

## Summary of responses to OCC Local List consultation October 2013

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Consultee comments</b>	<b>Local List paragraph/section affected</b>	<b>OCC response</b>
County Councillor Nick Carter	Can't find a reference to access/egress for construction traffic during the building of a development.	Transport Statement	Clarify as part of TIA/TA Assessment
HS2 Ltd	No comments		No changes
Richard Oram – OCC Planning Archaeologist	Rather than specifying that the applicant contact the Planning Archaeologist it would be better if they were advised to contact the Historic Environment Team.	Heritage & Archaeological Statements	Amend text of H & A Statements section
OCC Transport DC	No comments.		No changes
Bloxham Parish Council	No comments.		No changes
Chilterns Conservation Board	Supports the requirement for the submission of design and access statements in connection with relevant planning applications.	Design and Access statements	No changes
	Supports the requirement for the preparation and submission of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments in connection with developments within or visible from the AONBs.	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	No changes
	Supports the requirement for the	Lighting scheme	No changes

	<p>provision of details of any external lighting when proposed.</p> <p>Supports the need for the submission of a Noise Impacts Assessment in connection with proposals that raise issues of disturbance to the locality due to noise.</p>	Noise impact Assessment	No changes
Research Sites Restoration Ltd	No comments.		No changes
East Hendred Parish Council	<p>Pre-Application discussions - propose that the Parish Council is made aware that pre-application discussions have taken place and some summary provided of the results of these. This would enable the Council to consider the submission more effectively; this would also benefit the Development Management process as issues that have already been considered in the pre-application stage would be taken into account.</p>	Pre-Application discussions	No changes to document required but note comment and will provide East Hendred PC with copies of any pre-application advice for sites in that parish.
Environment Agency	<p>Pre-Application discussions - Include for completeness that as from 1 January 2014, the Environment</p>	Pre-Application discussions.	Add sentence advising of this to Pre-Application discussions sections.



	<p>and Wales CIRIA C624 document – Guidance for FRAs CIRIA C697 document - SuDS manual The Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems</p> <p><a href="https://www.ciria.org.uk">https://www.ciria.org.uk</a></p> <p>Land Contamination Assessment 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph We suggest that the following sentence starting “Where contamination is known or suspected or the proposed use would be particularly vulnerable (such as schools),” include the wording “or near public water supplies” in order to capture the risk to water quality as well as human health.</p>	Land Contamination Assessment	Amend text of Land Contamination Assessment section as suggested.
OCC Protected Species Officer	No comments.		No changes.
G P Planning Ltd	Surprised that the requirements are more onerous than before; current government advice is that Councils should be reducing the amount of information required, to help to reduce costs and speed up the planning process.	All	Comment noted. Article 29 (4) (bb) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Order) (England) 2010 as amended that the particulars or evidence the County Council requires to be included in an application are reasonable having

	<p>Should be applied with common sense and understanding and that the validation process becomes more than just a tick-box exercise.</p>		<p>regard, in particular, to the nature and scale of the proposed development; and are about a matter which it is reasonable to think will be a material consideration in the determination of the application. The Local List will therefore be applied by OCC officers in accordance with these requirements.</p>
<p>Smiths and Sons (Bletchington) Ltd</p>	<p>Discretion must be exercised in requesting information with a proportionate approach taken. This doesn't come out well when reading the document, it would be helpful if the preamble to the list could clarify this and also outline the process if there is disagreement. The inclusion of wording similar to paragraph 3 of the committee report of 9th September could provide this.</p> <p>The checklist at the end is a helpful approach but it isn't clear if the checklist should be appended to an application submission. If so can the checklist be supplied in an electronic document format. The actual checklist itself should have the final column amended to: 'Where</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Validation Checklist</p>	<p>Add text of paragraph 3 of related committee report of 9/9/2013 to Introduction section.</p> <p>Validation Checklist to be provided on County Council website as electronic document (if possible). Amend final column title as suggested. A worked example can be provided on the County Council's website for guidance.</p>

	<p>the information can be found OR reason/justification why information has not been submitted'. This would give immediate transparency at the registration stage as to the information supplied with an application and if not, why. Again to help clarify where the checklist cites that an item 'might' be required, it would be helpful to give some worked examples of completed checklists for different proposals in an appendix at the end of the document.</p> <p>The list at times seems to have a disproportionate emphasis on different items, which is demonstrated by the detail on the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Statement which includes several appendices which are highly technical. A qualified ecologist preparing such reports should be familiar with this. Bearing in mind the government drive to be proportionate and also reduce unnecessary guidance this perhaps could be reviewed and reduced without</p>	<p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assessment</p>	<p>This section prepared in close liaison with OCC Ecologist Planner and also supported by other relevant bodies. No changes proposed.</p>
--	---	---	--



	<p>appropriate for the validation checklist to be explicit on the documentation for S73 application submissions, taking account of the proportionality of guidance.</p> <p>The comments on pre-application advice are noted experience of this has not been positive which is particularly disappointing as 'pre application' advice is subject to the payment of a fee in Oxfordshire. Other counties do not charge for pre application advice. To encourage more pre-application discussion, which will improve application submissions, the payment of a fee should be dropped.</p>	Pre-Application discussion section	The comment is noted and OCC officers will seek to improve the pre-application service provided. The County Council is not the only county council which charges for pre-application advice and it does not propose to cease charging for this service.
Woodstock Town Council	Reference should be made to Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site	Heritage & Archaeological Statements	Add reference to World Heritage Sites to Heritage and Archaeological Statement section.
OCC Lead Local Flood Authority	Under Bore Hole and Trial pit, ask for soakage test results.	Bore hole or Trial pit analysis.	Add reference to Bore hole or Trial pit analysis section as requested.
	Indicate that all works which affect non-main rivers require	Hydrological Assessment	Comment noted but informative with regard to other statutory control



	<p>approval and licensing by the relevant Councils:-</p> <p>West Oxfordshire District Council  South Oxfordshire District Council  Vale of White Horse District Council  Oxford City Council  Oxfordshire County Council (covering Cherwell District Council)</p>		<p>rather than additional information required for planning application validation. Add reference.</p>
BBOWT	<p>Aftercare and Restoration Plan: it is stated that a plan would be required setting out how the site would be maintained and monitored for a period of 5 years following the final restoration of the site. However for many years now it has been standard practice in Oxfordshire that, for mineral and waste sites being restored to nature conservation habitat, a management plan is required for a further 20 years period following the five year aftercare period. This is a very valuable in ensuring that the habitats created through restoration are maintained appropriately and we would not wish to see this established practice lost from the</p>	<p>Aftercare &amp; restoration scheme</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is the practice of the County Council to seek an extended 20 years aftercare period through legal agreement, however, this is not development plan policy. It is not the role of the Local List to create policy and therefore this cannot be required as part of the Local List. However a footnote can be inserted to state: "Established standard practice in Oxfordshire is to have 20 years of long-term management in addition to 5 years of aftercare".</p>



	<p>reference is made to the Oxfordshire BAP in terms of habitat and species plans. In fact, the local BAP (which aims to conserve priority species and habitats) is now focussed on priority areas in the County known as Conservation Target Areas (CTAs) and targets are area based. Therefore, it would be useful for reference to be made here to Conservation Target Areas.</p> <p>Hydrological Assessment: alterations in hydrology can often in-directly impact wetland/water dependant priority habitats (including European sites, SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites), it is therefore important that the statement demonstrates that there will be no impact on such sites through changes in water regime or water quality, including appropriate mitigation measures if necessary.</p> <p>Appendix 1 Ecological Survey Seasons: it is not appropriate to undertake Extended Phase 1 survey throughout the year -</p>	<p>assessment</p> <p>Hydrological Assessment</p> <p>Appendix 1</p>	<p>assessment section as suggested.</p> <p>Comment noted but it is considered that any impacts will be identified through the information to be provided as part of the Biodiversity assessment and its associated appendices. Amend text of Appendix 1.</p> <p>Amend Table in Appendix 1.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>this is best done in Spring/Summer. The JNCC Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey states: 'The field season should be considered as starting in late March/early April in the south of England. The season generally ends to about mid-October, although in a mild season it may be possible to carry out some survey in November.' The appropriate survey season will depend on the types of habitat present.</p> <p>Appendix 2 Table A Designated sites: Regionally and Locally Designated Sites should refer to Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), not 'Key Wildlife Sites'. Under 'Other Biodiversity Features' Suggest inclusion of sites within or adjacent to a Conservation Target Area (CTA).</p>	Appendix 2	Amend text of Appendix 2 as suggested.
DK Symes Associates	Local List should be used practically and proportionately by OCC officers. Validation requirements should not be onerous for section 73 applications where there is little material change from the	General	Comment noted. Article 29 (4) (bb) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Order) (England) 2010 as amended that the particulars or evidence the County Council requires to be included in an application are

	<p>original application submission.</p> <p>The result of any pre-application discussions or request for a Screening Opinion should clarify what information is needed to enable the application to be validated as well as setting out clear reasoning having properly considered the proposal (i.e. standard replies should not be encouraged from any statutory consultee).</p> <p>This needs to reflect Government Guidance on Validation recognising that should an application be submitted that subsequently is considered to require an EIA, there is a process under the EIA Regulations for the application to be</p>	<p>Pre-application discussion</p> <p>Validation process</p>	<p>reasonable having regard, in particular, to the nature and scale of the proposed development; and are about a matter which it is reasonable to think will be a material consideration in the determination of the application. The Local List will therefore be applied by OCC officers in accordance with these requirements.</p> <p>Comment noted. Response as set out above.</p> <p>Comment noted. The effect of Regulation 10 (6) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 is that an application is valid without an EIA but that if the local authority issues a Screening Opinion that one is required the application is deemed to be refused after three weeks if the applicant</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>validated and then put on hold until an EIA is submitted. This flexibility should not be overridden by a local validation requirement.</p> <p>Past experience has shown that this can be a confusing title. The Government 'Guidance' indicates that the Location Plan should show the application boundaries in red and other land in blue. The scales of 1:10,000 and 1:50,000 are too small to do this with any accuracy. If the more usual scale (for minerals) of 1:2,500 or 1:5,000 is used as a 'Location Plan' then this is often too large to show where the site is located. Generally it is better to have a Location Plan showing the broad location of the site, with the application boundaries shown on the Site Plan. As the validation requirements repeat the National Guidelines, there is</p>	<p>Location Plan/Site Plan</p>	<p>does not advise in writing their intention to submit one or to seek a Screening Direction from the Secretary of State. The requirements of the Local List cannot take precedence over the requirements of Statutory Instruments. Delete section on Environmental Statements but provide as an informative.</p> <p>Comment noted. Amend text to reference a suitable metric scale proportionate to the size of the development proposed for mineral and waste developments and that the red line and blue line may instead be shown on the Site Plan where appropriate.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------	---



	<p>Bird Strike - Note conflict of 13 km referred to here and 12 km on the Validation Checklist.</p> <p>As sand and gravel working (which includes the ancillary activities normally associated with sand and gravel working such as temporary soil storage bunds, processing, restoration) is a water compatible activity it falls outside the sequential and exception tests which should be made clear.</p> <p>Mineral working (and engineering operations) are acceptable in the Green Belt so should be exempt from requiring a Green Belt Statement and this should be made clear.</p> <p>The pre-determination requirements need to be proportionate to the importance of the assets that may be affected (NPPF para. 128). There is also considerable flexibility within a mineral working to protect in situ features worthy of protection, as generally they are</p>	<p>Birdstrike management plan</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Green Belt Statement</p> <p>Heritage &amp; Archaeological Statements</p>	<p>Correct figure on Validation Checklist.</p> <p>Comment noted but incorrect; sequential test applies to all new development. No exception test is required but mineral processing should not be permitted in flood zone 3b (NPPF Technical Guidance Table 3).</p> <p>Comment noted. Amend text to state that a Green Belt statement for inappropriate development will be required.</p> <p>Comment noted. However, it is clear in the Local List that applicants should liaise with the OCC Historic Environment team at the pre-application stage to establish on a site specific basis what will be required. Therefore no amendment required.</p>
--	---	--	--



	<p>small in scale in relation to the size of the mineral working. The widely adopted approach of strip search and sample when the site is developed has demonstrated that very expensive pre-application field trenching is not generally necessary. It would be helpful to clarify this as at present the requirements are not clear as to what is the minimum required for validation.</p> <p>The level of detail required is extensive at the application stage when principles are being determined. Also, because of the often long period of a mineral scheme landscaping objectives can change, often due to external events (e.g. new housing on the edge of a settlement). This detail is usually provided by way of a condition as restoration and landscaping is progressive.</p> <p>This is not a requirement of NPPF but is strongly encouraged. Whilst it is more appropriate for an</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</p> <p>Statement of Community Involvement</p>	<p>Comment noted. Whilst detailed landscaping schemes are often required by condition, the County Council's consideration of the application may need to be informed, where appropriate and as set out in the Local List, by a detailed assessment. Therefore no amendment required.</p> <p>Amend text in line with Table 5.14 of OCC adopted Statement of Community Involvement 2006 to clarify more significant developments</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>application for new mineral working or extensions, for small application, such as a Section 73 the requirement for a Statement is considered unreasonable.</p> <p>Planning Statement should not normally be required for Section 73 applications. The planning issue should have been fully considered when permission was first issued and it should be made clear that the extensive level of detail set out is not required for this category of minor application.</p> <p>The paragraphs 93 – 99 of NPPF clearly relate to built development and renewable energy proposals rather than to mineral / operational / engineering activities. It should be made clear that, where appropriate, these matters need to be addressed, if and where practicable, rather than indicate that it has to be part of a scheme. For example, renewable energy for minerals sites will require</p>	<p>Supporting Planning Statement</p> <p>Sustainability Statement</p>	<p>that this requirement relates to.</p> <p>Accepted that it would be contrary to the requirements of section 62 (4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for this to be a requirement for Section 73 applications. Amend text to clarify.</p> <p>Amend text to clarify where relevant solely to new built development. However, energy usage is an appropriate consideration for all development.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>several hectares of solar panels or a wind turbine to achieve the power required, let alone the uneconomic cost of the equipment. This is an example of applying practical common sense to the validation requirements and not creating impossible barriers.</p> <p>For many mineral / waste sites there can be a very large number of trees and generally protection is provided by specifying a distance based on BS 5837:2012 (either in the Statement or condition) with a requirement to fence the agreed distance prior to any new phase commencing to ensure adequate protection. This clarity would be appreciated and would represent a practical approach which is applied by other Authorities.</p>	<p>Tree/hedgerow survey/ Arboricultural Statement</p>	<p>There is no reason to relax this requirement just because a site may contain a large number of trees. The reasonableness of applying a condition as suggested should permission be granted will still need to be informed by a survey carried out in accordance with BS 7837:2012. No amendment required.</p>
--	---	---	--



	<p>planners. It should allow flexibility in the information to be provided. Provided the justification for information requirements is clear, it should be stated that applications will not be refused as a result of minor omissions or a different approach in the submission of information.</p> <p>A statement should explain the council's intention to be helpful and to try to get the application registered and determined as expeditiously as possible.</p> <p>Secondary checklist could be provided common to all applications. There may need to be a separate section for Section 73 applications.</p> <p>Delete reference to financial provision to comply with NPPF.</p> <p>The part 3 columns should show whether information has been included in the application/EIA and, if not, space provided to allow applicant to</p>	<p>Pre-application discussions</p> <p>Validation checklist</p> <p>Supporting Planning Statement</p> <p>Validation checklist</p>	<p>As set out above, OCC officers will apply the Local List in accordance with Article 29 (4) (bb) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Order) (England) 2010 as amended.</p> <p>This point is already addressed in the Pre-applications discussions section. No amendment required.</p> <p>Comment noted but it is considered that the Local List should not become over-complicated. No amendment required.</p> <p>Agreed that this is not in line with NPPF policy and technical guidance other than in exceptional circumstances. Amend text of Supporting Planning Statement section.</p> <p>Amend text of head of column to reference justification for non-inclusion.</p>
--	---	---	--

	justify any intentional omission.		
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	<p>Whilst much information is relevant to a proposal, much is not and leads to both unnecessary costs and delays. The key test is set out in the NPPF - Para 193 states:</p> <p>'LPA's should publish a list of their information requirements for applications, which should be <u>proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposals</u> and reviewed on a frequent basis. LPA's should <u>only request supporting information that is relevant, necessary and material</u> to the application in question.' The Local List should not be a 'One Size Fits All' approach since every application is different and a degree of flexibility is necessary. This flexibility should be written into the document.</p> <p>Need to be clear what the National</p>	General	<p>As set out above, OCC officers will apply the Local List in accordance with Article 29 (4) (bb) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Order) (England) 2010 as amended. As set out above add text of paragraph 3 of related committee report of 9 /9/2013 to Introduction section.</p> <p>.</p> <p>National requirements in accordance with central</p>

	<p>requirements actually are, and what detail has been added by OCC. A tree survey should only be necessary where they would be affected by the development. This can only be judged on a site by site basis. Trees within a red line boundary or next to it should not trigger a tree survey - each proposal must be considered on its merits.</p> <p>Many buildings proposed on minerals and waste sites are temporary portakabin type structures and the detailed requirements should be proportionate. Plan and elevations are fine, but a roof plan should not be required for a flat roof.</p> <p>Dust assessment : Most minerals and waste sites will generate dust, but not all need a professional Dust Assessment. For many proposals a Dust Management Plan setting out the practical measures for mitigating dust will suffice.</p> <p>Environmental Statements: These</p>	<p>Other plans</p> <p>Dust assessment</p> <p>Environmental Statement</p>	<p>government guidance in “Guidance on information requirements and validation” 2010. No amendment required.</p> <p>Local List text already makes clear that this is dependent on the type of application and development proposed. No amendment required.</p> <p>Comment noted. Amend text of Dust assessment section appropriately.</p> <p>Comment noted. As set out above the effect of</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>significantly increase the cost of applications so OCC should not ask for unnecessary EIAs at the Screening Stage, and should limit the extent and detail of the topics to be included at the Scoping Stage.</p> <p>Flood Risk: The requirement for an FRA for all sites over 1Ha is a nonsense since many minerals and waste sites caught by this are in Zone 1 and self-evidently have no flood risk or impact on neighbouring land. There should be sensible discretion here, and if not some guidance on what is reasonably needed.</p> <p>Land contamination: Where land may be contaminated by a previous use, it is usually sufficient to cover this by a condition requiring evaluation before construction begins. It is rarely necessary to require any pre-determination SI which can be expensive.</p> <p>Lighting: The requirements of any lighting scheme should be proportionate to the</p>	<p>Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Land contamination assessment</p> <p>Lighting scheme</p>	<p>Regulation 10 (6) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 is that an application is valid without an Environmental Statement. Delete section on Environmental Statements but provide as an informative.</p> <p>Comment noted but standard national requirement of the Environment Agency and this is referenced on 1APP application form. No amendment required.</p> <p>Comment noted, but for consideration to be given for the attachment of a condition should planning permission be forthcoming, a pre-application assessment is a reasonable requirement of the Local List. No amendment required.</p> <p>Comment noted. The Lighting scheme requirements are considered to provide for</p>
--	---	--	--



	<p>development.</p> <p>Travel Plans: These are rarely appropriate for minerals and waste developments.</p> <p>Tree surveys: These are appropriate in some circumstances where certain trees/hedgerows need to be protected or are to be removed. However sites can contain trees that are not important and do not need such detailed scrutiny.</p>	<p>Travel Plan</p> <p>Tree/hedgerow survey/ Arboricultural Statement</p>	<p>this proportionality. No amendment required.</p> <p>Comment noted, but any development which would generate additional trips has travel implications which should be addressed in a Travel Plan. No amendment required.</p> <p>There is no reason to relax this requirement. A tree survey carried out in accordance with BS 7837:2012 will identify the condition and value of trees; it cannot be assumed that some trees are not important in the absence of a survey. No amendment required.</p>
<p>Hills Quarry Products Ltd</p>	<p>Over-bearing requirements increases costs and will deter applications for sustainable development which would boost the local economy. The proposed list is complicated and too prescriptive. It is not clear what is guidance and what is compulsory. It should be a help not a hindrance to applicants.</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Comment noted. There is a central government expectation that local authorities will adopt and maintain up to date Local Lists. As set out above, OCC officers will apply the Local List in accordance with Article 29 (4) (bb) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Order) (England) 2010 as amended. Therefore, whilst the list must be comprehensive, it is not intended that all items will be considered relevant for all applications. No amendment required.</p>

	<p>Some of validation requirements are unspecific and not clear what information is required e.g. photographs. Others are very technical e.g., biodiversity but does not include all references.</p>	<p>General, Photographs &amp; photomontages, biodiversity.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Requirement for photographs/photomontages as required is clear. No amendment required.</p>
	<p>Individual checklist should be provided for minerals, waste and Regulation 3 applications.</p>	<p>Validation Checklist</p>	<p>References are as considered to provide relevant background information to the Local List requirements. No amendment required.</p> <p>Amend Local List to provide separate validation checklists for different applications.</p>
	<p>Secondary checklist could be provided common to all applications. There may need to be a separate section for Section 73 applications.</p>	<p>Validation checklist</p>	<p>Comment noted but it is considered that the Local List should not become over-complicated. No amendment required.</p>
	<p>List should allow flexibility in the information to be provided. Provided the justification for information requirements is clear, it should be stated that applications will not be refused as a result of minor omissions or a different approach in the submission of information.</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>As set out above, OCC officers will apply the Local List in accordance with Article 29 (4) (bb) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Order) (England) 2010 as amended.</p>
	<p>A statement should explain the council's intention to be helpful and to try to get the application registered</p>	<p>Pre-application discussions</p>	<p>This point is already addressed in the Pre-applications discussions section. No amendment required.</p>

	<p>and determined as expeditiously as possible.</p> <p>The list at times seems to have a disproportionate emphasis on different items, which is demonstrated by the detail on the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Statement which includes several appendices which are highly technical. A qualified ecologist preparing such reports should be familiar with this. A consistent level of information should be provided for each topic</p>	<p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assessment</p>	<p>This section prepared in close liaison with OCC Ecologist Planner and also supported by other relevant bodies. No changes proposed. Some requirements are inevitably more technical and complicated and will therefore require more professional input and cost.</p>
	<p>Delete reference to financial provision to comply with NPPF.</p>	<p>Supporting Planning Statement</p>	<p>Agreed that this is not in line with NPPF policy and technical guidance other than in exceptional circumstances. Amend text of Supporting Planning Statement section.</p>
	<p>When making section 73 applications have been asked by the Council for the submission of all of the original application and permission documentation together with all subsequent condition discharge details. This is an onerous</p>	<p>Introduction &amp; Design and Access Statement sections &amp; Validation Checklist.</p>	<p>As set out above draft Local List does not require copies of existing application information to be submitted as this would be contrary to the requirements of section 62 (4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, but this is helpful in providing the context for Section 73 applications to vary</p>

	<p>requirement which does not conform with paragraph 7 of Guidance on Information Requirements and Validation (March 2010): The applicant will not be required to provide copies of the application</p> <p>The part 3 columns should show whether information has been included in the application/EIA and, if not, space provided to allow applicant to justify any intentional omission.</p>	<p>Validation checklist</p>	<p>conditions and for construction of planning permissions which need to reference existing approved documentation not otherwise varied by the new permission. This will remain an informal request made of applicants but not a requirement of the Local List.</p> <p>Amend text of head of column to reference justification for non-inclusion.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Add the words in italics to the Aftercare &amp; restoration section:          ..... Should the proposal involve the disturbance of existing agricultural land, details of <i>soil resources and</i> the Agricultural Land Classification will need to be provided..... <i>It will usually include a soil handling strategy indicating the methodology for soil stripping, storage and replacement, and the plant and machinery</i></p>	<p>Aftercare &amp; Restoration scheme</p>	<p>Amend text of Aftercare &amp; Restoration scheme section as suggested and also additional text:          Details should include the type of material with which the site would be infilled, sources and volumes of materials to be used in restoration, working methods.....</p>

	<p><i>to be used.....</i></p> <p>Other useful things to add would be relevant site history and (most importantly for variation of conditions, reserved matters etc.) details of any current planning permissions. This would be especially useful when a consultation is made on a variation of condition with very little background information.</p> <p>Advice for planning authorities on the agricultural aspects of site working and reclamation can be found in the Defra Guidance for successful reclamation of mineral and waste sites.</p> <p>Assumed this local list is for 'Full' applications? Are there proposals for similar lists to cover removal or variation of conditions, reserved matters/discharge of conditions etc. Or is this a one size fits all approach?</p>	<p>Aftercare &amp; Restoration scheme</p> <p>Aftercare &amp; Restoration scheme</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Air Quality</p>	<p>Comment noted. This is helpful in providing the context for Section 73 applications to vary or delete conditions. However, section 73 applications must reference the existing relevant permission to which variation or deletion of condition is required and current extant planning permissions and associated documents are available to view on the OCC planning applications website. Consultees can therefore readily access this background information. No amendment required.</p> <p>Add additional reference to Aftercare &amp; Restoration scheme section.</p> <p>The Introduction to the Local List sets out the applications to which it relates. No amendment required.</p> <p>Amend text of Air Quality</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p><b>Air Quality:</b> This section could reference sensitive ecological sites similar to the section on dust. Also as in the dust section, where the application/development may result in an adverse impact applicants should assess any adverse effects, and then detail how this will be limited, rather than just detail 'how the application will limit its impact on the environment'.</p> <p><b>Related guidance:</b> The APIS website (<a href="http://www.APIS.ac.uk">www.APIS.ac.uk</a>) provides further guidance on assessing impacts on sensitive ecological sites.</p> <p>Also the Highways Agency Design Manual for Roads and Bridges has a guide for looking at air quality impacts of traffic.</p> <p><b>Appropriate Assessment:</b> This section should be titled 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA) or 'Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010'. Appropriate Assessment (AA) is one part of a full</p>	<p>Appropriate Assessment</p>	<p>section and references as suggested.</p> <p>Comment noted but on reflection it is considered that this section should be deleted from the Local List – Under the Habitats Regulations 2010 it is for the County Council as the competent authority to carry out the appropriate assessment if it is considered that an application may have a significant impact on a European site. The</p>
--	---	-------------------------------	---

	<p>HRA. Page 2 of 3 HRA consists of an assessment of whether there is a likely significant effect (LSE) of the development on the site (SAC or SPA). The LPA, as the competent authority carries out this assessment. The LPA can require the applicant to bring forward the evidence for the assessment of LSE. The applicant can state what they think the outcome will be, but it is for the LPA to decide, with NE's input if the council require it. NE do like to be consulted at this stage.</p> <p>'No LSE' can't really be determined pre-application, but Natural England prefer to be involved/advise at this early stage and can advise applicants on the evidence base needed to show no LSE to enable the LPA to make the decision.</p> <p>If the LPA cannot rule out an LSE, then the assessment moves on to an Appropriate Assessment (AA).</p> <p>Biodiversity: Natural England is pleased to see that this section refers applicants to the Natural England</p>	<p>Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity Assessment</p>	<p>applicant may be required to provide additional information to assist with this assessment but the requirement to carry out the appropriate assessment does not fall on the applicant and so is not a matter for the Local List. Delete Appropriate Assessment section.</p> <p>Add reference to Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity Assessment section.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>website, which contains useful information on protected sites. It might also be helpful for Natural England's standing advice on protected species to be referenced here.</p> <p>Dust Assessment: This section is more detailed than the air quality section, and could be used to inform improvements in the wording of the air quality section.</p> <p>Hydrological Assessment: This section should mention that hydrologically sensitive ecological sites which are hydrologically linked to the application site should be taken into account here and any investigations beforehand may need to include these sites, to inform the ecological assessment or HRA depending on the site/s in question.</p> <p>Landscape &amp; Visual: The Management Plans of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which are in Oxfordshire might be useful related guidance for developers when assessing visual impacts of</p>	<p>Dust Assessment</p> <p>Hydrological Assessment</p> <p>Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment</p>	<p>See comment above on Air Quality section.</p> <p>Comment noted but it is considered that any impacts will be identified through the information to be provided as part of the Biodiversity assessment and its associated appendices. Amend text of Appendix 1.</p> <p>Relevant references already in the Landscape &amp; Visual Impact Assessment section of the Local List. No amendment required.</p>
--	---	---	--



	<p>developments which may affect these areas.</p> <p>Lighting scheme This section could mention impacts on wildlife, or lighting impacts could be mentioned in the biodiversity section of the document.</p> <p>Noise assessment: This section could mention impacts on wildlife</p> <p>Validation checklist: To bring the validation checklist into line with the improvements mentioned above, the following would need to be amended: Air Quality – in addition to ‘where application site is within or adjoining an AQMA’ , this should be required when a sensitive ecological site will be affected. Appropriate Assessment – needs to be labelled as Habs Regs Assessment. It states that AA is needed where there is the potential to impact on designated sites. This needs to clarify that evidence needs to be provided to support the LPA’s HRA – both LSE and AA where needed and only on European</p>	<p>Lighting scheme</p> <p>Noise impact assessment</p> <p>Validation checklist</p>	<p>Lighting scheme section of Local List already references assessment of potential impact on any sensitive biodiversity feature where relevant. No amendment required.</p> <p>Comment noted. Add text to Noise impact assessment section of Local List.</p> <p>Make commensurate changes to Validation checklist in line with comments above.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>designated sites. As the document currently stands, Ecology needs to be covered either under air quality, dust, hydrology, or the biodiversity section in detail, or it may need to be mentioned in all these sections, if relevant.</p> <p>Air Quality and hydrology are not mentioned as things to consider in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Appendix 5 –the link to the standing advice is correct, and is for all species; the specific reference to bats should be removed.</p> <p>Add link Natural England pre-application advice.</p>	<p>Appendix 1</p> <p>Appendix 5</p> <p>Appropriate Assessment, Biodiversity &amp; geodiversity Assessments, Appendix 2 &amp; Appendix 4</p>	<p>Amend text of Appendix 1.</p> <p>Replace “Bats” with “Protected Species” in heading to Appendix 5.</p> <p>Add link to Pre-Applications Discussion section.</p>
--	--	---	---