

CLIENT PROJECT REPORT CPR2366

Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy incorporating Proposed Main Modifications

Sustainability Appraisal Report Update

Non-Technical Summary

February 2017

Table of Contents

Non-Technical Summary

1 Introduction

This document is the Non-Technical Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal Report Update (SA Report Update) that has been prepared to accompany the consultation on the Proposed Main Modifications to the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (henceforth referred to in this document as 'the Core Strategy').

The SA Report Update documents the findings of both the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) process, which is required by regulations[1] because the Core Strategy has the potential to have significant effects on the environment, and also the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process, required under other legislation relating to Local Plans, this SA process assessing the potential effects of the Core Strategy on social, economic and environmental issues.

Consultation on the SA Report Update provides stakeholders and the public with an opportunity to comment on the findings of the SEA/SA, at the same time as making any representations on the Proposed Main Modifications to the Core Strategy.

2 The Local Plan (Core Strategy)

Oxfordshire County Council is preparing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan which once adopted will replace the current Minerals and Waste Local Plan 1996.

The new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy (Core Strategy) will provide the planning strategies and policies for the development that will be needed up to 2031 for the supply of minerals and the management of waste in Oxfordshire. It sets out strategic policies to guide minerals and waste development over the plan period and core policies which address development management issues relevant to both minerals and waste. It will be followed at a later stage by the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations Document.

In December 2015 the Council submitted the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy to the Secretary of State for Examination by an independent planning inspector. That Examination was held in September 2016.

During the Examination hearing sessions the Inspector requested that the Council undertake some further work to consider reasonable alternatives relating to both the minerals and waste strategies

[1] Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Wales) Regulations (2004)

in order to address some procedural issues and to inform the further development of the final policies that will be included in the Core Strategy.

The consideration and assessment of alternatives has now been undertaken and that process has resulted in the Council preparing a series of Proposed Main Modifications to the minerals and waste strategies in the Core Strategy. The Council has also proposed Main Modifications that cover other areas of the Core Strategy's policies and supporting text which were not considered in the assessment of alternatives. In addition the Council are proposing a series of Additional Modifications which are more minor changes such as factual updates and corrections or textual changes for clarifications.

All the proposed Main Modifications and the reasonable alternatives to them, as well as the Additional Modifications, have been subject to the SEA/SA process. The findings of that process are reported below.

3 The Purpose of the SA Report Update (February 2017)

This SA Report Update provides details of the SEA/SA activities that have been undertaken following the Examination Hearing sessions in September 2016, in particular in relation to the consideration and assessment of alternatives and in assessing the proposed Main Modifications. However it also provides an update to the whole plan assessment which was provided in the SA Report (August 2015) that accompanied the Submitted Core Strategy. This SA Report Update also includes unchanged information and assessments from that August 2015 version in order to produce a new standalone report, with no requirement needed therefore to refer to the SA Report submitted to the Examination.

4 The SEA/SA Process

The assessment process is briefly described below.

The SEA Regulations require that the following topics are investigated: Air; Biodiversity, flora and fauna; Climatic factors; Cultural heritage; Human health; Landscape; Material assets; Population; Soil; Water; and the interrelationship between these factors. The Sustainability Appraisal element of the process widens this to include consideration of additional social and economic issues.

Stage A - After documenting the sustainability characteristics of the area, and identifying any trends (i.e. is the situation getting better or worse?), the policy context of the Core Strategy was reviewed. From the outputs of these two initial tasks the key environmental issues and opportunities that exist in the County were identified, on which the assessment should focus.

A series of SEA/SA Objectives were developed to concentrate the subsequent assessment process on these key issues. This stage has been revisited on more than one occasion, most recently in December 2016 during the post-Examination Hearings SEA/SA work.

Stage B - This stage involved predicting the effects that would result if the Core Strategy were implemented and then assessing whether any of these effects would be significant. Where potential adverse effects were identified measures to mitigate these effects were identified.

NB: In undertaking the post-Examination SEA/SA work this stage has been revisited through the consideration of alternatives to the minerals and waste strategies.

Stage C - The SA Report Update pulls together the results of all the assessment activities that have been undertaken and identifies monitoring activities that will check the accuracy of the assessment once the Core Strategy is adopted. It incorporates the Environmental Report that is required by the SEA Regulations.

NB: The SA Report (August 2015) that was produced to accompany the publication version of the Core Strategy is superseded by this SA Report Update.

Stage D – This stage involves consultation on the SA Report with environmental bodies, key stakeholders and the public. The SEA/SA will then assess any significant changes to the Core Strategy that are made after the consultation. At plan adoption, an SEA/SA Adoption Statement will be published which explains how the SEA/SA has influenced the plan making process and which finalises the monitoring arrangements. As with Stage A, consultation as part of Stage D has happened on more than one occasion, most recently in April 2016.

NB: a new consultation will be undertaken on this SA Report Update at the same time as the consultation on the proposed Main Modifications and Additional Modifications to the Core Strategy.

Stage E – This stage takes place after the Core Strategy is adopted and covers the monitoring of the predicted effects.

5 Sustainability Issues and Opportunities

The first stage of the SEA/SA focused on the identification of the sustainability issues and opportunities in Oxfordshire. Those identified are shown in Table NTS 1 below.

Table NTS 1: Issues and Opportunities

Key sustainability issues and opportunities in Oxfordshire
Population growth will lead to increased waste production and demand for waste management facilities and for aggregates for construction, across the whole county.
Economic growth in Oxfordshire should be encouraged and minerals and waste development could support this through the provision of opportunities for unskilled labour.
Tourism represents an important part of Oxfordshire's economy. Minerals and waste development could detract from initiatives to encourage people to visit the whole county, not just Oxford. However, post mineral restoration could create opportunities for rural development and recreational facilities.
Climate change poses a threat to parts of the county through flooding. Minerals and waste development could meet this challenge not only by managing the positive and negative aspects of development in the floodplain, but also by encouraging working practices that minimise greenhouse gas emissions.
Increased traffic generation on both motorways and major roads in the county leads to congestion and contributes towards a reduction in air quality. Minerals and waste development should balance reducing air pollution by employing the 'proximity principle' with ensuring that minerals and waste transport minimises environmental impacts by using suitable roads.
Nine Air Quality Management Areas have been identified in Oxfordshire, where levels of NO^2 from traffic exceed recommended government levels. Minerals and waste developments need to manage their transport routes in order to reduce the negative impact on air quality, and to avoid exacerbating pollution levels in existing AQMAs.
Oxfordshire has low rainfall levels and the Thames Water area is one of the most water stressed in the country. Population growth will increase demand for water. The review of abstraction licences by the Environment Agency may result in smaller numbers of licences being permitted. Thames Water has proposed that it build a new reservoir in Oxfordshire to meet rising demand; this may result in increased demand for aggregate for a temporary period.
Minerals and waste development could negatively impact on the biodiversity value of certain areas. Restoration of minerals sites may be constrained by the designation of airfield safeguarding zones across much of Oxfordshire, which reduce the risk of bird strike to aircraft. It may also be constrained by a lack of available inert fill to restore sites to uses such as reed bed or wet woodland.
Mineral and waste development offers opportunities to improve access to rural areas, create recreational facilities, and contribute towards habitat creation in the county and biodiversity gains.
Oxfordshire includes parts of three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which will need to be protected from adverse effects of minerals and waste development. This provides a constraint as to where new and extended operations can be located.
Oxfordshire is a county which has a rich historic environment. Minerals and waste development could result in the loss or destruction of some of the heritage assets of the county such as Scheduled Ancient Monuments and archaeological assets**.**
Oxfordshire has plentiful reserves of sand and gravel, having approximately one third of the unconstrained gravel resource in the South East region. Identifying sites for mineral extraction should take into account the cumulative effect of extensive mineral working on local communities and the transport infrastructure.
The extraction of plentiful reserves of sand and gravel in the county must be balanced against the potential loss of best and most versatile agricultural land which could result from extraction.
Water quality in Oxfordshire's rivers could be improved. Minerals and waste development could contribute to the pollution of water courses and groundwater.
Significant provision needs to be made for secondary and recycled waste management facilities to continue to increase the amount of secondary and recycled waste which can be managed in the County.
Landfilling biodegradable waste products is a significant source of methane gas (a more powerful greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide). The amount of waste being disposed in landfill within the county should be minimised in order to reduce the contribution on greenhouse gas emissions.

The River Thames acts a constraint to the transportation of minerals and waste by restricting the lorry routes available suitable to cross the river between northern Oxfordshire (West Oxfordshire District and Cherwell District) and southern Oxfordshire (South Oxfordshire District and Vale of White Horse District).

Further detail can be found in the main SA Report Update and its accompanying appendices.

6 SA Framework

Government guidance[2] on how to undertake SEA/SA recommends that objectives are developed that relate to the key issues, so that the assessment can use these objectives to focus on the prediction and assessment of the effects that are most important in an area.

These objectives were developed as part of the Scoping Report and updated following consultation on that report in order to take account of consultation comments. The broad SA objectives that have been used in this SEA/SA are shown in Table NTS 2.

Table NTS 2: SA objectives

SA Objective
1. To protect, maintain, and enhance Oxfordshire's biodiversity and geological diversity including natural habitats, flora and fauna and protected species.
2a. To protect and enhance landscape character and local distinctiveness.
2b. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings
3. To maintain and improve ground and surface water quality.
4. To improve and maintain air quality to levels which do not damage natural systems.
5. To reduce greenhouse gas emissions to reduce the cause of climate change.
6. To reduce the risk of flooding.
7. To minimise the impact of transportation of aggregates and waste products on the local and strategic road network.
8. To minimise negative impacts of waste management facilities and mineral extraction on people and local communities.
9. To protect, improve and where necessary restore land and soil quality.
10. To contribute towards moving up the waste hierarchy in Oxfordshire.
11. To enable Oxfordshire to be self-sufficient in its waste management and to provide for its local need for aggregates as set out in the LAA.
12. To support Oxfordshire's economic growth and reduce disparities across the county.

[2] A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (ODPM, 2005)

7 Previous Assessment Stages

The following sections provide a summary of the assessment stages that have been undertaken from 2010 onwards.

7.1 Assessment of Spatial and Aggregates Apportionment Options (2010)

In 2010, the County Council identified various draft minerals spatial strategy options for the location of future areas for the extraction of sharp sand and gravel, soft sand, and crushed rock. In 2011 and 2012, various aggregate apportionment options were considered based on predictions of future demand. As part of its development of the waste strategy, in 2011 the Council also prepared spatial strategy options for all of the key waste streams.

An assessment of the various spatial options for minerals and waste and aggregates apportionment options was undertaken. Appendix C of the SA Report Update provides a summary of the options that were considered.

7.2 Assessment of the Planning Strategies (2011)

Based on the Preferred Options SA, stakeholder responses, findings of local and regional studies and assimilation of further information, Draft Minerals and Waste Planning Strategies were consulted upon in September 2011. Similar to the assessment undertaken at the Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages, each of the elements within the Minerals and Waste strategies was assessed. Appendix C of the SA Report Update provides a summary of the options that were considered.

7.3 Assessment of Proposed Submission Document (2012)

In May 2012, the County Council consulted on its Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document. Again, similar to the previous stages of the SEA/SA each of the plan elements were assessed against the SEA/SA Objectives and a SA Report was produced. Appendix C of the SA Report Update provides a summary of the options that were considered.

In October 2012, the County Council submitted an Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy to the Secretary of State for examination. The Inspector raised a number of issues, as a consequence of which the examination was suspended in February 2013 and in July 2013 the County Council resolved to withdraw that plan and to prepare a revised Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

7.4 Assessment of the Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy Consultation Draft (2014)

In February 2014 the County Council consulted on its revised Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy Consultation Draft, with this new Plan being subject to the combined SEA/SA process. An SA Report (February 2014) was prepared to document the findings of the assessment. Comments received in response to the consultation process were taken into account when undertaking the SEA/SA of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document. The details of the comments received and how they were taken into consideration are provided in Appendix B of this SA Report Update.

7.5 Assessment of the Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy Publication (August 2015)

In August 2015 the County Council published the Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document which was accompanied by an SA Report (August 2015). The assessment of the Core Strategy in the SA Report generally found that the policies were likely to have overall positive effects across the range of sustainability topics. A number of significant positive effects were identified but no significant negative effects were identified. The details of the comments received and how they have been taken into consideration are provided in Appendix B of this SA Report Update.

7.6 SA Report Addendum (April 2016)

An SA Report Addendum was produced in April 2016 to provide information in relation to the representations that were received on the SA Report (August 2015) during the period of consultation that ended on 30th September 2015 and to provide information relating to the issues raised during that consultation. The Addendum also provided clarification in relation to some other issues that were raised in correspondence from the Inspector (Examination document EX1).

The Addendum did not add any new assessment or findings to those previously published in the SA documents that had been produced prior to the publication of the Addendum.

7.7 SA Report 2nd Addendum (August 2016)

A second SA Report Addendum was prepared in August 2016 to provide further information for the Examination of the Core Strategy, in relation to the representations that were received on the first SA Report Addendum (April 2016), and to provide information relating to the issues raised during the consultation on that Addendum. The 2nd Addendum also provided clarification in relation to some other issues that had been raised by the Inspector (Matters and Issues). The information was provided in the two detailed annexes. Annex A provided a summary of the alternatives that were considered throughout the development of the plan, including alternatives considered prior to 2012

in the development of the 2012 Core Strategy (Withdrawn). Annex B provided a comparison of the 2012 Core Strategy (Withdrawn) with the 2015 Submitted Core Strategy. A summary was provided for each of the policies to show the significant changes that have occurred throughout the development of the Core Strategy, with information also being provided on how the Sustainability Appraisal of the policies addressed any changes. Annex B also provided a new assessment in relation to a policy element related to seeking a broad balance in production capacity between northern Oxfordshire (Cherwell and West Oxfordshire Districts) and southern Oxfordshire (South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Districts) to reflect distribution in demand.

7.8 Post-Hearing Assessment of the Core Strategy Alternatives

The reasonable alternatives identified for the minerals strategy and waste strategy have been subject to SEA/SA as part of this latest round of assessment that has been undertaken following the Examination hearing sessions in September 2016.

The reasonable alternatives considered and the findings of the assessments are summarised below, with the full details of these assessments being included in Section 5 and Appendix D to the SA Report Update.

8 Consideration of alternatives

There has been extensive and detailed consideration of options throughout the development of the Core Strategy. The SEA/SA has provided continual input into this process, through helping to develop and refine options and emerging strategies and policies and by reporting the findings of the assessments undertaken at each stage of the plan making process. These assessments have provided the decision makers with information on the likely sustainability implications of pursuing one option over another and have therefore been an important part of both the evidence base and the decision making process itself, when deciding the preferred options for including in the Core Strategy.

The options that were selected for inclusion in the Submission Core Strategy were those that were considered to be the most appropriate, based on studies and assessments, to deliver the objectives of the Core Strategy, whilst the options that were not taken forward were those that did not perform as well against the criteria in the studies and assessments that were undertaken to inform the development of the Core Strategy.

The policies that consider the quantity and location of activity have been subject to the most extensive consideration of alternatives throughout the process of developing the Core Strategy, as they are the policies that ‘drive’ the strategy and through which there is the greatest potential for significant effects to result, both positive and negative. For some of the supporting policies within

the Core Strategy no reasonable alternatives were identified as the policies either follow national policy and guidance, and hence have no alternatives, or because of the procedural nature of the policy.

The Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination in December 2015 with the Examination Hearings taking place in September 2016. Following the Hearings, the Inspector provided an Interim Report (October 2016) in which he indicated the requirement for the Council to consider reasonable alternatives with regards to certain policies.

In November/December 2016, consultants Land Use Consultants (LUC) undertook a further SEA/SA assessment of the reasonable alternatives being considered during the post-Examination Hearings stage. The following sections provide a summary of the findings of these assessments, while the comprehensive alternatives assessment documents for both the Minerals and Waste Strategies can be found in Appendix D to this SA Report Update. This work has informed the Council's selection and rejection of options.

8.1 Post-Examination Hearings Consideration of Minerals Strategy Alternatives

The following section provides a summary of the alternatives considered post-Examination hearings in relation to the policies that make up the minerals strategy.

8.1.1 Policy M1: Recycled and Secondary Aggregate

The Examination Inspector concluded that the figure of 'at least' or 'a minimum of' 926,000 tonnes per annum should be incorporated in the revision of policy M1. The Council have included this in their proposed main Modification for this policy. The Council consider that there are no reasonable alternatives for new assessment.

8.1.2 Policy M2: Provision for working aggregate minerals

The Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) 2014 has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF and the provision figures in it are the objectively assessed need. The findings of the LAA have been confirmed in the Inspector's Interim Report as being soundly based and robust. The Inspector has concluded that provision for the plan period should be made in policy M2 based on the LAA figures. There are therefore no reasonable alternatives to consider at this stage in the development of the Core Strategy.

8.1.3 Policy M3: Principal locations for working aggregate minerals.

Two sets of alternatives were considered in relation to Policy M3: Principal locations for working aggregate minerals.

A. Whether or not to include the Bampton/Clanfield area as a strategic resource area in Policy M3.

The following alternatives were considered:

- Option 1: The current approach in the submitted Core Strategy to exclude the Bampton/Clanfield area from policy M3
- Option 2: Include the Bampton/Clanfield area in policy M3

This SEA/SA recommended that the Bampton/Clanfield area is not included as a strategic resource area for sharp sand and gravel in the Core Strategy as whilst the inclusion of this area would lead to a greater choice of sites for minerals workings, it is likely to lead to negative effects associated with transport distances of aggregates to the main markets.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment, the approach taken in the submitted Core Strategy to not include the Bampton/Clanfield area as a strategic resource area in policy M3 has been selected as the preferred option and consequently that approach has been retained in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: The option to exclude the Bampton/Clanfield area from the strategic resource areas in policy M3 has been selected, and the option to include that area rejected, because based on the findings of the assessment exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area is expected to result in a lower overall lorry movement distance from mineral working sites to markets within Oxfordshire and consequently to result in less impacts in terms of greenhouse gas emissions in particular and also in relation to air quality and transport effects. Consequently, the approach in the submitted Core Strategy is expected to be the better of the two alternative options in delivering Minerals Planning Objective 3.4vii (minimise transport impacts) of the MWLP. Whilst inclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area would potentially provide a greater choice of sites for mineral working and would be likely to result in a smaller area of land being needed to be worked in order to yield the required tonnage of sharp sand and gravel, these factors are outweighed by the lower overall lorry movement distance that is expected to result from the exclusion of that area.

B. Spatial options relating to the balance of production capacity for the shortfall for which the Plan needs to make provision

In relation to the element of Policy M4[3] "*… achieving a change over the course of the plan period in the balance of production capacity for sharp sand & gravel between the strategic resource areas in western & southern Oxfordshire to more closely reflect the distribution of demand within the county*", the following alternatives were considered. All the options are potentially deliverable and were therefore all considered to be reasonable.

- Option 1: 0% southern Oxfordshire, 100% northern Oxfordshire (as proposed in representations);
- Option 2: 35% southern Oxfordshire, 65% northern Oxfordshire (current situation);
- Option 3: 75% southern Oxfordshire, 25% northern Oxfordshire Oxon (split required to achieve an approximate 50:50 split of production capacity to reflect the estimated 50:50 split in future demand between the north and south of the County). The percentage in the south is greater than that in the north as the existing permitted reserves are greater in the north (including a permission at Gill Mill which will continue right through the plan period and beyond);
- Option 4: 100% southern Oxfordshire, 0% northern Oxfordshire (as proposed in representations);

It is for the shortfall of 5.01 million tonnes of sharp sand and gravel that the MWLP needs to make provision and therefore the options presented above relate to this figure.

The SEA/SA recommended a distribution of 75% of new sharp sand and gravel provision in southern Oxfordshire and 25% in northern Oxfordshire (Option 3). This is the distribution required to achieve an equal distribution of supply (i.e. split in production capacity) between northern and southern Oxfordshire, in line with the distribution of expected demand for aggregates between the northern and southern parts of the county. This option is considered to be the most sustainable as it minimises lorry movement distance from mineral working sites to markets, whilst allowing a greater choice of locations for minerals workings.

[3] NB: this element of Policy M4 in the submitted Core Strategy is now included in Policy M3.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment Option 3: has been incorporated into policy M3 of the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications. This option reflects the strategy approach in policy M4 of the submitted Core Strategy but is more specific in terms of the proportional split of new provision required in the two parts of the county in order to achieve an approximate 50:50 split of production capacity.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: Option 3 has been selected because, based on the findings of the assessment, of the four alternatives assessed this option is expected to result in the lowest overall lorry movement distance from mineral working sites to markets and consequently to result in the lowest impacts in terms of air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and transport effects. Consequently Option 3 is expected to be the best of the four alternatives in terms of delivering Minerals Planning Objective 3.4vii (minimise transport impacts) of the MWLP. In addition, based on the findings of the assessment, Option 3 is likely to result in positive effects in terms of self-sufficiency compared with negative or uncertain effects for the other three options; and is expected to result in more positive effects in terms of economic factors than the other three options. Consequently Option 3 is the best of the four alternatives in terms of delivering Minerals Planning Objective 3.4ii (steady and adequate supply of minerals) of the MWLP. For these same reasons, Options 1, 2 and 4 have been rejected.

8.1.4 Policy M4: Sites for working aggregate minerals

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.1.5 Policy M5: Working of Aggregate Minerals

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.1.6 Policy M6: Aggregate rail depots

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.1.7 Policy M7: Non-aggregate mineral working

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.1.8 Policy M8: Safeguarding mineral resources

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.1.9 Policy M9: Safeguarding mineral infrastructure

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.1.10 Policy M10: Restoration of mineral workings

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2 Post-Examination Hearings Consideration of Waste Strategy Alternatives

The following section provides a summary of the alternatives considered post-Examination hearings in relation to the policies that make up the waste strategy.

8.2.1 Policy W1: Oxfordshire waste to be managed

The Examination Inspector concluded that the forecasts for municipal and commercial & industrial wastes previously in supporting text, and as amended in Examination Documents, should be included in this policy (but not for construction, demolition and excavation waste). There are therefore no reasonable alternatives to consider at this stage in the development of the Core Strategy.

8.2.2 Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets

Two sets of alternatives were considered in relation to Policy W2:

A. Alternative targets for Commercial and Industrial (C&I) waste

For C&I waste, an alternative policy approach was put forward via representations relating to the rate of increase in recycling targets post-2021. Consideration was given to whether these targets are achievable and whether the slower rate of increase put forward by the Council's consultants BPP Consulting in February 2014 (Examination Document 6.4c) should be used instead. The two alternatives assessed were as follows:

Year	2016	2021	2026	2031
Option1 (Submitted Plan approach) C&I dry recycling target	55%	60%	65%	65%
Option 2 C&I recycling target	55%	60%	60%	65%

The SEA/SA favoured Option 1 as it would require less land-take for landfill than Option 2.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment Option 1 has been incorporated into the Core Strategy

incorporating proposed Main Modifications. This option is the same approach as in policy W2 in the submitted Core Strategy, which is therefore unchanged in this respect.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: The assessment of the two alternatives identifies Option 1 as being the more sustainable option as it is expected that it will result in more waste overall being diverted from landfill than would be the case under Option 2. Consequently Option 1 is expected to be the better of the two alternatives in terms of delivering Waste Planning Objective 3.7iii (waste hierarchy) of the MWLP. For these reasons, Option 1 has been chosen and Option 2 has been rejected.

B. Alternative targets for Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CDE) waste

For CDE waste, an alternative policy approach was put forward via representations and was also discussed at the Examination relating to the recycling targets post-2021. A suggested modification to Policy W2 (in Examination Document M9/1) amended the targets to those used in an earlier version of the Core Strategy.

The Inspector noted in his Interim Report (para. 61) that there was agreement that the target for CDE waste recycling in policy W2 should be increased for 2026 and 2031 to 65% and 70% respectively.

For purposes of completeness this change was assessed as a reasonable alternative to the approach in the submitted Core Strategy. The two alternatives assessed were as follows:

Year	2016	2021	2026	2031
Option 1. Submitted Plan targets for CDE recycling CDE recycling target	55%	60%	60%	60%
Option 2. Suggested modification targets for CDE recycling CDE recycling target	55%	60%	65%	70%

The SEA/SA considered Option 2 to be more sustainable than Option 1, as it involves higher recycling targets, which are likely to lead to a lower proportion of waste being sent to landfill, resulting in a greater reduction in the land-take required for waste management.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment Option 2 has been incorporated into the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications. This option differs from the approach in policy W2 in the submitted Core Strategy and is therefore the subject of a proposed Main Modification to the Core Strategy.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: The assessment of the two alternatives identifies Option 2 as being the more sustainable option as it is expected that it will result in more waste overall being diverted from landfill than would be the case under Option 1. Consequently Option 2 is expected to be the better of the two alternatives in terms of delivering Waste Planning Objective 3.7iii (waste hierarchy) of the MWLP. For these reasons, Option 2 has been chosen and Option 1 has been rejected.

8.2.3 Policy W3: Provision for waste management capacity

For the waste facility types 'Composting / food waste treatment' and 'Non-hazardous waste recycling' (for MSW and C&I wastes), and 'inert waste recycling' (for CDE waste), the following alternatives were considered during the development of the proposed Main Modifications:

- Option 1: An approach to use any additional capacity requirement as a cap for the amount of provision to be made (as inferred by the wording of policy W3 in the submitted Core Strategy).
- Option 2: An approach to use any additional capacity requirement as a minimum amount of provision to be made which can be exceeded if suitable sites are available, with no cap on provision and no requirement for need to be demonstrated.

The SEA/SA found that Option 2 is expected to have more positive effects in comparison to Option 1 as it allows greater flexibility should demand exceed forecasted figures and may reduce the amount of land-take for landfill in comparison to Option 1.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment Option 2 has been incorporated into the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications. This option differs from the approach in policy W3 in the submitted Core Strategy and is therefore the subject of a proposed Main Modification to the Core Strategy.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: The assessment of the two alternatives identifies Option 2 as being the more sustainable option, as the positive policy approach (i.e. not including a cap) to provision of facilities that would move the management of waste up the waste hierarchy is expected to allow more waste to be diverted from landfill, and thereby reduce land-take associated with landfill sites. Option 2 may also have more scope to achieve self-sufficiency and economic gains than Option 1. Consequently Option 2 is expected to be the better of the two alternatives in terms of delivering Waste Planning Objectives 3.7iii (waste hierarchy), 3.7viii

(prioritise previously developed land) and 3.7i (net self-sufficiency) of the MWLP. For these reasons, Option 2 has been chosen and Option 1 has been rejected.

8.2.4 Policy W4: Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams

Through representations and discussions at the Examination Hearing a range of alternatives were suggested for inclusion in policy W4. These relate to the size of the zones around Oxford and other towns, the inclusion of Banbury as a potential location for strategic waste management facilities, the inclusion of the smaller towns (e.g. Carterton) as potential locations for non-strategic waste management facilities and the potential location of any size of facility at any of the specified locations.

In addition, suggested modifications included in Examination Document M9/1, amend policy W4 to include provisions relating to proximity to lorry routes that in the submitted Core Strategy are covered in the supporting text to policy W4. Similarly, issues relating to constraints on locations placed by AONBs and SACs that in the submitted Core Strategy are included in the supporting text to policy W4 could be included in modifications to policy W4, with cross references to policies C7, C8, and C12 (proposed new policy on Green Belt in Examination Document M9/1b).

Consequently four potential alternatives to the locational strategy provided in policy W4 were developed for assessment. The five alternatives considered are summarised below.

- Option 1: Policy as included in the Submission Core Strategy
- Option 2: This alternative does not add any new 'overall Plan' requirements, but brings into policy elements that were previously covered in supporting text. These cover the following areas: access to the lorry route network; Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC).
- Option 3: This alternative builds on Option 2 by 'reclassifying' Banbury as a location for strategic waste management facilities and expanding the zone around Oxford from 10km to 15km.
- Option 4: This alternative builds on Option 2 by 'reclassifying' Banbury as a location for strategic waste management facilities and expanding the zone around Oxford from 10km to 15km (as in Option 3), and adding small towns with 2km zones to element b), locations for non-strategic waste management facilities.
- Option 5: This option is a dispersal strategy which combines elements a) and b) in Option 2 to locate both strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities at all of the specified

locations, including within an expanded 15km zone around Oxford and at the small towns with 2km zones.

The SEA/SA found that Options 3 and 4 generally perform better in terms of sustainability than Options 1, 2 and 5 because they allow development of a strategic waste management facility at Banbury and non-strategic waste management facilities at smaller towns, in addition to the locations for waste management facilities identified in Options 1 and 2. This would lead to a wider distribution of waste management facilities across Oxfordshire, which would reduce the transportation distance between locations of waste arisings and waste management facilities and a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions associated with such transportation (SA Objectives 5 and 7). Option 4 would also allow non-strategic waste facilities to be located around smaller towns, which will further add to increasing the distribution of waste management facilities. Whilst Option 5 would lead to a greater dispersal of waste facilities across the county, this may lead to strategic waste facilities being located a considerable distance from the main areas of waste arisings, which could lead to increased transport distances from arisings to management facilities and associated greenhouse gas emissions.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment Option 4 has been incorporated into the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications. This option differs from the approach in policy W4 in the submitted Core Strategy and is therefore the subject of a proposed Main Modification to the Core Strategy.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: The assessment of the five alternatives identifies Options 3 and 4 as being the more sustainable options, with Option 4 being the slightly more sustainable option of these two. This is because Options 3 and 4 are expected to lead to a wider distribution of waste management facilities across the county and provide larger scale facilities where waste arisings are likely to be greatest, which is expected to lead to positive effects with regards to reduced transport impacts and greenhouse gas emissions (in line with Waste Planning Objectives 3.7iv (proximity principle) and 3.7v (distribution of waste management facilities) of the MWLP). Additional sustainability benefits associated with Option 4 have also been identified as this would allow non-strategic waste management facilities to be located at or close to smaller towns, and this would increase the distribution of waste management facilities in relation to waste arisings (further in line with Waste Planning Objective 3.7v of the MWLP) and maximise advantages associated with transport and greenhouse gases (further in line with Waste Planning Objectives 3.7iv and 3.7v of the MWLP). Therefore, Option 4 has been chosen over Option 3 for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications as it would result in slightly greater

sustainability benefits and perform slightly better in terms of helping to deliver the Waste Planning Objectives of the MWLP. The assessment shows that Options 1 and 2 are likely to be too restrictive to provide the necessary distribution of waste management facilities required to provide for waste arisings where they are expected to be greatest, therefore leading to increased transport distances and associated transport and greenhouse gas impacts. For this reason, these alternatives have been rejected. Option 5 would lead to the distribution of facilities necessary to provide for waste arisings where they are expected to be greatest but this option would also allow large scale (strategic) facilities in in areas of the county where waste arisings are small. This may lead to strategic facilities being located at a considerable distance from the main areas of waste arisings, thereby increasing transport distances and associated transport and greenhouse gas impacts. For this reason, Option 5 has been rejected.

8.2.5 Policy W5: Siting of waste management facilities

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2.6 Policy W6: Landfill

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2.7 Policy W7: Management and disposal of hazardous waste

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2.8 Policy W8: Management of agricultural waste

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2.9 Policy W9: Management and disposal of radioactive waste

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2.10 Policy W10: Management and disposal of waste water/sewage

No alternatives have been considered for this policy in the post-Examination hearings stage.

8.2.11 Policy W11: Safeguarding waste management sites

An alternative policy approach for safeguarding waste management sites was put forward via representations and was discussed at the Examination Hearing. This related to the inclusion of temporary waste management sites, with permissions that expire before the end of the plan period, within the sites that should be safeguarded for waste use. A suggested modification to Policy W11

included in Examination Document M9/1b would allow for the safeguarding of such temporary sites for the duration of their planning permission.

For purposes of completeness this change was assessed as a reasonable alternative to the requirements in the Submitted Core Strategy. The alternatives assessed were therefore as follows:

- Option 1: The Submitted Plan approach to not allow for temporary waste management sites to be safeguarded where the planning permission expires before the end of the plan period.
- Option 2: The suggested modification approach to safeguard all permitted waste management sites for the duration of their planning permission, whether or not the permission allows the use to continue to the end of the plan period.

The SEA/SA found that Option 2 performs slightly better than Option 1 in the short to medium-term, as it may allow greater capacity for waste management and therefore greater flexibility to accommodate demand greater than that forecast. In addition Option 2 may allow more waste to be managed within the county, which could reduce transportation of waste to other authority areas, thus reducing transport distances and associated greenhouse gas emissions. This could also allow a greater level of self-sufficiency in the county.

Option selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications: Based on the findings of the assessment Option 2 has been incorporated into the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications. This option differs from the approach in policy W11 in the submitted Core Strategy and is therefore the subject of a proposed Main Modification to the Core Strategy.

Reasons for selecting the preferred alternative and rejecting the others: The assessment of the two alternatives identifies Option 2 as being the more sustainable option as it is likely that it will secure more waste management capacity in Oxfordshire, at least in the shorter term, therefore contributing to the county's ability to be net self-sufficient in waste management (in line with Waste Planning Objective 3.7i (net self-sufficiency) of the MWLP). Option 1 would not secure current waste management capacity which may restrict the county's ability to be self-sufficient in waste management. For these reasons, Option 2 has been chosen and Option 1 has been rejected.

8.3 Post-Examination Hearings Consideration of Core Policy Alternatives

No alternatives have been considered for the core policies in the post-Examination hearings stage.

As part of the Proposed Main Modifications a new core policy relating to Green Belt has been included (Policy C12). This replaces the requirements that were previously included in policy W5. As

with the other core policies no alternatives were considered during the development of this new policy.

9 Screening of the proposed Main Modifications and Additional Modifications

The aim of this screening stage in the SEA/SA process is to determine whether there are likely to be any significant sustainability effects arising from the proposed Main Modifications and Additional Modifications to the Core Strategy and to consider whether there is a need to update the findings documented in previous SA Reports.

The results of the screening process for the proposed Main Modifications are detailed in Section 6 and Appendix E of this SA Report Update and can be summarised as follows:

The 76 proposed Main Modifications were categorised as follows:

- 20 Main Modifications with no implications for the SEA/SA, either due to the minor nature of the policy change or due to the change being to supporting text and not having any bearing on the requirements of the associated policy;
- 34 Main Modifications to supporting text with implications (either positive or negative) for SA objectives which have been assessed during the assessment of the related Core Strategy policy; and
- 22 Main Modifications to policies with implications of a nature that require an update to the original assessment.

For all of the Additional Modifications the screening found that there were no implications for the SEA/SA.

The Main Modifications 'screened in' for new assessment were assessed as part of the updated assessment for the Core Strategy as a whole. The findings are summarised below.

10 Assessment of the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications

The Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications has now been subject to further assessment as part of the SEA/SA process. This new assessment has been informed by the assessments of the reasonable alternatives described above. The findings of the assessments are summarised in the sections below and are explained in greater detail in Section 7 and Appendix F of the SA Report Update.

10.1 Assessment Findings

Based on the methodology used in the previous rounds of the SEA/SA, the assessment used the following scoring system:

Significance Assessment	Description
++	The option is likely to have a significant positive effect
+	The option is likely to have a positive effect which is not significant
0	No effect / no clear link
?	Uncertain or insufficient information on which to determine effect
-	The option is likely to have a negative effect which is not significant
- -	The option is likely to have a significant negative effect
+/-	The option is likely to have some positive and some negative effects

10.1.1 Significant Effects of Proposed Main Modifications

The updated assessments on the proposed Main Modifications which were screened in to the assessment identified additional significant positive effects relating to the following policy versus SEA/SA objective relationships:

- Policy M9 (Safeguarding mineral infrastructure) in relation to the SA objectives on transport effects (SA7) in the short, medium and long term, and economic growth (SA12) in the medium and long term. These significant effects relate to the addition to the policy of rail depot sites to be safeguarded. NB: these are not 'new' significant effects but have been 'transferred' from the assessment of policy M6 in the submitted Core Strategy – that policy previously having included rail depot sites.
- Policy M10 (Restoration of mineral workings) in relation to the SA objective on soils (SA9) in the long term. This reflects the proposed Main Modification to the policy that adds the restoration of best and most versatile agricultural land and the conservation of soil resources as criteria to take into account during restoration and after-use of mineral workings.
- Policy W4 (Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams) in relation to the SA objectives on greenhouse gas emissions (SA5) in the medium and long term and transport effects (SA7) in the medium and long term. This reflects the findings of assessments which were undertaken during the consideration of alternatives for the location of waste management facilities. The significant positive effects relate to the proposed Main

Modification that would enable waste management facilities to be located closer to waste arisings than would have been the case under the submitted policy.

The updated assessments also identified that effects were no longer significantly positive relating to the following policy versus SA objective relationships:

- Policy M3 (Principal locations for working aggregate minerals) in relation to the SA objective on self-sufficiency (SA11) in the medium and long term. This reflects the findings of assessments which were undertaken during the consideration of alternatives for the distribution of additional provision for sharp sand and gravel working. The principal locations for working aggregate minerals included in the policy do not result in significant positive effects against the self-sufficiency objective.
- Policy M6 (Aggregate rail depots) in relation to the SA objectives on transport effects (SA7) in the short, medium and long term, and economic growth (SA12) in the medium and long term. These significant effects have been 'transferred' to the assessment of policy M9 as that policy now safeguards rail depot sites (see Policy M9 above).

No significant negative effects were identified in these new assessments.

10.1.2 Summary of Assessment of Core Strategy including proposed Main Modifications

The following tables (Table NTS 3 for minerals policies, Table NTS 4 for waste policies and Table NTS 5 for core policies) provide a summary of the SEA/SA updated assessments on the policies in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications. The assessment generally found that the policies are likely to have overall positive effects across the range of sustainability topics.

The assessment identified that there are sufficient mineral resources in the county to meet the levels of aggregate provision in Policy M2 (Provision for working aggregate minerals) without having to undertake extraction in areas with significant environmental constraints.

In terms of the provision for waste management capacity specified in Policy W3 (Provision for waste management capacity), sufficient sites have been assessed as being potentially deliverable and suitably free of constraints, which will help to avoid new waste management facilities from having adverse environmental effects.

A number of significant positive effects have been identified as signified by the "++" scores in the tables. The assessment identified no significant adverse effects.

The significant positive effects were identified against the following SA objective versus policy relationships which will need to be monitored:

- SA1 ‘Biodiversity and geodiversity’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of minerals workings’ in the long term and ‘Core Policy C7: Biodiversity and geodiversity’ across all timescales (short, medium and long term).
- SA2a ‘Landscape’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of minerals workings’ in the long term and ‘Core Policy C8: Landscape’ across all timescales.
- SA2b ‘Historic Environment’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of minerals workings’ in the long term and ‘Core Policy C9: Historic environment and archaeology’ across all timescales.
- SA3 ‘Ground and surface water quality’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of minerals workings’ in the long term and ‘Core Policy C4: Water environment’ across all timescales.
- SA4 ‘Air quality’ in relation to ‘Core Policy C10: Transport’ across all timescales.
- SA5 ‘Greenhouse gas emissions’ in relation to ‘Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets’ in the medium and long term, ‘Policy W4: Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams’ in the medium and long term, ‘Core Policy C2: Climate change’ across all timescales and ‘Core Policy C10: Transport’ across all timescales.
- SA6 ‘Flood risk’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of minerals workings’ in the long term and ‘Core Policy C3: Flooding’ across all timescales.
- SA7 ‘Transport effects’ in relation to ‘Policy M9: Safeguarding mineral infrastructure’ across all timescales, ‘Policy W4: Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams’ in the medium and long term and ‘Core Policy C10: Transport’, both across all timescales.
- SA8 ‘Population and health’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of minerals workings’ in the long term, ‘Core Policy C5: Environmental and amenity protection and C10: Transport across all timescales and ‘Core Policy C11: Rights of way’ in the medium and long term.
- SA9 ‘Land and soil quality’ in relation to ‘Policy M10: Restoration of mineral workings’ in the long term, W5: Siting of waste management facilities in the medium and long term and ‘Core Policy C6: Agricultural land and soils’ across all timescales.
- SA10 ‘Waste hierarchy’ in relation to ‘Policy M1: Recycled and secondary aggregate’ and ‘Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets’, both in the medium and long term.
- SA11 ‘Self-sufficiency’ in relation to ‘Policy M2: Provision for working aggregate minerals’ in the medium and long term, ‘Policy M8: Safeguarding minerals resources’ in the long term,

and 'Policy W1: Oxfordshire waste to be managed', 'Policy W3: Provision for waste management capacity' and 'Policy W6: Landfill' all across the short, medium and long term.

- SA12 'Economic growth' in relation to 'Policy M9: Safeguarding mineral infrastructure' in the medium and long term.

Table NTS 3: Summary table of assessments of the Minerals Planning Policies

Plan Elements (abridged)	Duration (Short/Medium/Long term)	SA Objectives (abridged)												
		1	2a	2b	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Landscape	Historic Environment	Water Quality	Air Quality	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Flood Risk	Transport Effects	Population & Health	Soils	Waste Hierarchy	Self-sufficiency	Economic Growth
Policy M1: Recycled and Secondary Aggregate	ST	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+
	MT	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	+	++	+	+
	LT	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	+	++	+	+
Policy M2: Provision for working aggregate minerals	ST	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	+/?	?	0	+	+
	MT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	+/?	?	0	++	+
	LT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	+/?	?	0	++	+
Policy M3: Principal locations for working aggregate minerals	ST	+/-	-/?	-/?	-/?	+	+	0	+	-/?	-/?	0	+	+
	MT	+/-	-/?	-/?	-/?	+	+	+	+	-/?	-/?	0	+	+
	LT	+/-	-/?	-/?	-/?	+	+	+	+	+/?	-/?	0	+	+
Policy M4: Sites for working aggregate minerals	ST	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
	MT	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
	LT	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
Policy M5: Working of Aggregate Minerals	ST	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?	?	0	+	+
	MT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?	?	0	+	+
	LT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?	?	0	+	+
Policy M6: Aggregates rail depots	ST	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	+	?	0	0	0
	MT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	+	?	0	0	0
	LT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	+	?	0	0	0
Policy M7: Non-aggregate mineral working	ST	+/-	+/-	+/-/?	+/-	0	?	?	-	-/?	+/?	0	0	+
	MT	+/-	+/-	+/-/?	+/-	0	?	?	-	-/?	+/?	0	0	+
	LT	+/-	+/-	+/-/?	+/-	0	?	?	-	-/?	+/?	0	0	+
Policy M8: Safeguarding mineral resources	ST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
	LT	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	++	+
Policy M9: Safeguarding mineral infrastructure	ST	0	0	0	0	+	+	+/-	++	0	0	0	+	+
	MT	0	0	0	0	+	+	+/-	++	+	0	0	+	++
	LT	+/?	+/?	+/?	+	+	+	+/-	++	+	0	0	+	++
Policy M10: Restoration of mineral workings	ST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MT	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+
	LT	++	++	++	++	0	0	++	0	++	++	0	0	+

Table NTS 4: Summary table of assessments of the Waste Planning Policies

Plan Elements (abridged)	Timescale (Short/Medium/Long term)	SA Objectives (abridged)												
		1	2a	2b	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Landscape	Historic Environment	Water Quality	Air Quality	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Flood Risk	Transport Effects	Population & Health	Soils	Waste Hierarchy	Self-sufficiency	Economic Growth
Policy W1: Oxfordshire waste to be managed	ST	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?	?	0	++	+
	MT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?	?	0	++	+
	LT	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	+	?	?	0	++	+
Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets	ST	+/?	+/?	+/?	?	?	+	?	?	+/?	+	+	0	+
	MT	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	?	++	?	?	+/?	+	++	0	+
	LT	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	?	++	?	?	+/?	+	++	0	+
Policy W3: Provision for waste management capacity	ST	+/?	+/?	+/?	?	?	+/?	?	+/?	?	+/?	+	++	+
	MT	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	?	+/?	?	+/?	?	+/?	+	++	+
	LT	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	?	+/?	?	+/?	?	+/?	+	++	+
Policy W4: Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste	ST	+/?	+/-/?	?	?	?	+/?	?	+/?	?	?	0	+	+
	MT	+/?	+/-/?	?	?	?	++/?	?	++/?	?	?	0	+	+
	LT	+/?	+/-/?	?	?	?	++/?	?	++/?	?	?	0	+	+
Policy W5: Siting of waste management facilities	ST	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	0	0	+
	MT	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	++	0	0	+
	LT	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	++	0	0	+
Policy W6: Landfill	ST	+/?	+/?	?	+	?	+/?	0	?	?	+/-	0	++	+
	MT	+/?	+/?	?	+	?	+/?	0	?	?	+/-	0	++	+
	LT	+/?	+/?	?	+	?	+/?	0	?	?	+	0	++	+
Policy W7: Management and disposal of hazardous waste	ST	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	+/?	+
	MT	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	+/?	+
	LT	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	+/?	+
Policy W8: Management of agricultural waste	ST	0	?	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	+	0	0
	MT	+	?	?	+/?	?	+	0	+/?	?	+/?	+	0	0
	LT	+	?	?	+/?	?	+	0	+/?	?	+/?	+	0	0
Policy W9: Management and disposal of radioactive waste	ST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	+	0
	MT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	+	+
	LT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	+	+
Policy W10: Management and disposal of waste water/sewage	ST	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	MT	?	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+
	LT	?	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+
Policy W11: Safeguarding waste management sites	ST	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+/?	+	0
	MT	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+/?	+	+
	LT	0	0	0	0	0	+/?	0	+/?	0	0	+/?	+	+/?

Table NTS 5: Summary table of assessments of the Core Policies for Minerals and Waste

Plan Elements (abridged)	Timescale (Short/Medium/Long term)	SA Objectives (abridged)												
		1 Biodiversity & Geodiversity	2a Landscape	2b Historic Environment	3 Water Quality	4 Air Quality	5 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	6 Flood Risk	7 Transport Effects	8 Population & Health	9 Soils	10 Waste Hierarchy	11 Self-sufficiency	12 Economic Growth
Policy C1: Sustainable Development	ST	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	?	?	?	+	+
	MT	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	?	?	?	+	+
	LT	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	0	?	?	?	+	+
Policy C2: Climate Change	ST	+	+	0	0	?	++	+	?	?	0	0	+	+
	MT	+	+	0	0	?	++	+	?	?	0	0	+	+
	LT	+	+	0	0	?	++	+	?	?	0	0	+	+
Policy C3: Flooding	ST	+	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	+	?	0	+	+
	MT	+	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	+	?	0	+	+
	LT	+	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	+	?	0	+	+
Policy C4: Water Environment	ST	+	+	+	++	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+
	MT	+	+	+	++	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+
	LT	+	+	+	++	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	+
Policy C5: Local environment, amenity and economy	ST	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0
	MT	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0
	LT	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0
Policy C6: Agricultural land and soils	ST	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0
	MT	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0
	LT	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0
Policy C7: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	ST	++	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0
	MT	++	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0
	LT	++	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0
Policy C8: Landscape	ST	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
	MT	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
	LT	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Policy C9: Historic environment and archaeology	ST	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
	MT	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
	LT	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Policy C10: Transport	ST	?	?	?	+	++	++	0	++	++	+	0	+	+
	MT	?	?	?	+	++	++	0	++	++	+	0	+	+
	LT	?	?	?	+	++	++	0	++	++	+	0	+	+
Policy C11: Rights of way	ST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0
	MT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0
	LT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0
Policy C12: Green Belt	ST	0	?	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
	MT	0	?	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
	LT	0	?	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

10.2 Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are those effects which, though they may be small in relation to one policy, may combine across a whole plan (or in association with other plans) to produce an overall effect which is more significant. The following cumulative effects have been identified for the SEA/SA topics:

SA1: Biodiversity

Whilst the operation of minerals and waste facilities has the potential to result in some adverse cumulative effects on local biodiversity in the short-medium term, the measures in the core policies, in particular Core Policy C7 (Biodiversity and geodiversity), along with the restrictions placed by Policy M4 (Sites for working aggregate minerals) and the restoration requirements of Policy M10 (Restoration of mineral workings) provide the potential for cumulative positive effects in the long-term. There is potential for positive synergistic effects for biodiversity and water management if restoration schemes in close proximity to one another are implemented.

SA2a: Landscape

Whilst the operation of minerals and waste facilities has the potential to result in some adverse cumulative effects on local landscapes in the short-medium term, the measures in the core policies along with the restrictions of Policy W4 (Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams), the requirements of Policy W5 (Siting of waste facilities) and Policy M4 (Sites for working aggregate minerals) in association with M10 (Restoration of minerals workings) should help to avoid and mitigate these effects. Also, the aim of the waste strategy to minimise waste arisings along with reducing the amount of waste sent to landfill will contribute towards the protection of local landscapes. In addition to the consideration given to landscape within specific minerals and waste policies, Core Policy C8 (Landscape) will help to ensure that the landscape is protected and where possible enhanced while Core Policy 12 (Green Belt) will ensure that development only takes place in the Green Belt under ‘very special circumstances’.

SA2b: Historic environment

The operation of minerals and waste facilities has the potential to result in some adverse cumulative effects on heritage assets, with some potentially being of a permanent nature (e.g. the loss of archaeological heritage). However criteria within Policy M4 (Sites for working aggregate minerals), Policy C4 (relating to protection of waterlogged archaeological remains) and Core Policy C9 (Historic environment and archaeology) will help to protect the County’s historic environment from inappropriate minerals and waste developments. Policy M10 (Restoration of mineral workings) requires restoration of the historic environment, which should result in longer term positive effects. In addition, by seeking to achieve enhancements to the historic environment wherever possible,

Policy C9 should help further reduce the overall effects of minerals and waste on the County's heritage assets.

SA3: Water quality

Minerals extraction has the potential to cause adverse effects on surface and ground water resources. Requirements in Policy M4 (Sites for working aggregate minerals) and Core Policies C3 (Flooding) and C4 (Water environment) will however help to reduce the potential for adverse water quality effects. In the long-term the restoration of mineral sites (Policy M10) could have positive implications for local water quality.

SA4: Air quality

The transportation of minerals and waste by road will inevitably lead to emissions of pollutants from HGVs. However, the distribution of extraction sites and waste management facilities across the county will help to avoid any one particular area being overly-exposed to such emissions. There will also be air quality issues associated with the minerals and waste operations (non-transport emissions related) such as dust created by extraction and vehicle traffic. Core Policies C5 (Local Environment, amenity and economy) and C10 (Transport) will help to reduce the potential for adverse air quality effects.

SA5: Greenhouse gas emissions

Minerals extraction and waste management operations inevitably lead to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) emissions. The strategic and core policies in the Core Strategy, particularly Core Policy C2 (Climate change), should help to limit increases in emissions by distributing aggregate extraction across the county so it can serve local markets; providing a similar approach for waste facilities by locating facilities close to waste arisings; encouraging the use of rail for minerals transportation; reducing the amount of waste going to landfill; and adopting a low carbon approach for new development.

SA6: Flood risk

Minerals extraction operations have the potential to increase local flood risk. This risk should be avoided through the requirements of Core Policy C3 (Flooding). In addition Policy M10 (Restoration of mineral workings) considers the issue of increasing flood storage capacity within restoration schemes. The overall effect on flood risk of implementing the Core Strategy could therefore be positive.

SA7: Transport

The transport of minerals and waste by road will inevitably result in some adverse effects on local communities. The Core Strategy aims to reduce these effects through distribution of extraction sites and waste facilities across the county in order to reduce 'distance travelled'; encouraging a shift from rail and other non-road transport for minerals; and requiring lorry routes to be used. Core Policy C10 (Transport) is specifically aimed at reducing the harmful impacts of transport on the communities in the county and neighbouring areas.

SA8: Population and health

Communities in close proximity to minerals and waste operations, as well as those living on transportation routes are likely to be adversely affected by operations, such as through dust, odour and noise. The distribution of mineral sites and waste facilities across the county should help to prevent any one particular community or group of communities from being disproportionately over-exposed to these adverse effects. The core policies seek to mitigate any adverse effects, particularly Core Policy C5 (Local Environment, amenity and economy), whilst in the medium-long term Policy M10 (Restoration of mineral workings) could provide amenity benefits and countryside access as part of restoration schemes. The reduction of the amount of waste being sent to landfill will also result in benefits to local amenity.

SA9: Soil and land-use

The Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications aims to limit the amount of greenfield land required for new minerals and waste operations by encouraging the use of secondary and recycled aggregate, thereby reducing the need for primary extraction on greenfield sites, and the siting of new waste facilities on previously developed land. The restoration of best and most versatile agricultural land required by Policy M10 (Restoration of mineral workings) directly supports this objective. Core Policy C6 (Agricultural land and soils) provides specific requirements to reduce adverse effects on soils.

SA10: Waste hierarchy and SA11: Self-sufficiency

Key objectives of the Core Strategy are for Oxfordshire to move its waste up the hierarchy and for the county to be as self-sufficient as is possible for waste management and minerals supply. The strategic waste policies in conjunction with Policy M1 (Recycled and secondary aggregate) in the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications will help to achieve those objectives.

SA12: Economic growth

The policies within the Core Strategy incorporating proposed Main Modifications combine to provide the potential to contribute positively towards Oxfordshire's economic growth. The supply of minerals is a key factor in supporting economic growth, particularly in relation to the provision of new housing and employment developments that are being planned across the county.

10.3 Mitigation and recommendations

A key role of the SEA/SA is to provide recommendations as to how the sustainability performance of the plan can be improved. While undertaking the SEA/SA since 2010, a range of recommendations have been identified as to how the Core Strategy could maximise its performance against the range of sustainability topics. Some of the recommendations sought to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst others looked to build on some of the opportunities within Oxfordshire.

11 Monitoring

The requirement in the SEA Regulations relating to monitoring focuses specifically on significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes, with a view to identify unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and be able to undertake appropriate remedial action.

Once the Core Strategy is adopted, its effects against a range of sustainability topics are to be monitored to allow action to be taken to reduce and/or offset any significant effects. Where possible this monitoring will make use of existing arrangements, particularly those being developed to monitor the performance of the Minerals and Waste Plan. The final monitoring plan will be published in the SEA/SA Adoption Statement, alongside the adopted Core Strategy.

12 Next Steps

The publication of this SA Report Update signifies the start of the process whereby key stakeholders and the public are given the opportunity to provide representations on the contents of both the Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications and the accompanying SA Report Update. When the consultation period has finished, the comments received will be considered by the Examination Inspector during the finalisation of the Plan.

12.1 Making your Views Known

This SA Report will be published for representations alongside the Proposed Main Modifications for the Local Plan (Core Strategy).

Copies of the all the consultation documents can be found on the Council's website:

https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/public-site/minerals-and-waste-policy

Comments on the SA Report Update should be sent in writing to:

By email: mineralsandwasteplanconsultation@oxfordshire.gov.uk

By post: Minerals & Waste Core Strategy Consultation
Environment & Economy
Planning Regulation (Minerals & Waste)
Oxfordshire County Council
County Hall
New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND

Responses must be received by **20th March 2017**.

All comments received will be publicly available.