

## Appendix 2: Summary of the reasons for rejection of alternative options

### Issue 1 – Plan Period

<b>Question 2a: What period should the Core Strategy cover?</b>	
to 2018	Not inline with Government policy of a Core strategy coving 10yrs from adoption
to 2026	Selected
to another date	All other options would not be inline with Government Policy or draft South East Plan (to 2026)
<b>Question 2b: What period should the Minerals and Waste Sites Proposals and Policies document cover?</b>	
to 2016	Does not give 10 years provision from adoption
to 2018	
to 2026	Selected
to another date	All other options would not be inline with Government Policy, earlier date would give less certainty to industry and local communities

### Issue 2a – Provision for Mineral Supply

<b>Question 3a: What sort of areas should the MWDF identify to provide for the future mineral working needed?</b>	
Broad areas of search for new workings	Less certainty for mineral working being permitted and only broad non-site specific Sustainability Appraisal
Specific site allocations	Selected
A combination of these	Less certainty for mineral working being permitted and only broad non-site specific Sustainability Appraisal in certain cases
Set locational criteria	Less certainty for mineral working being permitted and no sites could be subject to Sustainability Appraisal

<b>Question 3b: What type of new mineral workings should be preferred for the sites to be identified in the MWDF?</b>	
Extensions to existing quarries	Both selected in a combination of options
New quarries	

<b>Question 3c: For how much of the period of the MWDF should sites and/or areas be identified?</b>	
The whole period	Selected with out over providing
To 2016 or 2018 only	Doesn't give 10 years from adoption

**Issue 2b – Provision for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand**

<b>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?</b>	
10% soft sand to 90% sharp sand and gravel	No longer reflects actual demand
18% soft sand to 82% sharp sand and gravel	No longer reflects actual demand
Some other split	Selected: 17% to 83% - current demand

**Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings**

<b>Question 5: What strategy for the location of new sand and gravel workings should be adopted in the MWDF?</b>	
Continue in the main working areas of Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton and the Lower Windrush Valley	Over concentration in one part of the County, limited resource, doesn't reflect demand across the county
Identify new strategic workings area(s) in the southern part of the county	Doesn't reflect demand across the county
Promote a more dispersed pattern of smaller scale working areas	Spread of impact over larger area, promotes peace meal applications and hard to ensure adequate restoration

Some other pattern of new working areas	Selected: More balanced approach between West Oxon and South but not necessarily smaller scale
---	--

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

<b>Question 6:</b>	
<b>What strategy for the location of new limestone and/or ironstone workings should be adopted in the MWDF?</b>	
Locate new limestone workings in the Witney-Burford areas	Will concentrate working in one part of the county and doesn't reflect current demand
Identify new limestone workings in the Oxford-Bicester areas	
Make increased provision for ironstone working from the north of the county	Less well located to transport routes
Some other pattern of new working areas	Selected: Combination of the above

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

<b>Question 7a:</b>	
<b>How should the MWDF make provision for additional aggregate recycling facilities?</b>	
Identify sites for temporary facilities	All part of the solution, incorporated into a sequential approach, permanent, temporary supported by locational
identify sites for permanent facilities	
Set locational criteria	
<b>Question 7b:</b>	
<b>How much provision should the MWDF make for aggregate recycling?</b>	
Enough just to meet the regional targets for supply of recycled aggregates	We do not see recycling targets as a ceiling but as a minimum target
More than is required to meet those targets	Selected

**Issue 5b – Where Aggregates Recycling Facilities should be Located**

<b>Question 8a:</b>	
<b>What sort of sites should the MWDF identify to provide for new aggregates recycling facilities?</b>	
Sites on industrial or employment land	A combination of the options was selected and incorporated into a sequential approach.
Sites at existing minerals and/or waste sites	
Sites on previously developed (Brownfield) land	
Greenfield sites	
<b>Question 8b:</b>	
<b>At what type of location in relation to the Green Belt around Oxford should the MWDF make provision for new aggregates recycling facilities?</b>	
Locations in either urban areas or in areas of countryside outside the Green Belt	A combination of the options was selected and incorporated into a sequential approach.
At suitable locations within the Green Belt as well	

**Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots**

<b>Question 9:</b>	
<b>In making provision for imported aggregates, including aggregates transported by rail:</b>	
Should the Core Strategy promote an increase in the supply of aggregates from outside the county to meet demand?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies document identify new sites for rail aggregate depots?	Posed as a question; no options

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

<b>Question 10: In identifying and Assessing options for the location of new areas or sites for mineral working for inclusion in the MWDF:</b>	
What factors or criteria should be used to identify and assess site/area options?	Posed as a question; no options
Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? If so, how?	Posed as a question; no options
What weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people?	Posed as a question; no options
What weight should be given to access and proximity to market?	Posed as a question; no options
What weight should be given to protections of high grade agricultural land?	Posed as a question; no options
Should restoration potential and after-use opportunities be taken into account in site/area selection and assessment?	Posed as a question; no options

**Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings**

<b>Question 11: In setting policies and proposals for the workings and restoration of sites or areas for mineral extraction in the MWDF:</b>	
What should the priorities for restoration be: agriculture; habitat creation; recreation; other?	Posed as a question; no options
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?	
Should infilling and restoration or mineral workings be a priority use for inert waste materials?	
How should environmental enhancement be promoted and secured?	

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

<b>Question 12:</b>	
<b>In setting policies and proposals for the working and supply of minerals in the MWDF:</b>	
How should the MWDF ensure developments for mineral working and supply will be environmentally acceptable?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the standard buffer zone distances for mineral workings be specified in the MWDF or be set at the planning application stage on a site by site basis?	
How can the MWDF reduce the environmental impact of mineral transport?	

**Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals**

<b>Question 13a:</b>	
<b>How should the MWDF safeguard mineral resources?</b>	
By identifying all mineral deposits?	Posed as a question; no options
By identifying only those mineral resources that would be economic to work?	
By identifying only the resources required for the MWDF period?	
<b>Question 13b:</b>	
<b>Which minerals should be safeguarded in the MWDF?</b>	
Sand and gravel	All three selected
Limestone and ironstone	
Fuller's earth	
Other minerals	No other minerals have been selected for safeguarding

**Issue 11a – How should the Plan make Provision for Waste Management Facilities**

<b>Question 14a:</b>	
<b>What sort of locations should the MWDF identify to provide for the waste management facilities needed?</b>	
Broad locations	Identifying specific site allocations was preferred but recognising that this maybe difficult a combination of these options has been put forward.
Specific site allocations	
Combination of these	
Set locational criteria	
<b>Question 14b:</b>	
<b>How should the MWDF relate locations identified for waste management facility?</b>	
Identify locations suitable for and restricted to specified types of facility	This option would restrict the evolving development of new technologies by reducing the flexibility to accommodate future changes and developments
Identify locations more generally suitable for a range of types of facility, allowing flexibility for evolving waste management or technology	A combination of these two options has been selected
Rule out particular types of facility which could be unacceptable for planning reasons, either at particular locations or anywhere within the county.	
<b>Question 14c:</b>	
<b>What types of sites for waste treatment facilities should the MWDF identify?</b>	
Small number of strategic sites for large-scale waste treatment facilities or integrated groups of facilities	Option would limit local waste treatment and increase transport of waste across the County.
Larger number of more local sites for small-scale waste treatment facilities	Option would limit the types of technology available resulting in insufficient capacity to reduce waste from landfill
Mix of both	Selected

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

<b>Question 15a:</b>	
<b>What strategy for locating waste treatment facilities should form the basis for identifying sites in the MWDF?</b>	
Within or close to main urban areas	Within or close to main urban areas is preferred but a combination of these options has been put forward in a sequential approach recognising the difficulty of finding sites close to main urban areas.
More rural locations away from centres of population	
<b>Question 15b:</b>	
<b>What sort of sites should the MWDF identify to provide for waste treatment facilities?</b>	
Sites on industrial and employment land	A combination of these options has been put forward in a sequential approach recognising the difficulty of finding sites.
Sites and existing waste management sites	
Sites on previously developed (Brownfield) land	
Greenfield sites	
<b>Question 15c:</b>	
<b>At what type of location in relation to the Green Belt around Oxford should the MWDF make provision for waste treatment facilities?</b>	
Either in urban areas or in areas of countryside outside the Green Belt	A combination of these options has been put forward in a sequential approach recognising the difficulty of finding sites.
At suitable locations within the Green Belt as well	



**Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy**

<b>Question 16: In setting policies and making provision in the MWDF for the sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:</b>	
What can the plan do to help move waste management up the hierarchy?	Posed as a question; no options
Should disposal (landfill) provision be restricted to encourage waste management methods further up the hierarchy?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the plan over-provide for recycling and recovery facilities?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the plan aim to meet (or exceed) national / regional targets for recycling and diversion from landfill; or set local targets?	Posed as a question; no options

**Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management**

<b>Question 17: In making provision in the MWDF for waste management facilities in Oxfordshire:</b>	
Should the MWDF provide only for Oxfordshire's waste?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the MWDF provide for net self-sufficiency, to allow local cross county boundary movements?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the MWDF make additional provision for waste from elsewhere (in the region and/or beyond the region), particularly London? If so, should this just be to landfill or should it be for treatment facilities as well?	Posed as a question; no options
How much provision should the MWDF make for landfill, recycling, composting, and other waste treatment facilities?	Posed as a question; no options
Should the waste management capacity requirements for Oxfordshire in the Regional Spatial Strategy be used, or should local capacity requirements be established?	Posed as a question; no options

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

<b>Question 18: In identifying and assessing options for the location of sites for waste management facilities for inclusion in the MWDF:</b>	
What factors or criteria should be used to identify and assess site options?	Posed as a question; no options
Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently?	Posed as a question; no options
What weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people?	Posed as a question; no options
What weight should be given to access and proximity to waste source?	Posed as a question; no options

**Issue 15 – Landfill**

<b>Question 19: In making provision in the MWDF for the more sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:</b>	
How much provision should be made for further landfill of waste?	Posed as a question; no options
Should landfill provision be restricted only to residues from waste treatment processes?	Posed as a question; no options
Should landfill provision for inert waste be restricted only to restoration of mineral workings?	Posed as a question; no options
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?	Posed as a question; no options

**Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management**

<b>Question 20: In setting policies and proposals for the management of waste in the MWDF:</b>	
How should the MWDF ensure waste management developments will be environmentally acceptable?	Posed as a question; no options
How can the MWDF reduce the environmental impact of waste transport?	Posed as a question; no options