregate minerals has generally decreased in recent years. Production levels in 2003 were significantly lower than the proposed new sub-regional apportionments for Oxfordshire.
- 6.6 Taking into account the reserves of sand and gravel and crushed rock with planning permission at the end of 2004 (the most recent year for which figures are available) and permissions granted since then:
- a) the MWDF will need to make provision for an additional 12.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel for the period to the end of 2016. If the

same level of provision is maintained beyond 2016, the requirement would increase to 16.2 million tonnes if the plan period is extended to 2018, and to 30.7 million tonnes if the plan period is extended to 2026.

- b) there appears to be sufficient provision of crushed rock for the periods both to the end of 2016 and the end of 2018 at the level of provision proposed. If the plan period is extended to 2026 the MWDF will need to make provision for an additional 8.0 million tonnes of crushed rock, if the same level of provision is maintained beyond 2016.

- 6.7 The MWDF will therefore need to identify new locations for mineral extraction. Government guidance in MPG1 'General Considerations and the Development Plan System' (1996) is that minerals local plans should indicate areas for possible future working, which may take the form of 'specific sites', 'preferred areas' or 'areas of search'. The Government's consultation paper on MPS1 'Planning and Minerals' (2004) says areas should be indicated in minerals development documents to show the places where extraction is most likely to take place, which may take the form of 'preferred areas' or 'areas of search'. This draft guidance goes on to say that sufficient provision should be made to meet the anticipated need over the plan period and that in most cases preferred areas should be identified to cover at least the first half of this period.
- 6.8 The consultation paper on MPS1 defines 'preferred areas' as areas of known resources where planning permission might reasonably be anticipated; and 'areas of search' as broader areas where the knowledge of mineral resources may be less certain but within which planning permission for particular sites could be granted. The distinction between 'specific sites' and 'preferred areas' in MPS1 is unclear and in the light of the consultation paper on MPS1 are assumed essentially to be the same.
- 6.9 New sand and gravel, limestone and ironstone reserves can be provided by permitting new free-standing sites or extensions to existing operations. Extensions can take advantage of existing quarry infrastructure such as processing plant and access, whereas new sites require new infrastructure to be set up. This means that new free-standing sites need to be of sufficient size to justify the investment involved in establishing a new operation, whereas extensions can be much smaller. However, generally a greater number of extensions than of new sites are needed to provide for a required amount of mineral supply.
- 6.10 Government guidance in MPG1 is that it may be preferable to adopt a policy of allowing extensions rather than new sites, as a means of minimising disturbance, but that this may not be appropriate for all

existing mineral workings and in some cases less environmental harm may be caused by opening a new operation.

Question 3a:

What sort of areas should the MWDF identify to provide for the future mineral working needed?

- (i) broad areas of search for new workings; or**
- (ii) specific site allocations (preferred areas); or**
- (iii) a combination of broad areas of search and specific site allocations (preferred areas) (please specify); or**
- (iv) none of these, but instead set locational criteria for planning applications to be considered against.**

Question 3b:

What type of new mineral workings should be preferred for the sites to be identified in the MWDF?

- (i) extensions to existing quarries; or**
- (ii) new quarries.**

Question 3c:

For how much of the period of the MWDF should sites and/or areas be identified?

- (i) the whole of the MWDF period (whatever period is covered); or**
- (ii) (if the MWDF extends beyond 2016) to 2016 or 2018 only (please specify) with criteria policies to cover the remainder of the MWDF period.**

Issue 2 b) Provision for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand

- 6.11 Oxfordshire produces two distinct types of sand and gravel: soft sand - used mainly for mortar and asphalt; and sharp sand and gravel – mainly used for making concrete and other constructional uses. Soft sand occurs mainly in a band between Faringdon and Abingdon, with smaller outcrops in the north of the county. Sharp sand and gravel deposits are found in the Thames, Windrush and other river valleys and also in the Chilterns and near Finmere (north of Bicester).
- 6.12 Government guidance in MPG6 is that where different aggregate types occur which are not interchangeable, separate landbanks may be appropriate. On the basis of this guidance, the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996) subdivided the total sand and gravel apportionment for Oxfordshire of 2.0 million tonnes a year (mtpa): 0.2 mtpa soft sand (10%); and 1.8 mtpa sharp sand and gravel (90%).
- 6.13 The actual average production over the last 3 years for which figures are available has been 0.29 mtpa soft sand (18%); and 1.33 mtpa sharp sand and gravel (82%) (average total production 1.62 mtpa).

- 6.14 If separate provision is to be made for soft sand and sharp sand and gravel in the MWDF, a decision will need to be made as to what basis should be used for subdividing the sand and gravel apportionment figure for Oxfordshire between these two aggregate types.
- 6.15 The options for subdividing the Oxfordshire sand and gravel apportionment figure of 1.82 mtpa between soft sand and sharp sand and gravel could be based on the split in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan; recent production trends; or taking account of other factors.

Question 4:

How should the 1.82 mtpa sand and gravel supply requirement (apportionment) for Oxfordshire be subdivided between soft sand and sharp sand and gravel?

- (i) **10% soft sand to 90% sharp sand and gravel (as in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan); or**
- (ii) **18% soft sand to 82% sharp sand and gravel (in line with production in recent years); or**
- (iii) **some other split (please specify and give reasons).**

Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings

- 6.16 The Core Strategy should set out a strategy for the location of sand and gravel workings in Oxfordshire, which will provide a basis for the identification of areas and/or sites in the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies document.
- 6.17 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan identified land for sharp sand and gravel working based on areas identified in the then Oxfordshire Structure Plan. This was carried forward with amendments into the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2011, which identified four areas – Sutton Courtenay, Sutton Wick, Stanton Harcourt and Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton where the principle of sharp sand and gravel working was accepted.
- 6.18 Areas for sand and gravel working are no longer identified in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016. The Plan includes a new policy (M2) which states that locations for sand and gravel working will be identified in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework and sets out factors to be taken into account in identifying appropriate locations.
- 6.19 Of the four former Structure Plan areas, production from the Sutton Courtenay and Sutton Wick areas has declined and there seems to be limited potential for new sand and gravel working in these areas. Approximately 70% of sand and gravel production in Oxfordshire is now from the Lower Windrush Valley and Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton areas.

- 6.20 In the preparation of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016, a study was carried out to identify a potential new strategic area for sand and gravel working in the southern part of Oxfordshire. 15 potential sharp sand and gravel resource areas were initially identified and assessed, of which 7 were considered to merit more detailed consideration, at: Radley; Marcham; Appleford – Little Wittenham; Caversham; Culham – Clifton Hampden; Wallingford – Cholsey – South Moreton; and Stadhampton – Berinsfield – Warborough – Benson. The County Council view at the Draft Plan stage was that the last named of these sites was the best option for identification in the new Structure Plan. Following consideration of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel Report, no locations (new or existing) are identified in the Plan. All options for sand and gravel working are to be reassessed in the preparation of the MWDF.

Question 5:

What strategy for the location of new sand and gravel workings should be adopted in the MWDF?

- (i) **continue to concentrate new workings in the main existing sharp sand and gravel working areas in West Oxfordshire, the Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton and the Lower Windrush Valley areas; or**
- (ii) **identify new strategic working area(s) in the southern part of the county, to spread production more evenly in relation to the main areas of demand for aggregates in Oxfordshire; or**
- (iii) **promote a more dispersed pattern of smaller scale working areas; or**
- (iv) **some other pattern of new working areas (please specify and give reasons).**

Issue 4 – Strategy for Location of Limestone and/or Ironstone Workings

- 6.21 The Core Strategy should set out a strategy for the location of limestone and/or ironstone workings in Oxfordshire, which will provide a basis for the identification of areas and/or sites in the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies document.
- 6.22 Neither the Minerals and Waste Local Plan nor the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 identifies areas for limestone or ironstone working. The location of areas for limestone and ironstone working has not been a major issue for the development plan in the past, because levels of permitted reserves have historically been high and production levels generally low. In recent years production (particularly of limestone) for use as aggregate has increased and permitted reserves have declined. There is now for the first time a figure (sub-regional apportionment) in the South East Plan for the amount of crushed rock provision to be made in Oxfordshire.

- 6.23 Over recent years the production of crushed rock in Oxfordshire has been around 700,000 tonnes a year, comprising about 60% limestone and 40% ironstone. The main area of limestone production is the Oxford – Bicester area, accounting for over half of limestone output, with significant amounts also being produced in the Witney – Burford and Faringdon areas.
- 6.24 Ironstone is worked in the Alkerton – Hornton – Wroxton area to the north west of Banbury. Large reserves of ironstone were granted planning permission for extraction in this area in the 1950s, but much of the permitted land is now considered unsuitable for working by current standards and extraction is limited to particular sites within the overall permitted areas.
- 6.25 At recent rates of working, current permitted reserves of limestone and ironstone are sufficient for nearly 20 years. However, if production increases towards the apportionment figure of 1.0 million tonnes a year, additional reserves will be required before 2024. At the apportionment rate, current reserves will last only to 2018. If ironstone production continues to be limited, any increase in crushed rock production is likely to require the identification of new areas for working of limestone rather than ironstone.

Question 6:

What strategy for the location of new limestone and/or ironstone workings should be adopted in the MWDF?

- (i) locate new limestone workings in the Witney – Burford area;
or**
- (ii) identify new limestone workings in the Oxford – Bicester area;
or**
- (iii) make increased provision for ironstone working from the north of the county; or**
- (iv) some other pattern of new working areas (please specify and give reasons).**

Issue 5 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

Issue 5 a) Provision for the Supply of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

- 6.26 National policy is to increase the use of secondary and recycled materials as substitutes for natural minerals. It is a prime objective of regional minerals policy to increase supplies of secondary aggregates and encourage greater use of mineral waste in the construction industry in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. The Draft South East Plan sets challenging targets for the recycling of construction and demolition waste. The MWDF must determine how much provision should be made in Oxfordshire for recycled and secondary aggregates.

- 6.27 Recycled aggregate is principally derived from construction and demolition waste, including road planings. The main source of secondary aggregates in Oxfordshire is ash from the Didcot A Power Station. There is no reliable and comprehensive data on production of secondary and recycled aggregates available for Oxfordshire. A survey in 2004 recorded production of 261,000 tonnes, but there was only a partial response from site operators and this figure is believed to be significantly less than the total production.
- 6.28 An assessment of the capacity of waste management facilities in the South East region carried out for SEERA in 2005 shows facilities with planning permission for production of aggregates for recycled construction and demolition waste in Oxfordshire having capacity totalling 350,000 tonnes per annum. However, much of this capacity is in facilities that have planning permission for only a temporary period.
- 6.29 The draft South East Plan seeks an increase in use of secondary and recycled aggregates in the South East from 6.6 to at least 7.7 million tonnes by 2016. To enable this target to be met, the draft Plan proposes a sub-regional apportionment of the provision to be made by 2016. The proposed figure for Oxfordshire is 0.9 million tonnes a year of secondary and recycled aggregates. Additional recycling facilities will be required to meet achieve this. The draft Plan says mineral planning authorities should identify sites to meet this scale of provision in their minerals development frameworks. In addition to permanent sites, the draft Plan says that temporary facilities, including mobile recycling facilities, can make a useful contribution to overall provision. Temporary recycling facilities are often located at mineral workings and landfill sites.

Question 7a:

How should the MWDF make provision for additional aggregate recycling facilities?

- (i) identify sites for temporary facilities; or**
- (ii) identify sites for permanent facilities); or**
- (iii) neither of these, but instead set locational criteria for planning applications to be considered against.**

Question 7b:

How much provision should the MWDF make for aggregate recycling?

- (i) enough just to meet the regional targets for supply of recycled aggregates; or**
- (ii) more than is required to meet those targets.**

Issue 5 b) Where Aggregates Recycling Facilities should be Located

- 6.30 To meet national and regional targets the draft South East Plan says mineral planning authorities should identify sufficient sites for recycling plants, primarily on brown field sites or within new employment developments to ensure that there is an increase in the recycling of construction, demolition and other waste as secondary aggregates.
- 6.31 The draft Plan says mineral planning authorities should take into account the need for recycling operations to be located within a viable catchment area close to the origins of the waste materials and subsequent markets; the ability for recycling operations to be enclosed in an industrial building; and the need to provide an indication of typical site sizes, acknowledging the need for materials storage before and after processing.
- 6.32 The draft Plan says also that mineral recycling facilities should not be precluded from green belt where this is consistent with the proximity principle, where there are no alternative sites and provided that development would not cause harm to green belt objectives. In very exceptional circumstances minerals recycling facilities for local materials should not be precluded from AONB's.

Question 8a:

What sort of sites should the MWDF identify to provide for new aggregates recycling facilities?

- (i) sites on industrial or employment land; or**
- (ii) sites at existing minerals and/or waste sites; or**
- (iii) sites on previously developed (brownfield) land in the countryside; or**
- (iv) greenfield sites.**

Question 8b:

At what type of location in relation to the Green Belt around Oxford should the MWDF make provision for new aggregates recycling facilities?

- (i) only at locations either in urban areas or in areas of countryside outside the Green Belt; or**
- (ii) at suitable locations within the Green Belt as well.**

Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots

- 6.33 There is no indigenous hard rock in Oxfordshire. Significant quantities of crushed rock aggregate are imported into Oxfordshire by rail to two rail depots, at Banbury and Sutton Courtenay. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan welcomes in principle proposals for additional rail depots if there is shown to be a need for more capacity.

- 6.34 Policy M5 in the draft South East Plan says mineral planning authorities should assess the need for wharf and rail facilities for the handling and distribution of imported minerals and processed materials and identify strategic sites for safeguarding in minerals development frameworks.

Question 9:

In making provision for imported aggregates, including aggregates transported by rail:

- (i) **should the Core Strategy promote an increase in the supply of aggregates from outside the county to meet needs in Oxfordshire?**
- (ii) **should the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies document identify new sites for rail aggregate depots?**

Issue 7 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Areas or Sites for Mineral Working

- 6.35 The identification and approval of mineral sites, their working and their subsequent reuse/restoration cannot be seen in isolation. Minerals make a crucial contribution to the wider economy. Workings and the transport of minerals have environmental and social impacts and local extraction often has special significance for rural areas.
- 6.36 Structure Plan policy M1 says permission will be granted for mineral working at appropriate locations provided any adverse impact is outweighed by need for the mineral. Policy M2 says that in identifying appropriate locations, the County Council will take account of the distribution of sand and gravel resources; the existing pattern of supply and distribution of workings; proximity to main market areas; accessibility to main transport routes; risk of birdstrike; restoration and after use potential; and development plan policies (in particular those which seek to safeguard important environmental features and areas).

Question 10:

In identifying and assessing options for the location of new areas or sites for mineral working for inclusion in the MWDF:

- (i) **What factors or criteria should be used to identify and assess site/area options?**
- (ii) **Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? If so, how?**
- (iii) **What weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people?**
- (iv) **What weight should be given to access and proximity to market?**
- (v) **What weight should be given to protection of high grade agricultural land?**
- (vi) **Should restoration potential and after-use opportunities be taken into account in site/area selection and assessment?**

Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings

- 6.37 One of the most significant impacts of mineral working is the disturbance of the landscape and visual intrusion it can cause. Structure Plan policy M1 seeks to ensure that the minimum amount of land is taken up by mineral working at any one time and that restoration is carried out to enable an acceptable after-use.
- 6.38 The MWDF should give guidance on the types of after-uses that may be appropriate in different areas. It is important that agreed after-uses are managed and maintained following restoration. Where appropriate, aftercare schemes and/or long-term management and maintenance agreements will need to be secured.
- 6.39 Generally, restoration to agriculture, woodland, nature conservation or recreation are acceptable after-uses. Mineral working can provide opportunities for environmental enhancement and public benefit, such as the creation of new habitats and improved public access, which give some local long-term gain to offset the impact of working. The County Council is keen to see an increase in the extent of woodland, nature conservation and general public access to the countryside, and pursues these aims through the restoration of mineral workings.
- 6.40 Because of the generally high water table and a shortage of inert waste material for infilling (due in large part to increased recycling), most new sand and gravel workings in the river valleys of Oxfordshire will have to be restored to water bodies. The issue of risk to aircraft from birdstrike will be an important consideration which may restrict the location of workings and affect the design of restoration schemes.
- 6.41 Where the impact of mineral working affects a significant area, as for instance in the Lower Windrush Valley, the Council works with landowners, operators and others to secure a coordinated approach to environmental improvements across the whole area.

Question 11:

In setting policies and proposals for the working and restoration of sites or areas for mineral extraction in the MWDF:

- (i) What should the priorities for restoration be: agriculture; habitat creation; recreation; other (please specify)?**
- (ii) Should there be a preference for restoration back to land; or for creation of lakes; or for partial infilling, e.g. to create reed beds?**
- (iii) Should infilling and restoration of mineral workings be a priority use for inert waste materials?**
- (iv) How should environmental enhancement be promoted and secured?**

Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Mineral Working and Supply

- 6.42 Government guidance in MPG1 'General Considerations and the Development Plan System' is that development plans should provide guidance on the criteria that will be applied to minerals proposals to ensure they do not have an unacceptably adverse impact on the environment. The draft South East Plan recognises that mineral working and transport can have an adverse impact on the environment and local amenity, and says that mineral development frameworks should include policies to manage specific impacts such as noise and dust and encourage good site management and effective restoration.
- 6.43 Structure Plan policy M1 says permission will be granted for mineral working at appropriate locations provided it can be demonstrated that any adverse environmental or other impact the development is likely to cause is outweighed by the need for the mineral. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan includes policies to protect the environment.

Question 12:

In setting policies and proposals for the working and supply of minerals in the MWDF:

- (i) How should the MWDF ensure developments for mineral working and supply will be environmentally acceptable?**
- (ii) Should standard buffer zone distances for mineral workings be specified in the MWDF, to give certainty, or should these distances be set at the planning application stage on a case by case basis, related to the particular circumstances of the proposed development?**
- (iii) How can the MWDF reduce the environmental impact of mineral transport?**

Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals

- 6.44 Mineral resources can only be worked where they occur naturally. Environmental and other constraints can make it difficult to secure an adequate number of sites for the extraction and processing of minerals to meet economic needs. It is a Government objective that minerals should be conserved as far as possible and that unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources should be prevented. Structure Plan policy M3 seeks to safeguard mineral resources of potential economic importance for possible future use. It is for the MWDF to say how this policy will be implemented in accordance with national, regional and other local policies.

Question 13a:

How should the MWDF safeguard mineral resources:

- (i) by identifying all mineral deposits? or**
- (ii) by identifying only those mineral resources that would be economic to work? or**
- (iii) by identifying only the mineral resources required for the MWDF period?**

Question 13b:

Which minerals should be safeguarded in the MWDF?

- (i) sand and gravel;**
- (ii) limestone and ironstone;**
- (iii) fullers earth;**
- (vi) other minerals (please specify).**

7. Key Waste Issues and Options

- 7.1 Oxfordshire residents, businesses and public organisations produce around 1.5 million tonnes of waste a year, mainly comprising municipal, commercial and industrial, and construction and demolition wastes, with smaller quantities of hazardous wastes. This waste all has to be treated and/or disposed of somewhere. At present the main method of management is disposal at local landfill sites. In addition, Oxfordshire has for many years received waste (mainly by rail) from London, which does not have sufficient facilities to deal with all its own waste.
- 7.2 It is important that the Minerals and Waste Development Framework makes appropriate provision – through sites and policies – for the new waste management facilities that will be needed to enable a shift from disposal of waste by landfill to recovery of resources from waste, in particular for municipal waste but also for other types of waste.
- 7.3 The MWDF will need to establish the requirements for waste management for different types of waste over the plan period. The MWDF will need to establish the level of provision that should be made for each waste management route – recycling, composting, other recovery (treatment) methods and landfill – for the different waste streams, and consequently the requirement for new facilities over the plan period.
- 7.4 The Core Strategy of the MWDF should set a locational strategy for waste management in Oxfordshire. Different strategy options for delivering the required additional waste management provision will need to be considered and assessed.
- 7.5 For the Waste Sites Proposals and Policies Document it will be necessary to decide for which types and sizes of facilities sites should be identified, and to consider and assess the different site options. The inclusion of locational criteria policies will also need to be considered, including for any types of facilities for which it is not practical or appropriate to identify sites.

European and national policy drivers and targets

- 7.6 Planning for waste management in Oxfordshire will be shaped by a number of regulatory instruments and policy measures at European, national and regional levels. The EU Waste Framework Directive sets out general requirements for waste management across the Community, including key objectives for control of waste management and disposal and the promotion of waste prevention, re-use, recycling and recovery. This includes a hierarchy of waste management routes to guide decisions, which is set out in the Government's Waste Strategy 2000 (as amended July 2005) as:
- Reduction;
 - Re-use;

- Recycling & Composting
- Energy Recovery;
- Disposal.

7.7 There are also a number of daughter Directives that implement various aspects of the Waste Framework Directive. In particular, the Landfill Directive introduces restrictions on the type and quantities of wastes that may be landfilled. It progressively limits the amount of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) that can be landfilled. This presents what is probably the biggest waste management and planning challenge faced by the County, and is expected to be the main driver in moving waste management up the hierarchy. The targets for the UK are:

- by 2010 to reduce BMW landfilled to 75% of that produced in 1995;
- by 2013 to reduce BMW landfilled to 50% of that produced in 1995; and
- by 2020 to reduce BMW landfilled to 35% of that produced in 1995.

7.8 To ensure these targets are met, the Government has introduced the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme. This sets allowances for landfill of BMW for each waste disposal authority (county council) for each year to 2020. The amount of Oxfordshire's BMW that may be landfilled annually (without fines being incurred) should decrease from the current level of around 143,000 tonnes to no more than about 57,000 tonnes by 2020. This will require higher levels of waste minimisation and recycling and the provision of new waste treatment facilities to divert waste from landfill. This challenge is set in the context of a current trend of increasing arisings of waste.

7.9 The Landfill Directive also requires landfills to be classified as hazardous, non-hazardous or inert, and to only accept wastes in the appropriate category. As a result there are now fewer landfills that can take non-hazardous waste (municipal and most commercial & industrial wastes) and far fewer landfill sites that can take hazardous waste.

7.10 The Government's Waste Strategy 2000 (as amended July 2005) is a national waste strategy for England and Wales that reflects the requirements of the EU Directives. It includes key waste management principles that should underpin all waste management decisions and sets targets for managing waste in a more sustainable way, including the following national targets for recovery of resources from municipal waste and recycling and composting of household waste:

- To recover value from 40% of municipal waste by 2005;
- To recover value from 45% of municipal waste by 2010; and
- To recover value from 67% of municipal waste by 2015.
(Recovery includes recycling, composting, other forms of material recovery and energy recovery.)

- To recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005;
 - To recycle or compost at least 30% of household waste by 2010;
and
 - To recycle or compost at least 33% of household waste by 2015.
- 7.11 Subsequently the Government has set targets for recycling and composting of household waste for all local authorities. For Oxfordshire a target of 33% was set for 2005/06. This has been met.
- 7.12 The only target in Waste Strategy 2000 for other waste streams is:
- By 2005 to reduce the amount of industrial and commercial waste sent to Landfill to 85% of that landfilled in 1998.
- 7.13 In February 2006 the Government published a consultation document on a Review of England's Waste Strategy, which proposes higher targets.
- 7.14 Government planning policy for waste management is set out in PPS10 'Planning for Sustainable Waste Management' (July 2005). It contains key planning objectives and decision making principles, and the Government's policy on how development plans should make provision for waste management facilities. PPS10 is to be supplemented by practice guidance on implementation of policies, a draft of which was published in November 2005.
- 7.15 The key planning objectives for planning authorities in PPS10 are to prepare and deliver planning strategies that:
- drive waste management up the waste hierarchy, address waste as a resource and look to disposal as the last option;
 - provide for communities to take more responsibility for their waste and enable provision of waste facilities to meet the needs of communities;
 - help implement the national waste strategy and targets;
 - help secure recovery or disposal of waste without danger to health or harm to the environment and enable waste to be disposed at one of the nearest appropriate installations;
 - reflect the concerns, interests and needs of communities, waste authorities and business and encourage competitiveness;
 - protect green belts but give significant weight to the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities;
 - ensure the design and layout of new development supports sustainable waste management.

Regional policies and targets

- 7.16 RPG9 includes a single policy on provision for waste management facilities. The Proposed Changes to RPG9, which are expected to be approved by the Government soon, contain a greater number of policies than RPG9. With a few amendments, these policies have been

included in the draft South East Plan that was submitted by SEERA to the Government in March 2006 and published for consultation.

7.17 The draft South East Plan sets regional targets for increased diversion of waste from landfill, and for recycling and composting. Policy W5 says waste planning authorities should put policies and proposals in place to deliver these targets through the following hierarchy of processes, giving priority to those higher up the hierarchy.

- re-use;
- recycling;
- mechanical and/or biological processing;
- thermal treatment.

In addition, sufficient landfill capacity should be provided for waste that cannot practicably be recovered.

7.18 A key policy thrust of the draft South East Plan is that waste planning authorities should plan for net self-sufficiency, by making provision for waste management capacity equivalent to the amount of waste arising and requiring management within their areas (policy W4). This should include appropriate provision for waste from London and other adjoining areas. The draft Plan sets out the waste management capacity and landfill requirements for each waste planning authority area, for municipal (MSW) and commercial and industrial (C&I) wastes, including for waste from London (policies W3, W7 and W13). The requirements for Oxfordshire are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Waste management requirements in Oxfordshire

	Waste Type	2006 - 2010	2011 - 2015	2016 - 2020	2021 - 2025
Waste management capacity requirements for South East waste (annual average in million tonnes per annum)	MSW	0.395 mtpa	0.441 mtpa	0.480 mtpa	0.517 mtpa
	C&I	0.615 mtpa	0.685 mtpa	0.745 mtpa	0.791 mtpa
	Total MSW + C&I	1.01 mtpa	1.126 mtpa	1.225 mtpa	1.308 mtpa
Landfill provision for London waste (total tonnage)	MSW + C&I	2.7 million tonnes (over 10 year period)		1.7 million tonnes (over 10 year period)	

Source: Draft South East Plan, March 2006, Policies W3 and W7

7.19 Policy W13 in the draft South East Plan shows the projected surplus or shortfall of landfill capacity within each county at 2015. For Oxfordshire a surplus of capacity at 2015 is shown, including imports from London.

7.20 The draft South East Plan also includes figures for the provision that should be made in each county for recycled and secondary aggregates. It proposes that Oxfordshire should make provision for 0.9 million tonnes a year by 2016.

County policy and strategy

- 7.21 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 states that provision will be made for treatment and/or disposal of amount of waste produced in Oxfordshire plus some waste from London (policy WM1) and that a range of facilities will be permitted to ensure sufficient waste management capacity (policy WM2). On landfill, it states that permission will only be granted for landfill required for the disposal of waste which remains after policies for reduction, re-use, recycling and recovery have been applied (policy WM2) and that landfill will only be permitted for restoration of mineral workings or where overall environmental benefit would be achieved.
- 7.22 The Oxfordshire Joint Household Waste Management Strategy was agreed by the County Council and the five District Councils, after public consultation, in 2001. The Strategy is currently being reviewed.

Issue 11 – Waste Management Facilities

- 7.23 A total of approximately 1.5 million tonnes of waste is managed in Oxfordshire each year, of which about 50% is construction and demolition waste, 30% commercial and industrial waste and 20% municipal waste. The most recent survey/assessment figures for waste arising and managed in Oxfordshire are set out in Table 2 below. These figures do not include municipal waste from outside the county (particularly from London) that is managed or disposed in Oxfordshire.

Table 2: Annual Arisings / Management of Waste in Oxfordshire (tonnes)

Waste Type	Total Waste Arising / Managed	Landfilled	Recycled or Composted	Recovered
Construction & Demolition	750,000	189,000	253,000	313,000
Commercial & Industrial	486,000	286,000	195,000	5,000
Municipal	300,000	200,000	100,000	-
All Waste	1,541,000	675,000	548,000	318,000

Figures for construction & demolition and commercial & industrial wastes are for 2000/01; figures for municipal waste are for 2005/06.

(Source: ODPM – construction & demolition waste; Environment Agency – commercial & industrial waste; Oxfordshire County Council, Waste Management Group – municipal waste)

- 7.24 Most construction and demolition waste is recycled (33%) or recovered (41%) (mainly for use in restoration of mineral workings and landfills, land improvement and engineering works), and only about 25% is disposed to landfill. About 40% of commercial and industrial waste is recycled, a very small amount is recovered, with most of the remaining 60% being disposed to landfill. Of the 300,000 tonnes of municipal

waste produced in Oxfordshire in 2005/06, 33% was recycled (21.5%) or composted (11.5%), with 67% being disposed, almost all by landfill.

- 7.25 The assessed capacity of waste management facilities in Oxfordshire are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Capacity of Waste Management Facilities in Oxfordshire in 2005

Type of Facility	Capacity
Inert Landfill	3,823,000 cubic metres (5,735,000 tonnes)
Non-Hazardous Landfill	12,540,000 cubic metres (10,032,000 tonnes)
Total Landfill	16,363,000 cubic metres
Composting	95,000 tonnes per annum
Materials Recovery Facilities	180,000 tonnes per annum
Other Physical Treatment	127,000 tonnes per annum
Construction & Demolition Waste Crushing & Screening	350,000 tonnes per annum
Chemical/Physico-Chemical Treatment	20,000 tonnes per annum
Vehicle Dismantling & Other Metal Recovery	157,000 tonnes per annum
Total Waste Treatment Capacity	929,000 tonnes per annum

(Source: SEERA, 2005)

- 7.26 Work is currently being carried out by the County Council to establish how much provision needs to be made in the MWDF for new waste management facilities. Further work will be done to translate the regional targets and requirements in the draft South East Plan into more specific requirements for capacity for recycling and composting, other recovery of resources from waste, and landfill, for the different waste streams. The results from a new (2006) regional survey of waste management capacity will be taken into account when they become available. In addition, the Review of the Oxfordshire Joint Household Waste Management Strategy will also be an important input to establishing the provision that needs to be made in the MWDF.
- 7.27 There is uncertainty as to Oxfordshire's detailed waste management requirements over the new plan period, but it is clear that new waste management facilities will be needed. In particular there will be a significant need for new capacity for recycling, composting and other resource recovery and treatment of waste in order to reduce the quantities of waste disposed by landfill. The draft South East Plan indicates a requirement for additional capacity for waste recycling, composting and resource recovery in Oxfordshire totalling over 0.6 million tonnes a year by 2015, but this is thought to be an underestimate and will be reviewed when new information becomes available. The MWDF will need to make provision to ensure the facilities that are needed can be delivered.

- 7.28 It is less clear what if any requirement there will be for additional landfill capacity over the plan period. The draft South East Plan shows there to be no additional requirement at least to 2015, but this will be reassessed when new information on landfill capacity becomes available later this year.

Issue 11 a) – How the Plan makes Provision for Waste Management Facilities

- 7.29 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan identifies only one site for waste management development – land at Langford Lane, Kidlington, for a waste reception (recycling) centre for household waste. The Plan otherwise relies on criteria policies to deliver waste recycling facilities. It has no policies specifically for composting or other types of waste treatment. The Plan assessed there was no need for additional landfill provision over the period to 2006 and consequently did not identify any sites for landfill, apart from an area at Sutton Wick identified for sand and gravel extraction and to be restored by landfill.
- 7.30 PPS10 says the core strategy should ensure sufficient opportunities for the provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations, in line with the regional spatial strategy and informed by the municipal waste management strategy, for a period of at least 10 years. It goes on to say that development plan documents should identify sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities for the waste management needs of the area, in particular sites and areas to support the pattern of waste management facilities, broad locations and apportionment (amount of waste requiring management within the plan area) set out in the regional spatial strategy. Development plan documents should make provision for capacity equivalent to at least 10 years and should identify the types of waste management facility that would be appropriate for allocated sites and areas.
- 7.31 The draft South East Plan (policy W7) says waste planning authorities should provide for an appropriate mix of development opportunities to support the waste management facilities required to achieve targets, and that in identifying sites they should consider the type, size and mix of facilities required, taking into account activities requiring open sites; activities involving either segregated or mixed materials requiring enclosed industrial premises; and hybrid activities.
- 7.32 The issue of how provision should be made in the MWDF for the new waste management facilities that will be required needs to be considered in terms of:
- whether provision should be made by identifying broad locations, specific sites or by setting criteria against which proposals would be considered, or some combination of these;
 - whether locations identified should be for specific types of waste facility, or a range of waste facility types, or should rule out types of waste facility that would be unacceptable;

- whether the plan should identify a small number of strategic sites, or a large number of local sites, or some combination.

Question 14a:

What sort of locations should the MWDF identify to provide for the waste management facilities needed?

- (i) **broad locations; or**
- (ii) **specific site allocations; or**
- (iii) **a combination of broad locations and specific site allocations (please specify); or**
- (iv) **none of these, but instead set locational criteria for planning applications to be considered against.**

Question 14b:

How should the MWDF relate locations identified for waste management facilities to types of facility?

- (i) **by identifying locations suitable for and restricted to specified types of facility, providing certainty; or**
- (ii) **by identifying locations more generally suitable for a range of types of facility, allowing flexibility for evolving waste management practice and technology; or**
- (iii) **by ruling out particular types of facility which would be unacceptable for planning reasons, either at particular locations or anywhere in the county (please specify).**

Question 14c:

What types of sites for waste treatment facilities should the MWDF identify?

- (i) **a small number of strategic sites for large-scale waste treatment facilities or integrated groups of facilities ('resource parks'); or**
- (ii) **a larger number of more local sites for small-scale waste treatment facilities; or**
- (iii) **a mix of sites for both large and small facilities (please specify).**

Issue 11 b) – Where Waste Management Facilities should be Located

- 7.33 PPS10 says waste planning authorities should consider: opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises; and a broad range of locations including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate facilities. The suitability of sites and areas should be assessed against:
- the extent to which they support the policies in PPS10;
 - physical and environmental constraints on development;
 - the cumulative effect of waste disposal facilities on the local community;

- the capacity of transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste and products from resource recovery. Priority should be given to re-use of previously developed land and redundant agricultural buildings and curtilages.
- 7.34 The draft South East Plan (policy W17) states that priority should be given to expanding suitable existing waste management sites with good transport connections, and that the suitability of existing and potential new sites should be assessed on the basis of:
- good accessibility from existing urban areas and planned new development;
 - good transport connections, including rail or water where possible;
 - compatible land uses – active mineral workings; industrial land; contaminated or derelict land; land adjoining sewage works; or redundant farm buildings and curtilages;
 - capability of meeting local environmental and amenity criteria.
- 7.35 This policy also states that waste facilities should not be precluded in Green Belt where this is consistent with the proximity principle, there are no alternative sites and the objectives of the designation would not be harmed. In exceptional circumstances small-scale facilities should not be precluded in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The types of facilities that could be included are construction and demolition waste recycling; household waste recycling sites; in-vessel composting; anaerobic digestion; and transfer stations.
- 7.36 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan includes policies only on the location of waste recycling facilities and landfill sites. Policy W3 says proposals for recycling will normally be permitted where certain locational and environmental criteria are met. Policy W4 says recycling will not normally be permitted in open countryside unless there is an overriding need and no other suitable site or it is a temporary facility at a mineral extraction/landfill site. Policy W7 sets criteria against which proposals for landfill sites should be assessed.
- 7.37 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 notes the guidance on recycling facilities given in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. It says this will be reviewed in the MWDF, which will consider the need for locational guidance for other types of waste treatment facilities and whether sites should be identified.
- 7.38 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 policies do not specify locational factors for waste management facilities, except that policy WM2 refers to the proximity principle. Paragraph 12.15 says waste management facilities should be located close to where waste is produced and that in considering where facilities should be located other relevant Structure Plan policies will be taken into account, including policies on transport, protecting and enhancing the environment, and the Green

Belt. Policy WM3 says landfill should only be used for restoring mineral workings or where there would be overall environmental benefit.

7.39 The issue of where the new waste management facilities that are required and that the plan should make provision for should be located needs to be considered in terms of:

- the locational strategy to be followed: whether facilities should be located in or close to urban areas or away from people in rural areas;
- whether facilities should be located on industrial or employment land, at existing waste management sites, on brownfield land in the countryside, or on greenfield sites;
- whether facilities should be located at sites in Green Belt.

Question 15a:

What strategy for locating waste treatment facilities should form the basis for identifying sites in the MWDF?

- (i) locate waste treatment facilities within or close to the main urban areas; or**
- (ii) locate waste treatment facilities in more rural locations, away from centres of population.**

Question 15b:

What sort of sites should the MWDF identify to provide for waste treatment facilities?

- (i) sites on industrial or employment land; or**
- (ii) sites at existing waste management sites; or**
- (iii) sites on previously developed (brownfield) land in the countryside; or**
- (iv) greenfield sites.**

Question 15c:

At what type of location in relation to the Green Belt around Oxford should the MWDF make provision for waste treatment facilities?

- (i) only at locations either in urban areas or in areas of countryside outside the Green Belt; or**
- (ii) at suitable locations within the Green Belt as well.**

Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy

7.40 A key objective of PPS10 is to prepare and deliver planning strategies that help deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy, addressing waste as a resource and looking to disposal as the last option. The waste hierarchy is defined in the Government's Waste Strategy 2000 (amended July 2005) as:

- Reduction;
- Re-use;

- Recycling & Composting
- Energy Recovery;
- Disposal.

7.41 The issue for the MWDF is how can and should it help to move waste management up the hierarchy through policies and proposals for the use of land. Should this be done through restricting the provision of new landfill capacity and / or by over-providing for waste recycling and recovery facilities, to encourage these waste management methods? Should the MWDF aim to meet (or exceed) national and / or regional targets for diversion of waste from landfill and recycling; or should the plan set local targets which are specific to Oxfordshire?

Question 16:

In setting policies and making provision in the MWDF for the sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:

- (i) what can the plan do to help move waste management up the hierarchy?**
- (ii) should disposal (landfill) provision be restricted to encourage waste management methods higher up the hierarchy?**
- (iii) should the plan over-provide for recycling and recovery facilities?**
- (iv) should the plan aim to meet (or exceed) national / regional targets for recycling and diversion from landfill; or should it set local targets?**

Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management

7.42 The draft South East Plan promotes regional self-sufficiency in waste management. Policy W3 states that waste management capacity should be provided equivalent to waste arising and requiring management within the region plus a declining amount of waste from London. Policy W4 states that waste planning authorities should plan for net self-sufficiency by making provision for waste management capacity equivalent to the waste arisings within their area plus, where appropriate, some provision for waste from London and adjoining counties. These policies indicate the provision to be made in Oxfordshire, as set out in table 1 above.

7.43 The issue to be considered is what waste the MWDF should make provision for – how much and from where. Should the MWDF provide just for the waste produced in Oxfordshire; or should it include flexibility to enable local cross-county boundary movements, for instance where there are waste facilities or significant waste producing areas close to the county boundary and/or good transport links; or should it also provide for waste from elsewhere within the South East or beyond the South East region, particularly from London. If provision is made for waste from outside Oxfordshire, particularly from London, should this

be restricted to landfill capacity for residual waste after treatment at the source, or should provision also be made for treatment (recycling / composting / resource recovery) of imported waste as well.

- 7.44 There is also the issue of how much provision the MWDF should make for the different types of waste management facility (recycling, composting, other resource recovery and treatment, and landfill). Should the MWDF simply apply the waste management requirements in the draft South East Plan (top down approach); or should Oxfordshire's requirements be established based on locally-derived information (which could provide a reality check on the regional figures).

Question 17:

In making provision in the MWDF for waste management facilities in Oxfordshire:

- (i) Should the MWDF provide only for Oxfordshire's waste?**
- (ii) Should the MWDF provide for net self-sufficiency, to allow local cross county boundary movements?**
- (iii) Should the MWDF make additional provision for waste from elsewhere (in the region and/or beyond the region), particularly from London? If so, should this just be for landfill or should it be for treatment facilities as well?**
- (iv) How much provision should the MWDF make for landfill, recycling, composting, and other waste treatment facilities? (please specify)**
- (v) Should the waste management capacity requirements for Oxfordshire in the Regional Spatial Strategy be used, or should local capacity requirements be established?**

Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities

- 7.45 The Government's policy on identifying suitable sites and areas for waste management facilities in PPS10 includes the criteria in paragraph 7.33 above. PPS10 (Annex E) lists the following locational factors which should be considered in testing the suitability of sites against those criteria: protection of water resources; land instability; visual intrusion; nature conservation; historic environment and built heritage; traffic and access; air emissions including dust; odours; vermin and birds; noise and vibration; litter; and potential land use conflict.
- 7.46 The draft South East Plan (policy W17) lists characteristics which should form the basis of assessment of the suitability of sites for waste management facilities, as referred to in paragraph 7.34 above.

- 7.47 Policies on location of waste management facilities in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan are summarised in paragraphs 7.36 – 7.38 above.
- 7.48 The MWDF should identify sites for the waste management facilities that will be needed over the new plan period. The criteria or factors that are to be used to identify the range of potential site options and then assess those options, and the way in which those criteria or factors should be used, need to be established.

Question 18:

In identifying and assessing options for the location of sites for waste management facilities for inclusion in the MWDF:

- (i) What factors or criteria should be used to identify and assess site options?**
- (ii) Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? If so, how?**
- (iii) What weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people?**
- (iv) What weight should be given to access and proximity to waste source?**

Issue 15 – Landfill

- 7.49 Disposal of waste is the management route at the bottom of the waste hierarchy. However, PPS10 points out that whilst planning strategies should look to disposal as the last option, it is one that must be adequately catered for. There will always be some waste that cannot physically or practicably be re-used, recycled or have resources recovered from it and there will always be some residues from resource recovery processes that will have to be subject to disposal. The main means of waste disposal is landfill.
- 7.50 The draft South East Plan (policy W13) states that waste development plan documents should provide for continuing but declining landfill capacity, and that non-inert landfill capacity should be husbanded for disposal of residual non-inert waste. The draft Plan shows a surplus of landfill capacity in Oxfordshire at 2015 even taking into account imports from London. This position will need to be reassessed in the MWDF.
- 7.51 Landfill is now classified as inert, non-hazardous or hazardous. What was previously called non-inert landfill is now mainly classified as non-hazardous (able to take municipal waste and most commercial and industrial waste). There is currently no hazardous landfill capacity in Oxfordshire.
- 7.52 On hazardous waste, the Draft South East Plan identifies a need for a sub-regional network of landfill cells for stabilised non-reactive hazardous wastes (such as contaminated soils and asbestos).

- 7.53 Policies on provision for and location of landfill in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan are summarised in paragraphs 7.36 and 7.38 above.
- 7.54 Compared with most other counties in the South East, Oxfordshire has a large remaining permitted capacity for landfill. This includes significant capacity for non hazardous landfill, which is mostly at four mineral working sites, at Alkerton, Ardley, Stanton Harcourt (Dix Pit) and Sutton Courtenay. The Sutton Courtenay site takes significant quantities of waste from London, transported by rail.
- 7.55 The MWDF will need to establish whether and how much new provision for landfill is needed – for inert, non-hazardous and hazardous waste, how and where that provision should be made, whether provision for inert and non-inert waste should be made in different ways and, if there is a surplus of landfill capacity, how that surplus should be managed.

Question 19:

In making provision in the MWDF for the more sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:

- (i) How much provision should be made for further landfill of waste?**
- (ii) Should landfill provision be restricted only to residues from waste treatment processes?**
- (iii) Should landfill provision for inert waste be restricted only to restoration of mineral workings?**
- (iv) Should existing landfill void that is not currently needed be safeguarded for future landfill use, or should such sites be restored more quickly in some other way?**

Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management

- 7.56 PPS10 says planning strategies should help secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health or harming the environment, and should enable waste to be disposed at one of the nearest appropriate installations.
- 7.57 The draft South East Plan states that development plan document policies should aim to reduce the transport and associated impacts of waste movement and that the suitability of sites for waste management facilities should be assessed on the basis of capability of meeting a range of locally based environmental and amenity criteria (policies W16 and W17).
- 7.58 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 states (policy WM2) that waste management facilities will be permitted having regard to the principle of best practicable environmental option, including the waste hierarchy

and proximity principle, and (paragraph 12.15) that other relevant policies of the Plan will be taken into account in considering where waste management facilities should be located, including policies on transport and protecting and enhancing the environment.

- 7.59 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan includes policies (PE1 – PE18) on protecting the environment and a Code of Practice for sites (mainly for mineral working or landfill). Also, policy W3 states that proposals for recycling will be permitted where certain criteria are met, including transport impacts being minimised and environmental / amenity impacts being acceptable. These policies are all due for review in the MWDF, which will need to consider how it can ensure waste management developments will be acceptable in terms of environmental impact and reduce the environmental impact of transporting waste.

Question 20:

In setting policies and proposals for the management of waste in the MWDF:

- (i) How should the MWDF ensure waste management developments will be environmentally acceptable?**
- (ii) How can the MWDF reduce the environmental impact of waste transport?**

“Formate alternative te ketij publikimi ofrohen me kerkese. Kjo perfshin dhe gjuhe te tjera, me shkronja te medhaja, shkronja per te verberit, kasete degjimi, disk kompjuteri ose email.”

Albanian

আপনি যদি অনুরোধ করেন তাহলে এই পুস্তিকাটি বিকল্প ছাঁদে, যেমন, অন্য কোনও ভাষায়, বড় হরফে, ব্রেইলে, অডিও-ক্যাসেটে, কমপিউটারের ডিস্কে বা ইমেলের মাধ্যমে পেতে পারেন।

Bengali

“本刊物備有其他的格式可供索取。這些包括有其他語言版，大字版，盲人用版，錄音帶版，電腦磁碟版或電子郵件版。”

Chinese

प्रार्थना करने पर यह प्रकाशन दूसरे रूपों में प्राप्त किया जा सकता है। जिस में सम्मिलित है, दूसरी भाषाओं में, बड़े छापे में, ब्रेअल, सुनने की टेप पर, कम्प्यूटर की डिस्क पर या ई-मेल द्वारा।

Hindi

“ਇਹ ਪੁਸਤਕ ਬੇਨਤੀ ਕਰਨ ਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਵੀ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹੈ। ਜਿਵੇਂ ਕਿ ਹੋਰ ਭਾਸ਼ਾਵਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਵੱਡੇ ਛਾਪੇ ਤੇ, ਬ੍ਰੇਲ ਵਿਚ, ਸੁਣਨ ਵਾਲੀ ਟੇਪ ਤੇ, ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰ ਡਿਸਕ ਜਾਂ ਈ ਮੇਲ ਤੇ।”

Punjabi

“اس اشاعت کو متبادل اشکال میں درخواست کرنے پر حاصل کیا جاسکتا ہے۔ اس میں دوسری زبانیں، بڑا پرنٹ، بریل (جسے اندھے چھو کر پڑھ سکیں)، آڈیو کیسٹ، کمپیوٹر ڈسک یا ای میل شامل ہیں۔”

Urdu

**Alternative formats of this publication can be made available on request.
These include other languages, large print, Braille, audio cassette,
computer disk or e-mail**

