

**Minerals & Waste Core Strategy  
MINERALS & WASTE ISSUES AND OPTIONS  
Consultation Paper June 2006**

**Response Form**

Please use this form to make comments on the Mineral & Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper.

You may photocopy this form or obtain further copies from Oxfordshire County Council (contact information below). This form is also available on the County Council web site at: [www.oxfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk)

**PLEASE COMPLETE ALL SECTIONS IN BLACK OR BLUE INK**

Name: Suzi Coyne

Organisation: on behalf of Sheehan Group of Companies

Address: c/o SCP

77 Middle Way, Oxford OX2 7LE

Daytime Telephone: 01865 453747

Email address: suzi.coyne@ntlworld.com

The information you provide will be used in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Please remember your comments may be made available to others in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1995 and/or the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Please return completed form to:

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

Telephone No: 01865 810428

Fax No : 01865 814085

Email: [minerals.wasteplan@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:minerals.wasteplan@oxfordshire.gov.uk)

**Responses must be received by Friday 11<sup>th</sup> August 2006.**



**Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste  
Development Framework**



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



**OXFORDSHIRE  
COUNTY COUNCIL**  
ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY  
[www.oxfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk)

## INSTRUCTIONS ON HOW TO FILL IN THIS RESPONSE FORM

- Please read the Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper before answering the questions.
- In responding, it is not necessary to answer all the questions. You may choose to respond to any or all of them.
- The questions are grouped together following the title of the part of the document they are referring to.
- The numbers of the questions are highlighted and numbered in numeric order (e.g. **Q 1**, **Q 2** etc.). Where there is more than one question referring to the same part of the document, they are subdivided further (e.g. **Q 1a**, **Q 1b** etc. or **Q1 (i)**, **(ii)** etc.)
- Please tick or circle the relevant answer in the questions offering **YES** or **NO** choice as well as in multiple choice questions **((i), (ii), (iii)** etc.).
- Some questions require a more detailed response.
- Please use additional sheets as necessary.
- Thank you for your participation and contribution.

<b>Aims and Objectives of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF)</b>		
<b>Q 1a</b> Are these the right aims and objectives for the MWDF?		
<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b> ✓
<b>Q 1b</b> If your answer is <b>NO</b> , how do you think they should be changed?		
Waste Objective W2 should refer to regional targets only, which are higher than national targets. PPS10 requires the Core Strategy to be in line with the Regional Spatial Strategy.		
<b>Q 1c</b> Are there any other objectives that should be included? <i>(if yes, please specify)</i>		
<b>YES</b> ✓		<b>NO</b>
Specific encouragement should also be given to new waste management technologies.		
<b>Issue 1 – Plan Period</b>		
<b>Q 2a</b> What period should the Core Strategy cover?		
<b>(i)</b> to 2018	<b>(ii)</b> to 2026 ✓	<b>(iii)</b> to another date <i>(please specify and give reasons)</i>

<b>Q 2b</b> What period should the Minerals and Waste Sites Proposals and Polices documents cover?			
(i) to 2016	(ii) to 2018	(iii) to 2026 ✓	(iv) to another date <i>(please specify and give reasons)</i>
<b>Issue 2 a) Provision for mineral supply</b>			
<b>Q 3a</b> What sort of areas should the MWDF identify to provide for the future mineral working needed?			
(i) broad areas of search for new workings	(ii) specific site allocations (preferred areas)	(iii) a combination of broad areas of search and specific site allocations (preferred areas) <i>(please specify)</i>	(iv) none of these, but instead set locational criteria
<b>Q 3b</b> What type of new mineral workings should be preferred for the sites to be identified in the MWDF?			
(i) extensions to existing quarries		(ii) new quarries	
<b>Q 3c</b> For how much of the period of the MWDF should sites and/or areas be identified?			
(i) the whole of the MWDF period)	(ii) to 2016 or 2018 only <i>(please specify)</i> with criteria policies to cover the remainder of the MWDF period		
<b>Issue 2 b) Provision for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand</b>			
<b>Q 4</b> 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	(ii) 18% soft sand to 82% sharp sand and gravel	(iii) some other split <i>(please specify and give reasons)</i>	

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

**Q 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 Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton and Lower Windrush Valley areas

**(ii)** identify new strategic working area(s) in the southern part of the county

**(iii)** promote a more dispersed pattern of smaller scale working areas

**(iv)** some other pattern of new working areas (*please specify and give reasons*)

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

**Q 6** What strategy for the location of new limestone and/or ironstone workings should be adopted in the MWDF?

**(i)** new limestone workings in the Witney – Burford area

**(ii)** new limestone workings in the Oxford – Bicester area

**(iii)** increased provision for ironstone working from the north of the county

**(iv)** some other pattern of new working areas (*please specify and give reasons*)

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

**Q 7a** How should the MWDF make provision for additional aggregate recycling facilities?

**(i)** identify sites for temporary facilities

**(ii)** identify sites for permanent facilities ✓

**(iii)** neither of these, but instead set locational criteria

**Q 7b** How much provision should the MWDF make for aggregate recycling?

**(i)** enough just to meet the regional targets for supply of recycled aggregates

**(ii)** more than is required to meet those targets ✓ \*

\*C&D waste has the greatest potential for recycling and using recycled aggregate conserves mineral resources, so reducing the potential for environmental impact from mineral extraction. All suitable sites that come forward should be allocated, even if they provide more capacity than required to meet targets, so that optimum levels of recycling are encouraged.

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

**Q 8a** What sort of sites should the MWDF identify to provide for new aggregates recycling facilities?

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

**Q 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	(ii) at suitable locations within the Green Belt as well ✓
---	--

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

**Q 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?
--	---

YES

NO

YES

NO

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

**Q 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? *(please specify)*

(ii) should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? *(if YES, please specify)*

YES

NO

(iii) what weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people? *(please specify)*

\* The cost of sites on industrial or employment land is invariably too high to make aggregate recycling viable at such locations. There is also potential for conflict (because of dust and noise) with other industrial or employment land users.

<b>(iv)</b>	what weight should be given to access and proximity to market? <i>(please specify)</i>		
<b>(v)</b>	what weight should be given to protection of high grade agricultural land? <i>(please specify)</i>		
<b>(vi)</b>	should restoration potential and after-use opportunities be taken into account in site/area selection and assessment?		
<b>YES</b>		<b>NO</b>	
<b>Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings</b>			
<b>Q 11</b>	In setting policies and proposals for the working and restoration of sites or areas for mineral extraction in the MWDF:		
<b>(i)</b>	What should the priorities for restoration be? <i>(please indicate)</i>		
agriculture	habitat creation	recreation	other <i>(please specify):</i>
<b>(ii)</b>	Should there be a preference for: <i>(please indicate)</i>		
restoration back to land	creation of lakes	partial infilling, e.g. to create reed beds	
<b>(iii)</b>	Should infilling and restoration of mineral workings be a priority use for inert waste materials?		
<b>YES</b> ✓ *		<b>NO</b>	
<b>(iv)</b>	How should environmental enhancement be promoted and secured? <i>(please indicate)</i>		
<b>Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Mineral Working and Supply</b>			
<b>Q 12</b>	In setting policies and proposals for the working and supply of minerals in the MWDF:		
<b>(i)</b>	how should the MWDF ensure developments for mineral working and supply will be environmentally acceptable? <i>(please specify)</i>		

\* For those inert materials that cannot be recycled.

<b>(ii)</b> should buffer zone distances for mineral workings be:			
specified in the MWDF as standard distances? or	set at the planning application stage on a case by case basis?		
<b>(iii)</b> how can the MWDF reduce the environmental impact of mineral transport? <i>(please specify)</i>			
<b>Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals</b>			
<b>Q 13a</b> How should the MWDF safeguard mineral resources?			
<b>(i)</b> by identifying all mineral deposits	<b>(ii)</b> by identifying only those mineral resources that would be economic to work	<b>(iii)</b> by identifying only the mineral resources required for the MWDF period	
<b>Q 13b</b> Which minerals should be safeguarded in the MWDF?			
<b>(i)</b> sand and gravel	<b>(ii)</b> limestone and ironstone	<b>(iii)</b> fullers earth	<b>(vi)</b> other minerals <i>(please specify)</i>
<b>Issue 11 a) How the Plan makes Provision for Waste Management Facilities</b>			
<b>Q 14a</b> What sort of locations should the MWDF identify to provide for the waste management facilities needed?			
<b>(i)</b> broad locations	<b>(ii)</b> specific site allocations ✓	<b>(iii)</b> a combination of broad locations and specific site allocations <i>(please specify)</i>	<b>(iv)</b> none of these but instead set locational criteria
<b>Q 14b</b> How should the MWDF relate locations identified for waste management facilities to types of facility?			
<b>(i)</b> by identifying locations suitable for and restricted to specified types of facility	<b>(ii)</b> by identifying ✓ locations more generally suitable for a range of types of facility	<b>(iii)</b> by ruling out particular types of facility which would be unacceptable for planning reasons, either at particular locations or anywhere in the county <i>(please specify)</i>	

<b>Q 14c</b>	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	(ii) a larger number of more local sites for small-scale waste treatment facilities	(iii) a mix of sites for both large and small facilities <b>(please specify)</b> ✓ Larger integrated facilities for a wide range of wastes would help improve recycling/recovery levels and reduce transport impact. Smaller sites for e.g. C&D and skip waste should also be available to serve local areas and prevent such materials being transported long distances.	
<b>Issue 11 b) Where Waste Management Facilities should be Located</b>			
<b>Q 15a</b>	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 ✓ *	(ii) locate waste treatment facilities in more rural locations, away from centres of population		
<b>Q 15b</b>	What sort of sites should the MWDF identify to provide for waste treatment facilities?		
(i) sites on industrial or employment land **	(ii) sites at existing waste management sites ✓	(iii) sites on previously developed (brownfield) land in the countryside ✓	(iv) greenfield sites ✓
<b>Q 15c</b>	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	(ii) at suitable locations within the Green Belt as well ✓		
<b>Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy</b>			
<b>Q 16</b>	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? <b>(please specify)</b>		
Make as much site allocation provision for waste recycling/recovery as possible in suitable locations, including more than is required to meet regional targets.			
(ii)	should disposal (landfill) provision be restricted to encourage waste management methods higher up the hierarchy?		
	YES ✓	NO	
(iii)	should the plan over-provide for recycling and recovery facilities?		
	YES ✓	NO	
(iv)	should the plan aim to meet (or exceed) national / regional targets for recycling and diversion from landfill? ✓ (exceed regional)		
		set local targets?	

\* Some sites are likely to need to be in rural locations away from residential areas and other sensitive land uses, because of their potential effects, but still close to urban areas (i.e. within 6-10 miles).

\*\* See comments on question 8a page 5. The same applies to many other forms of waste management facilities.



<b>Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management</b>			
<b>Q 17</b>	In making provision in the MWDF for waste management facilities in Oxfordshire:		
<b>(i)</b>	Should the MWDF provide only for Oxfordshire's waste?		
	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b> ✓	
<b>(ii)</b>	Should the MWDF provide for net self-sufficiency, to allow local cross county boundary movements?		
	<b>YES</b> ✓	<b>NO</b>	
<b>(iii)</b>	Should the MWDF make additional provision for waste from elsewhere, particularly from London?		
	<b>YES</b> ✓	<b>NO</b>	
If the answer is <b>YES</b> , should this be:			
just for landfill? or		for treatment facilities as well? ✓	
<b>(iv)</b>	How much provision should the MWDF make: <b>(please specify)</b>		
	for landfill?	for recycling?	for other waste treatment facilities?
	All as per Regional Spatial Strategy.*		
<b>(v)</b>	Which capacity requirements should be used?		
<b>(i)</b>	The waste management requirements for Oxfordshire in the Regional Spatial Strategy ✓	<b>(ii)</b> Locally established capacity requirements	
<b>Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities</b>			
<b>Q 18</b>	In identifying and assessing options for the location of sites for waste management facilities for inclusion in the MWDF:		
<b>(i)</b>	What factors or criteria should be used to identify and assess site options? <b>(please specify)</b>		
	Distance to waste source/point of delivery of recycled product; distance to sensitive receptors/ability to mitigate potential effects; transportation arrangements; associated facilities co-located or close by; use of previously-developed land.		
<b>(ii)</b>	Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? <b>(if YES, please specify how)</b>		
	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b> ✓	
<b>(iii)</b>	What weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people? <b>(please specify)</b>		
<b>(iv)</b>	What weight should be given to access and proximity to waste source? <b>(please specify)</b>		

\* For C&D waste as many aggregate recycling facilities as possible should be allocated, the amount of C&D waste recycled in temporary (construction/demolition site) contracts and other exempt sites estimated, and then landfill provision made for the remainder of the inert waste arisings. For C&I/MSW sites should be identified to meet or exceed regional recycling/composting and recovery targets, then landfill provision made for the residual waste arising.

<b>Issue 15 – Landfill</b>	
<b>Q 19</b>	In making provision in the MWDF for the more sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:
<b>(i)</b>	How much provision should be made for further landfill of waste <i>(please specify)</i>
See answer to question 17 (iv), 9.	
<b>(ii)</b>	Should landfill provision be restricted only to residues from waste treatment processes?
<b>YES</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>NO</b> ✓</span>	
<b>(iii)</b>	Should landfill provision for inert waste be restricted only to restoration of mineral workings?
<b>YES</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>NO</b> ✓</span>	
<b>(iv)</b>	Should existing landfill void that is not currently needed be: safeguarded for future landfill use? <span style="float: right;">restored more quickly in some other way?</span>
✓	
<b>Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management</b>	
<b>Q 20</b>	In setting policies and proposals for the management of waste in the MWDF:
<b>(i)</b>	How should the MWDF ensure waste management developments will be environmentally acceptable? <i>(please specify)</i>
Set out clearly in policies the standards that waste management development will be required to meet.	
<b>(ii)</b>	How can the MWDF reduce the environmental impact of waste transport? <i>(please specify)</i>
See answer to Q 14c page 8.	