



CLIENT PROJECT REPORT RPN3854

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

Sustainability Appraisal Report Update

Appendix E: SEA/SA and HRA Screening of Proposed Main Modifications and Proposed Additional Modifications

DRAFT

January 2017

Contents

Appendix E1	SEA/SA and HRA Screening of Proposed Main Modifications
Appendix E2	SEA/SA and HRA Screening of Proposed Additional Modifications

**Oxfordshire County Council
Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy
Proposed Modifications**

Including screening for SEA/SA and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Schedule of the County Council’s Proposed Main Modifications to the Core Strategy

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strike through~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission core strategy, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Please note that footnotes are only referred to where a change is proposed. Their absence is not indicative of them being removed from the Plan.

SEA/SA and HRA Screening

The table below is based on the Council’s Suggested Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy, with an additional column added to provide the findings of the screening undertaken to determine whether the modifications would have any implications for the previous findings of the SEA/SA or the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
4. MINERALS PLANNING STRATEGY					
MM1	37	4.1	This section sets out the County Council’s minerals planning strategy and policies for the plan period to 2031. Provision must be made for a steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals over this period. The Council intends that this will be achieved: <u>firstly</u> by encouraging the <u>increased supply use of secondary and recycled recycled and secondary aggregates; and secondly as well as by making provision identifying areas for the remaining need to be met from mineral working</u> to meet the need for primary aggregates such as sand and gravel and crushed rock.	To place greater emphasis on using secondary and recycled aggregates in preference to primary aggregates in providing a steady and adequate supply of aggregate	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M1. See the Main Modification to policy M1 for an

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
				minerals. In line with Examination Document H10.	update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.
MM2	37	4.2	The strategy includes a spatial strategy for the delivery of the new mineral workings and other mineral supply facilities that are expected to be needed, which is illustrated on the minerals key diagram (Figure 9) at the end of this section, and policies which provide the context for considering future proposals for minerals development. <u>Spatial elements of the strategy, including principal locations for working aggregate minerals (strategic resource areas), mineral safeguarding areas and safeguarded aggregate rail depots, are shown on the Policies Map.</u> It provides a policy framework for the identification of suitable sites in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document and against which planning applications for new mineral workings and other developments will be considered.	To reflect that the content of the minerals key diagram is now shown on the policies map.	No implications for the previous SA or HRA from this update to the supporting text.
MM3	37	4.5	Oxfordshire has permitted and operational capacity for recycling producing approximately 0.9 1.0 million tonnes a year per annum of construction and demolition waste recycled and secondary aggregate (much of this some of which is in temporary, sites being located at time-limited quarries and landfill sites). <u>This total comprises capacities of approximately 0.9 million tonnes per annum for producing aggregate from recycling of construction demolition and excavation waste and 0.1 million tonnes per annum for producing secondary aggregate.</u> Didcot A power station ceased to operate during 2013 and ash recycling at Didcot is not included in this figure. The processing of <u>around 75,000 tonnes per annum of incinerator bottom ash</u> from the new energy recovery facility at Ardley for use as a secondary aggregate commenced in 2015 <u>and is included in the figure.</u> However, these secondary aggregates have different end uses: the power station ash was used for block making whereas incinerator bottom ash is largely used for sub-base in road construction. Figure X shows the timeline for consented capacity in Oxfordshire over the plan period, as at August 2016.	Factual updates and clarifications.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M1. See the Main Modification to policy M1 for an update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Figure X: Consented capacity for producing recycled and secondary aggregates in Oxfordshire 2016 – 2031 (August 2016).</p>		
MM4	37	4.6	<p>The total <u>actual</u> production of recycled and secondary aggregate is difficult to quantify because it includes, for example, material from mobile crushing plants at building and road development sites which is recycled and sometimes re-used on site, and material which passes through waste transfer stations. Surveys of secondary and recycled <u>recycled and secondary</u> aggregate producers in Oxfordshire in between 2012 and 2013 <u>2015</u> indicate a total <u>annual production</u> of around 450,000 tonnes <u>470,000 tonnes</u> are produced each year, but it is likely that the overall supply was higher <u>greater</u> than that, as the surveys were not comprehensive.</p>	Factual updates and clarifications.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M1.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M1 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM5	38	4.8	The supply of recycled and secondary aggregates in Oxfordshire will be limited	Clarifications	No implications for

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			largely by the scale of construction and demolition activity <u>within or in the vicinity of the County</u> and the <u>type and</u> quantity of <u>feedstock</u> material available from that source for recycling. The aggregate materials produced generally vary in quality and cannot meet all specifications; for higher specification applications <u>such as load bearing concrete</u> , use of high quality land-won aggregate is usually the only practicable option.		the previous SA or HRA from this update to the supporting text.
MM6	38	4.9	<p>The earlier (withdrawn) Minerals and Waste Core Strategy included a policy target for recycled and secondary aggregate facility provision of 0.9 million tonnes per year. That target was from the now revoked South East Plan. It is now more appropriate for policy M1 not to set a specific target, which could be misconstrued as setting a maximum level to be achieved, but rather seek to maximise the contribution to aggregate supply in Oxfordshire from recycled and secondary aggregate sources. Policy M1 is a positive policy to enable facilities to be provided in order to achieve this objective. The production of recycled and secondary aggregate will continue to be monitored to check whether this is being achieved through this policy or whether a different approach needs to be considered.</p> <p><u>The Council supports the principle of maximising the contribution from recycled and secondary material sources to aggregate supply in Oxfordshire and wishes to encourage opportunities to develop capacity that enables more intensive processing to maximise recycled aggregate production, in line with plan objective 3.4i. Policy M1 is a positive policy to enable facilities to be provided in order to achieve this. This policy sets no target or ceiling for the amount of provision to be made but it includes a minimum level of production and/or supply of recycled and secondary aggregate that is to be enabled throughout the plan period though making provision for facilities. There will be a decrease in capacity to produce recycled and secondary aggregates from existing facilities over the Plan period, as time-limited permissions expire as indicated in Figure X above. Under policy M1, such lost capacity will at least need to be replaced. Sales and capacity for production of recycled and secondary aggregates will continue to be monitored on an annual basis to check whether the Council's objective is being met through this policy or whether a different approach needs to be considered.</u></p>	To place greater emphasis on using secondary and recycled aggregates in preference to primary aggregates in providing a steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals. In line with Examination Document H10.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M1.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M1 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM7	38	4.11	Provision for additional facilities for the production of recycled aggregates from construction and demolition waste will be made through the <u>allocation identification</u> of sites in the Site Allocations Document, in line with <u>policy M1, policies W3, W4</u>	Consequential updates and to clarify that	No direct implications for the previous SA from

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>and W5 on waste management capacity requirements and provision and siting of facilities. Facilities that produce recycled aggregate from construction, demolition and excavation waste are also waste management facilities and therefore policy W3 on provision for waste management capacity and facilities required and policies W4 and W5 on location and siting of waste management facilities are also relevant. Policies M1 and W3 take a consistent approach to making provision for these facilities; and policy M1 requires allocated sites to be in accordance with policies W4 and W5. Additional facilities may be permitted at other sites where the requirements of relevant policies of the Plan, including Policies M1, W4 and W5, are met. Policy W5 C12 includes provision for recycling facilities to be located within the Green Belt where very special circumstances have been are demonstrated; and policy C8 allows for small-scale facilities serving local needs to be provided in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Recycled and secondary aggregate facilities with permanent permission, or with temporary permission extending at least to the end of the plan period, will be safeguarded under policy M9 and/or policy W11 and these safeguarded sites will also be identified and defined in the Site Allocations Document. Restoration of the The sites of time-limited temporary facilities, including those located at quarries and landfill sites, will be required should be restored in line with policy M10 when the facility is removed, in accordance with any restoration requirements in the planning permission.</p>	<p>provision for recycled and secondary aggregate facilities will not be capped according to a capacity requirement, in line with Examination Document H10.</p>	<p>this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M1.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M1 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM8	39	Policy M1 (4.12)	<p>Policy M1: Recycled and secondary aggregate</p> <p>So far as is practicable, the need for aggregate mineral supply to meet demand in Oxfordshire should be met from recycled and secondary aggregate materials in preference to primary aggregates, in order to minimise the need to work primary aggregates.</p> <p>The production and supply of recycled and secondary aggregate will be encouraged, in particular through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste; • recycling of road planings; • recycling of rail ballast; • recovery of ash from combustion processes; and • where available, the supply of secondary aggregates from sources outside Oxfordshire; 	<p>To address representation 098/ac/1 and 113-116/6 in part.</p>	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>to enable the contribution made by these materials towards meeting the need for aggregates in Oxfordshire to be maximised.</p> <p><u>The production and supply of recycled and secondary aggregate, including that which improves waste separation and the range or quality of end products, will be encouraged so as to enable the maximum delivery of recycled and secondary aggregate within Oxfordshire. Where practicable, the transport of recycled and secondary aggregate materials (both feedstock and processed materials) from locations remote from sources distant to Oxfordshire should be by rail.</u></p> <p>Permission will be granted for facilities for the production and/or supply of recycled and secondary aggregate, including temporary recycled aggregate facilities at aggregate quarries and inert waste landfill sites, at locations that meet the criteria in policies W4, W5 and C1 – C11. Proposals for temporary facilities shall provide for the satisfactory removal of the facility. At mineral working and landfill sites the facility shall be removed when or before the host activity ceases. Temporary facility sites shall be restored in accordance with the requirements of policy M10 for restoration of mineral workings.</p> <p>Sites for the production and/or supply of recycled and secondary aggregate will be safeguarded in accordance with policy W11.</p> <p>Sites proposed or safeguarded for the production and/or supply of recycled and secondary aggregate will be identified in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document.</p> <p><u>Provision will be made for facilities to enable the production and/or supply of a minimum of 0.926 million tonnes of recycled and secondary aggregates per annum.</u></p> <p><u>Sites which are suitable for facilities for the production and/or supply of recycled and secondary aggregates at locations that are in accordance with policies W4 and W5 and other relevant policies of this Plan and of other development plans will be allocated in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document. Permission will be granted for such facilities at these allocated sites provided that the requirements of policies</u></p>		

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>C1 – C12 are met.</u></p> <p><u>Permission will normally be granted for recycled and secondary aggregate facilities at other sites, including for temporary recycled aggregate facilities at aggregate quarries and landfill sites, that are located in accordance with policies W4 and W5 and that meet the requirements of policies C1 – C12, taking into account the benefits of providing additional recycled and secondary aggregate capacity and unless the adverse impacts of doing so demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Where permission is granted for such a facility at a time-limited mineral working or landfill site this will normally be subject to the same time limit as that applying to the host facility and the site shall be restored in accordance with the requirements of policy M10 for restoration of mineral workings at the end of its permitted period. Except where a new planning permission is granted for retention of the facility beyond its permitted end date, temporary facility sites shall be restored at the end of their permitted period.</u></p> <p><u>Sites for the production and/or supply of recycled and secondary aggregate will be safeguarded under Policy M9 and/or W11 and safeguarded sites will be defined in the Site Allocations Document.</u></p>		
MM9	40	4.14	<p>The County Council's Oxfordshire Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 sets the following requirements for provision for land-won aggregate supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharp sand and gravel – 1.015 million tonnes a year; • Soft sand – 0.189 million tonnes a year; • Total sand and gravel – 1.204 million tonnes a year; • Crushed rock – 0.584 million tonnes a year. <p>These figures will be revised on an annual basis through the annual Local Aggregate Assessment and will be superseded by the figures in the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment.</p>	To ensure clarity and consistency with the change to policy M2 to include specific provision figures.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM10	40	4.18	<p>The Local Aggregate Assessment is to be reviewed annually and the provision figures are likely to change as the 10 year sales average period moves forward and other relevant local information changes. Regular monitoring of aggregates supply and demand in Oxfordshire will be carried out through the plan period and will be recorded in the Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports and used in the</p>	To ensure clarity and consistency with the change to policy M2 to include specific	No implications from this update to the supporting text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			annual reviews of the Local Aggregate Assessment.	provision figures.	
MM11	41	4.19	<p>The current <u>Based on the</u> Local Aggregate Assessment <u>2014 annual provision</u> figures, <u>the total requirements over the plan period 2014 to 2031 are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sharp sand and gravel – 18.270 million tonnes (1.015 x 18);</u> • <u>Soft sand – 3.402 million tonnes (0.189 x 18); and</u> • <u>Crushed rock – 10.512 million tonnes (0.584 x 18).</u> <p><u>The Plan needs to make provision to enable the supply of these quantities of primary aggregate minerals from land won sources in Oxfordshire over the plan period. This is set out in policy M2. Taking into account actual sales in 2014 and 2015, permitted reserves remaining at the end of 2015 (excluding reserves that are not expected to be worked during the plan period*) and permissions granted in 2016**, indicate the following additional requirements for which provision needs to be made over the plan period (2014 to 2031), taking into account existing planning permissions are approximately:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8.866 <u>5.0</u> million tonnes; • 4.238 <u>1.3</u> million tonnes; and • Crushed rock – no additional requirement. <p>If 'reserves' subject to a resolution to grant permission are also taken into account, the additional requirement for sharp sand and gravel is reduced to approximately 5.4 million tonnes. Table 2 shows how these requirements are calculated. This is the position as at the end of 2016 but these additional requirements may change over time, as actual sales and remaining permitted reserves figures for further years become available, and if further planning permissions are granted. The additional requirements for each aggregate mineral type, for which provision needs to be made, will therefore be recalculated when the Site Allocations Document is prepared.</p> <p><i>Footnotes:</i></p> <p>* <u>The planning application for an extension to Gill Mill Quarry submitted in 2013 and permitted in 2015 is for the working of a total of 7.8 million tonnes of sharp sand and gravel (including 2.8 million tonnes previously permitted and 5.0 million tonnes in the extension area). Information in the application indicates this will be worked over 22 years from 2013, giving an average rate of working of approximately 0.35 million tonnes per annum. Mineral working at Gill Mill Quarry is therefore expected to extend beyond the end of the plan period</u></p>	To replace deleted Table 2 and reflect modification to policy M2 and factual update.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M2.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M2 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>(2031); of the total of 7.8 million tonnes, it is estimated approximately 6.65 million tonnes will be worked within the plan period and approximately 1.15 million tonnes will remain to be worked after 2031.</p> <p>** <u>Permissions granted in 2016 comprise:</u> <u>Sharp sand and gravel:</u> <u>Sutton Wick Quarry – extension (0.35 million tonnes) – permission granted 18 March 2016);</u> <u>Bridge Farm, Sutton Courtenay Quarry – deeper working (0.165 million tonnes) – permission granted 17 May 2016.</u></p>		
MM12	41	4.20	<p>This is the current position but this <u>The requirement for aggregate mineral working in the county may change over the plan period if the levels of annual provision change as the Local Aggregate Assessment is reviewed annually. Such changes are likely to be relatively small from one year to another but may add up to more substantial change over a period of years. The strategy for mineral working therefore needs to have sufficient flexibility to allow for changes in demand for locally supplied aggregates; policy M2 requires landbanks to be maintained in accordance with the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment and taking into account the need to maintain sufficient productive capacity; and policy M5 provides for permission to be granted where the need for aggregate supply cannot be met from allocated sites. Policy M2 therefore does not include the figures from the current Local Aggregate Assessment but instead makes a policy commitment to meeting the requirements in the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment. Provision to meet these requirements in policy M2 will be made through the locations for mineral working identified in policy M3 and the allocation of specific sites for mineral working in the Site Allocations Document under policy policies M3 and M4, taking into account the need for appropriate flexibility to enable the plan to be delivered.</u></p>	For clarification and to reflect deletion of Table 2 and modifications to policy M2 and the supporting text.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M2.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M2 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM13	42	Table 2	<p>Table 2: Aggregate provision required over plan period 2014 – 2031</p> <p>Delete Table 2</p>	Provision requirement is now covered in Policy M2.	No implications from the deletion of this table.
MM14	43	Policy M2 (4.21)	<p>Policy M2: Provision for working aggregate minerals</p> <p>Provision will be made through policies M3 and M4 to enable the supply of:</p>	To address representations 082/3, 082/ac/1,	Policy amendment has implications for the SA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>aggregate minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>sharp sand and gravel - 1.015 mtpa giving a total provision requirement of 18.270 million tonnes</u> • <u>soft sand - 0.189 mtpa giving a total provision requirement of 3.402 million tonnes</u> • <u>crushed rock - 0.584 mtpa giving a total provision requirement of 10.512 million tonnes</u> <p>from land-won sources within Oxfordshire to meet the requirement identified in the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment throughout for the period to the end of 2014 – 2031 inclusive.</p> <p>Permission will be granted for aggregate mineral working under policy M5 to enable separate landbanks of reserves with planning permission to be maintained for the extraction of minerals of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least 7 years for sharp sand and gravel; • at least 7 years for soft sand; • at least 10 years for crushed rock; <p>in accordance with the annual requirement rates in the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment, taking into account the need to maintain sufficient productive capacity to enable these rates to be realised.</p>	<p>098/ac/2, 125/2 and 131/2. To address representations 098/5, 098/ac/2, 011/1, 031/1 and 117/4.</p>	<p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM15	44	4.29	<p><u>Using four indicators of construction activity – population, housing, jobs and land for economic development – and looking at both the existing situation and the forecast or planned position at 2031 within each of the five Oxfordshire District Council areas, there is an approximately equal split between northern Oxfordshire (Cherwell and West Oxfordshire Districts and half of Oxford City) and southern Oxfordshire (South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Districts and half of Oxford City). There is a broadly equal split in existing and forecast levels of economic growth and development between the northern and southern parts of the county (taking Oxford as a mid-point), and consequently. Consequently, it is expected that there will be a similar broadly approximately equal split in the demand for aggregate within the county between northern and southern Oxfordshire over the plan period.</u> The plan objectives include minimising the distance that minerals need to be transported by road, from quarry to market. In line with this, the minerals planning strategy should promote and enable a move over the plan period to a distribution of sharp sand and gravel production that more</p>	<p>To provide additional explanation of and justification for modified policy M3.</p>	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M3.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			closely reflects the distribution of demand for aggregate within the county.		No implications for the HRA.
MM16	45	4.30	<u>An assessment of options for the distribution of additional sharp sand and gravel working has shown that the option that best meets this objective, and that overall is the most sustainable, is for 25% of the additional tonnage required to be provided in northern Oxfordshire – within the Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys area from Standlake to Yarnton strategic resource area (which lies entirely within West Oxfordshire); and 75% to be provided in southern Oxfordshire – in the Thames and Lower Thame Valleys area from Oxford to Cholsey and Thames Valley area from Caversham to Shiplake strategic resource areas. This reflects the current situation of concentration of remaining permitted reserves within northern Oxfordshire (mainly in West Oxfordshire District) and should lead to an approximately equal split of production capacity for sharp sand and gravel between northern and southern Oxfordshire by 2031. This means changing the balance of production capacity between the strategic resource areas in western Oxfordshire (mainly in West Oxfordshire District) and southern Oxfordshire (in South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Districts), even though remaining resources of sharp sand and gravel are more extensive in West Oxfordshire. In view of the relatively high level of existing permitted reserves in the northern part of Oxfordshire (mainly in West Oxfordshire), any The requirement for additional sites for sharp sand and gravel should therefore be met primarily in the southern part of the county, at least particularly over the first half of the plan period. Provision for additional sharp sand and gravel working in southern Oxfordshire would enable local supplies of aggregate for planned housing and economic growth in this part of the county, including the Science Vale area. The Council will seek to achieve this objective of changing change in the balance distribution of production capacity through the selection of sites to be allocated for sharp sand and gravel working in the Site Allocations Document and through making decisions on planning applications.</u>	To provide additional explanation of and justification for modified policy M3.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M3. See the Main Modification to policy M3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.
MM17	45	4.33	Within the northern part of the County, the only significant remaining resources of sharp sand and gravel lie within the strategic resource areas <u>are located</u> along the Thames Valley to the west/north west of Oxford and the related Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys (mostly almost all <u>mostly almost all</u> in West Oxfordshire District, with a small part but partly <u>small part</u> in Cherwell District). Whilst any <u>the</u> requirement for additional sites for sharp sand and gravel should be met primarily in the southern part of the	To provide additional explanation of and justification for modified policy M3.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>county, in the event that some further provision for working is also expected to be required from the northern part of the county in before the end of the plan period; <u>and this should be from within the Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys area from Standlake to Yarnton strategic resource area</u>, which includes the existing working areas of the Lower Windrush Valley and around Cassington.</p> <p><u>There are also large areas of sharp sand and gravel resource within the part of the Thames Valley to the west of the Lower Windrush Valley, around Bampton and Clanfield, but these are not included within the strategic resource areas in policy M3. This is Provision should not be made from the resource areas further to the west, around Bampton and Clanfield, primarily because these areas are further from the main locations of demand for aggregate in Oxfordshire, in some cases in terms of direct distance but more generally due to the relatively long routes that would be involved using and lack suitable road access to the advisory lorry route network and avoiding unsuitable bridges and environmentally sensitive areas (see policy C10 and figure 13). The requirement for further working areas within the plan period can be met from the strategic resource areas that are closer to the main areas of demand and provision should not be made from the areas around Bampton and Clanfield. An assessment undertaken as part of the sustainability appraisal of the plan has shown that excluding the areas around Bampton and Clanfield is the more sustainable option.</u></p>		<p>result from the change to policy M3.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM18	46	4.35	<p>Potentially important archaeological constraints have been identified in the Lower Windrush Valley, south of Hardwick, and at a number of locations within the Thames and Lower Thame Valleys (Oxford to Cholsey) strategic resource area. The Council will work with English Heritage to ensure that important archaeology is given appropriate protection, in particular when sites for minerals working are allocated in the Site Allocations document.</p> <p><u>The Lower Windrush Valley part of the Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys (Standlake to Yarnton) strategic resource area to the south of Hardwick is of particular archaeological significance, as are a number of locations in the Thames and Lower Thame Valleys (Oxford to Cholsey) strategic resource area. Both strategic resource areas quite possibly contain archaeological remains which, whilst not scheduled, are demonstrably of equivalent importance to scheduled monuments and which should therefore be accorded the same protection as these designated heritage assets in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. In accordance with this, and minerals planning objective 3.4 viii, any</u></p>	To address representation 120/11 and for clarification.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy M3.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy M3 for an update to the assessment for this</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<u>such important archaeological resources should be conserved and enhanced, and would therefore present a significant constraint on mineral extraction in these strategic resource areas. The Council will work with Historic England to undertake further detailed assessment of this archaeological resource, to ensure that it is given appropriate protection, in particular when sites for mineral working are allocated in the Site Allocations Document.</u>		topic area. No implications for the HRA.
MM19	48	4.44	Government policy is that major minerals developments should only be permitted in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in exceptional circumstances and that landbanks of aggregate minerals should, as far as is practical, be maintained outside AONBs, World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments and Conservation Areas. There are sufficient aggregate resources in Oxfordshire outside these designated areas and sites such that working within them is not necessary. Policy C8 provides protection for the landscape quality of the county and policy C9 provides protection for the historic environment. <u>Government Policy is that mineral extraction in the Green Belt is not inappropriate development, provided it preserves the openness of the Green Belt, and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. Therefore this has not been applied as a constraint for the locations of working aggregate minerals. Proposals for development other than mineral extraction in Green Belt will be considered against policy C12.</u>	To address representation 084/4 and 085/4.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM20	48	Policy M3 (4.45)	<p>Policy M3: Principal locations for working aggregate minerals</p> <p>The principal locations for aggregate minerals extraction will be within the following strategic resource areas, as indicated on the Minerals Key Diagram shown on the Policies Map:</p> <p>Sharp sand and gravel</p> <p><u>in northern Oxfordshire (Cherwell District and West Oxfordshire District):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys area from Standlake to Yarnton; <p><u>in southern Oxfordshire (South Oxfordshire District and Vale of White Horse District):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Thames and Lower Thame Valleys area from Oxford to Cholsey; • The Thames Valley area from Caversham to Shiplake. 	To address representation 120/13. To address representation 120/13. To move the requirement relating to the balance of sharp sand and gravel supply between western and southern Oxfordshire within the minerals	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Soft sand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Corallian Ridge area from Oxford to Faringdon; • The Duns Tew area. <p>Crushed rock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area north west of Bicester; • The Burford area south of the A40; • The area east and south east of Faringdon. <p>Specific sites (<u>new quarry sites and/or extensions to existing quarries</u>) for working aggregate minerals will be identified within these strategic resource areas <u>will be allocated</u> in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document, in accordance with policy M4.</p> <p><u>Specific sites for extensions to existing aggregate quarries (excluding ironstone) outside the strategic resource areas may also be allocated in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document provided they are in accordance with policy M4.</u></p> <p><u>Sites allocated for sharp sand and gravel working (including both new quarry sites and extensions to existing quarries, including any extensions outside the strategic resource areas), to meet the requirement in policy M2 will be located such that approximately 25% of the additional tonnage requirement is in northern Oxfordshire and approximately 75% of the additional tonnage requirement is in southern Oxfordshire, to achieve an approximately equal split of production capacity for sharp sand and gravel between northern and southern Oxfordshire by 2031.</u></p>	working locational strategy policy (M3), to reflect its role as a key part of the strategy and to make the meaning of this requirement clearer.	
MM21	49	Policy M4 (4.46)	<p>Policy M4: Sites for working aggregate minerals</p> <p>Specific sites for working aggregate minerals within the strategic resource areas identified in <u>in accordance with policy M3, to meet the requirements set out in policy M2 will be allocated in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document, taking into account the following factors in accordance with the following criteria:</u></p>	To address representations 070/10 and 120/15. To address Matter 7, Issue 2. To move the	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>a) consideration of the quantity and quality of the mineral resource;</p> <p>b) 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;</p> <p>e) <u>b)</u> priority for the extension of existing quarries, where environmentally acceptable (including taking into consideration criteria d) c) to m) l) and after consideration of criterion b), before working new sites;</p> <p>d) <u>c)</u> potential for restoration and after-use and for achieving the restoration objectives of the Plan in accordance with policy M10;</p> <p>e) <u>d)</u> suitability & accessibility of the primary road network;</p> <p>f) <u>e)</u> proximity to large towns and other locations of significant demand to enable a reduction in overall journey distance from quarry to market;</p> <p>g) <u>f)</u> ability to provide more sustainable movement of excavated materials;</p> <p>h) <u>g)</u> avoidance of locations within or significantly affecting an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;</p> <p>i) <u>h)</u> avoidance of locations likely to have an adverse effect on sites and species of international nature conservation importance and Sites of Special Scientific Interest; in the case of locations within the Eynsham / Cassington / Yarnton part of the Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys area, it must be demonstrated that there will be no change in water levels in the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation and the proposal must not involve the working of land to the north or north east of the River Evenlode; in the case of locations within the Corallian</p>	<p>requirement relating to the balance of sharp sand and gravel supply between western and southern Oxfordshire within the minerals working locational strategy policy (M3), to reflect its role as a key part of the strategy.</p>	<p>policy. No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Ridge area, it must be demonstrated that there will be no change in water levels in the Cothill Fen Special Area of Conservation;</p> <p>j) i) avoidance of locations likely to have an adverse effect on <u>the significance of</u> designated heritage assets, including World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, and Conservation Areas, <u>Registered Parks and Gardens and Registered Battlefields</u>, or on archaeological assets which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to a Scheduled Monument;</p> <p>k) i) avoidance of, or ability to suitably mitigate, potential significant adverse impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. locally designated areas of nature conservation and geological interest; ii. <u>non-designated heritage assets</u>; iii. local landscape character; iv. water quality, water quantity, flood risk and groundwater flow; v. <u>best and most versatile</u> agricultural land and soil resources; vi. local transport network; vii. land uses sensitive to nuisance (e.g. schools & hospitals); viii. residential amenity & human health; and ix. character and setting of local settlements; <p>l) k) potential cumulative impact of successive and/or simultaneous mineral development, including with non-mineral development, on local communities; <u>and</u></p> <p>m) l) ability to meet other objectives and policy expectations of this <u>Core Strategy Plan</u> (including policies C1 – C14 <u>C12</u>) and relevant <u>policies</u> <u>policies</u> in other development plans.</p>		
MM22	50	Policy M5 (4.47)	<p>Policy M5: Working of aggregate minerals</p> <p><u>Prior to the adoption of the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document, permission will be granted for the working of</u></p>	To address representations 082/5, 125/4 and 131/4.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>aggregate minerals where this would contribute towards meeting the requirement for provision in policy M2 and provided that the proposal is in accordance with the locational strategy in policy M3 and that the requirements of policies C1 – C12 are met.</u></p> <p>Permission will be granted for the working of aggregate minerals within the sites allocated further to policy M4 provided that the requirements of policies C1 – C14 <u>C12</u> are met.</p> <p>Permission will not be granted for the working of aggregate minerals outside the sites allocated further to policy M4 unless the requirement to maintain a <u>steady and adequate</u> supply of aggregate in accordance with policy M2 cannot be met from within those sites <u>and provided that the proposal is in accordance with the locational strategy in policy M3 and the requirements of policies C1 – C12 are met. The criteria in policy M4 will be taken into consideration in the determination of planning applications for aggregate minerals working in locations not allocated under policy M4.</u></p> <p>Permission will exceptionally be granted for the working of aggregate minerals outside the sites allocated further to policy M4 where extraction of the mineral is required prior to a planned development in order to prevent the mineral resource being sterilised, having due regard to policies C1 – C14 <u>C12</u>.</p> <p>Prior to the adoption of the Minerals & Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document, permission will be granted for the working of aggregate minerals where this is required in order to maintain landbanks in accordance with policy M2 and taking into consideration the criteria in policy M4 and provided that the requirements of policies C1 – C11 are met.</p> <p><u>Permission will exceptionally be granted for borrow pits to supply mineral to associated construction projects, having due regard to policies C1 – C12, provided that all of the following apply:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the site lies on or in close proximity to the project area so that extracted mineral can be conveyed to its point of use with minimal use of public highways and without undue interference with footpaths and bridleways;</u> 	<p>To address Matter 7, Issue 3.</p>	<p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the mineral material extracted will only be used in connection with the project;</u> • <u>it can be demonstrated that supply of the mineral from the borrow pit would have less environmental impact than if the mineral were supplied from an existing source;</u> • <u>the borrow pit can be restored without the use of imported material, other than that generated by the project; and</u> • <u>use of the borrow pit is limited to the life of the project.</u> <p>Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs, permission for working of ironstone for aggregate use will not be permitted except in exchange for an agreed revocation (or other appropriate mechanism to ensure the non-working) without compensation of an equivalent existing permission in Oxfordshire containing potentially workable resources of ironstone and where there would be an overall environmental benefit.</p>		
MM23	51	Policy M6 (4.51)	<p>Policy M6: Aggregate rail depots</p> <p>The following rail depot sites are safeguarded for the importation of aggregate into Oxfordshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hennef Way, Banbury (existing facility); • Kidlington (permitted replacement facility); • Appleford Sidings, Sutton Courtenay (existing facility); • Shipton-on-Cherwell Quarry (permitted facility); • And any other aggregate rail depot sites which are permitted, as identified in the Annual Monitoring Report. <p>Permission will be granted for new aggregate rail depots at locations with suitable access to an advisory lorry route shown on the Oxfordshire Lorry Route Maps (policy C10) and that meet the criteria in <u>requirements of policies C1 – C11 C12.</u></p> <p>Safeguarded rail depot sites will be identified in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document.</p> <p>Proposals for development that would directly prevent or prejudice the use of</p>	To address representation 033/8 and Matter 7, Issue 4.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>a safeguarded rail depot site for an aggregate rail depot will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a suitable alternative rail depot site can be provided; or • it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the site to be safeguarded for aggregate rail depot use. <p>Proposals on land near to a safeguarded rail depot site for development sensitive to disturbance from, and which would indirectly prevent or prejudice the operation or establishment of, an aggregate rail depot at the safeguarded site will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development is in accordance with a site allocation for development in an adopted local plan or neighbourhood plan; or • a suitable alternative aggregate rail depot site can be provided; or • it can be demonstrated that the safeguarded rail depot site is no longer needed for Oxfordshire's aggregate supply requirements. 		
MM24	54	Policy M7 (4.60)	<p>Policy M7: Non-aggregate mineral working</p> <p>All proposals for the working of non-aggregate minerals, including exploration and appraisal, shall meet the criteria in <u>requirements of policies C1 – C14 C12.</u></p> <p><u>Building Stone</u> Permission will be granted for extensions to existing quarries and new quarries for the extraction of building stone where a need for the material has been demonstrated and the <u>scale, extent and location of the proposed quarrying is small-scale are such that adverse impacts upon the environment and amenity can be avoided, minimised or adequately mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>Clay</u> The extraction of clay will be permitted in conjunction with the working of sharp sand and gravel from the locations in policy M3. The extraction of clay</p>	To address representations 125/5, 131/5, 132/6 and 146/2.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>will not be permitted in other locations unless it can be demonstrated that there is a local need for clay which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cannot be met by extraction in conjunction with sharp sand and gravel working; or • would be met with less overall environmental impact than by extraction in conjunction with sharp sand and gravel working. <p><u>Chalk</u> The extraction of chalk for agricultural or industrial use in Oxfordshire will be permitted provided the proposed quarrying is small-scale and a local need for the material has been demonstrated. Extraction of chalk for wider purposes, including as an aggregate or for large scale engineering will not be permitted unless the proposal is demonstrated to be the most sustainable option for meeting the need for the material.</p> <p><u>Fuller's Earth</u> The working of fuller's earth will be permitted provided that a national need for the mineral has been demonstrated.</p> <p><u>Oil and Gas (conventional and unconventional)</u> Proposals for the exploration and appraisal of oil or gas will be permitted provided arrangements are made for the timely and suitable restoration and after-care of the site, whether or not the exploration or appraisal operation is successful.</p> <p>The commercial production of oil and gas will be supported in the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full appraisal programme for the oil or gas field has been successfully completed; and • The proposed location is the most suitable, taking into account environmental, geological, technical and operational factors; and • For major development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it is clearly demonstrated that <u>there are exceptional circumstances and the proposal is in the public interest, including in terms of national considerations, in accordance with the 'major developments test' in the NPPF (Paragraph 116).</u> 		

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
MM25	55	4.63	<p>Mineral safeguarding areas will be <u>are</u> defined on the Policies Map maps in the Site Allocations Document, <u>covering the following areas of mineral resource:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sharp sand and gravel resources of significance in the main river valleys, in particular including the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3;</u> • <u>Soft sand within the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3;</u> • <u>Limestone within the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3;</u> • <u>Fuller's earth in the Baulking – Fernham area.</u> <p><u>Mineral safeguarding areas for other significant proven areas of important mineral resources may be defined when the Site Allocations Document is prepared.</u> The extent of safeguarded areas can be reviewed if economic or other considerations change.</p>	To address representation 134/3.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM26	55	4.64	<p>District Councils in Oxfordshire are responsible for planning development (other than minerals and waste) in their areas. The County Council, as Mineral Planning Authority, must also identify mineral consultation areas and specify the types of application for non-mineral related development on which the relevant district council must consult the County Council within these areas. The mineral consultation areas will be <u>are</u> based on the minerals safeguarding areas and will include land within 250m of the boundary of a Minerals Safeguarding Area <u>minerals safeguarding area</u>. They are also shown on the Policies Map. They will be identified and updated when necessary in the Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. <u>Further mineral consultation areas will be similarly defined around any additional minerals safeguarding areas that are defined when the Site Allocations Document is prepared.</u></p>	To address representation 134/3.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM27	55	Policy M8 (4.65)	<p>Policy M8: Safeguarding mineral resources</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Areas will be defined in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document, covering the following mineral resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharp sand and gravel in the main river valleys, including the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3, and other areas of proven resource; 	To address representation 134/3.	Policy amendment has no implications for the SA or the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft sand within the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3; • Limestone within the strategic resource areas identified in policy M3; • Fuller's earth in the Baulking – Fernham area. <p>Mineral resources in these <u>Mineral Safeguarding Areas shown on the Policies Map</u> are safeguarded for possible future use. Development that would prevent or otherwise hinder the possible future working of the mineral will not be permitted unless it can be shown that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has been allocated for development in an adopted local plan or neighbourhood plan; or • The need for the development outweighs the economic and sustainability considerations relating to the mineral resource; or • The mineral will be extracted prior to the development taking place. <p><u>Mineral Consultation Areas, based on the Mineral Safeguarding Areas, are shown on the Policies Map. Within these areas the District Councils will consult the County Council on planning applications for non-mineral development will be defined, identified and updated when necessary in the Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports.</u></p>		
MM28	57	Policy M9	<p>Policy M9: Safeguarding mineral infrastructure</p> <p>Existing and permitted infrastructure that supports the supply of minerals in Oxfordshire is safeguarded against development that would unnecessarily prevent the operation of the infrastructure or would prejudice or jeopardise its continued use by creating incompatible land uses nearby.</p> <p><u>Safeguarded sites include the following rail depot sites which are safeguarded for the importation of aggregate into Oxfordshire:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Hennef Way, Banbury (existing facility);</u> • <u>Kidlington (existing facility);</u> • <u>Appleford Sidings, Sutton Courtenay (existing facility); and</u> • <u>Shipton-on-Cherwell Quarry (permitted facility);</u> <p><u>as shown on the Policies Map; and</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>any other aggregate rail depot sites which are permitted, as identified in the Annual Monitoring Report.</u> 	To address Matter 7, Issue 4.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>Other</u> safeguarded sites will be <u>identified defined</u> in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document.</p> <p>Proposals for development that would <u>directly or indirectly</u> prevent or prejudice the use of a site safeguarded for mineral infrastructure will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development is in accordance with a site allocation for development in an adopted local plan or neighbourhood plan; or • it can be demonstrated that the infrastructure is no longer needed; or • the capacity of the infrastructure can be appropriately and sustainably provided elsewhere. 		
MM29	61	Policy M10 (4.85)	<p>Policy M10: Restoration of mineral workings</p> <p>Mineral workings shall be restored to a high standard and in a timely and phased manner to an after-use that is appropriate to the location and delivers a net gain in biodiversity. The restoration <u>and after-use</u> of mineral workings must take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the characteristics of the site prior to mineral working; • the character of the surrounding landscape and the enhancement of local landscape character; • the amenity of local communities, including opportunities to enhance green infrastructure provision and provide for local amenity uses and recreation; • the capacity of the local transport network; • the quality of any agricultural land affected, <u>including the restoration of best and most versatile agricultural land</u>; • <u>the conservation of soil resources</u> • flood risk and opportunities for increased flood storage capacity; • <u>the impacts on flooding and water quality of any use of imported material in the proposed restoration</u>; • bird strike risk and aviation safety; • any environmental enhancement objectives for the area; • the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity appropriate to the local area , supporting the establishment of a coherent and resilient ecological network through the landscape-scale creation 	To address representations 126/1, 098/8, 136/1 and 133/ac/2.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA														
			<p>of priority habitat;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the conservation and enhancement of geodiversity; and • the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment; <u>and</u> • <u>consultation with local communities on options for after-use.</u> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for mineral working unless satisfactory proposals have been made for the restoration, aftercare and after-use of the site, including where necessary the means of securing them in the longer term.</p> <p>Proposals for restoration must not be likely to lead to any increase in recreational pressure on a Special Area of Conservation.</p>																
MM30	62	Figure 9	Delete Figure 9: Minerals Key Diagram and replace with Policies Map.	Minerals Key Diagram is not needed because all content is now shown on Policies Map.	No implications from deletion of the Key Diagram.														
5. WASTE PLANNING STRATEGY																			
MM31	64	Table 3	<p>Table 3: Waste produced in Oxfordshire in 2012 (tonnes) <u>Baseline waste arising in Oxfordshire requiring provision for management (million tonnes per annum)</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>MSW</th> <th>C&I</th> <th>CDE</th> <th>Hazardous</th> <th>Agricultural</th> <th>Waste Water</th> <th>LLW</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>300,000 <u>0.300*</u></td> <td>710,000 <u>0.533**</u></td> <td>932,000 <u>1.033**</u></td> <td>50,000 <u>0.050*</u></td> <td>900,000 <u>0.900*</u></td> <td>23,000 <u>0.023*</u></td> <td>See table 4415</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Baseline year 2012 ** Baseline year 2014 Source: MSW (Municipal Solid Waste) – Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) C&I (Commercial and Industrial Waste) – BPP Consulting for OCC ('as managed' estimate) CDE (Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste) – Oxfordshire County Council ('as managed' estimate – there is considerable uncertainty over this figure, see paragraph 5.5b) Hazardous waste – BPP Consulting for OCC Agricultural waste – BPP Consulting for OCC (estimate)</p>	MSW	C&I	CDE	Hazardous	Agricultural	Waste Water	LLW	300,000 <u>0.300*</u>	710,000 <u>0.533**</u>	932,000 <u>1.033**</u>	50,000 <u>0.050*</u>	900,000 <u>0.900*</u>	23,000 <u>0.023*</u>	See table 4415	Clarifications.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3. See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.
MSW	C&I	CDE	Hazardous	Agricultural	Waste Water	LLW													
300,000 <u>0.300*</u>	710,000 <u>0.533**</u>	932,000 <u>1.033**</u>	50,000 <u>0.050*</u>	900,000 <u>0.900*</u>	23,000 <u>0.023*</u>	See table 4415													

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			Waste Water – Thames Water plc LLW (Low Level Radioactive Waste)		No implications for the HRA.
MM32	64	5.5a (new Paragraph)	<u>The BPP Review of the Waste Needs Assessment (2014) established a point of production ‘arisings’ figure for the C&I and CDE waste streams, whereas the Supplement to the Waste Needs Assessment (2016) used a method developed by national government to establish an ‘as managed’ waste figure for each of these waste streams. The ‘as managed’ figures in broad terms are approximately 60-70% of the equivalent ‘arisings’ figures. The reason for the difference between the values (other than the three year time lag between estimates) is attributable to the fact that a certain amount of waste is managed through routes outside the formal management system. This might be through management on the site of production (e.g. crushing of demolition waste and incorporation into groundworks), through methods ancillary to other activities such as storage and distribution (e.g. backhauling by major retailers of packaging waste for bulking at distribution depots), or through the use of mobile plant that do not require express planning consent and therefore bypassing static facilities. The actual degree to which such activities may contribute to the management of these waste streams today and in the future is not fully able to be accounted for. Therefore the ‘as managed’ values for C&I waste included in Tables 3 and 4 and in Policy W1 should be regarded as a minimum arising values.</u>	To clarify and explain the approach to estimating C&I and CDE waste to be managed.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM33	64	5.5b (new paragraph)	<u>There is considerable uncertainty over the estimated figure for CDE waste in Table 3 and over forecasts for this waste stream. Significantly different figures can be derived depending on the assumptions used. Consequently, no forecasts for CDE waste are included in Table 4; and no values for this waste stream are included in Policy W1. Nevertheless, the estimate of 1.033 mtpa shown in Table 1 can be taken as a minimum value for the amount of CDE waste to be managed going forward. This will include an element of non- inert waste, which has been estimated to comprise 20% of the total, and this waste will require management as non-hazardous waste rather than inert waste. Inert waste is expected to be primarily managed through recycling, in particular at recycled aggregate production facilities, recovery operations or the backfilling of mineral workings. Some will continue to go to landfill for restoration purposes.</u>	To clarify and explain the approach to estimating CDE waste to be managed.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3. See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA																																																
					topic area. No implications for the HRA.																																																
MM34	64	5.6	Forecasts of waste produced in Oxfordshire are likely to change over time, as circumstances affecting the amount of waste produced change and new information becomes available. The forecasts are therefore not included in policy W1. Current (January 2015) forecasts for the MSW and C&I waste streams are set out in Table 4. <u>No forecasts for CDE waste are included.</u> These forecasts will be kept under review and updated as necessary in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. <u>The forecasts in Table 4 are included in policy W1.</u>	Consequential amendment resulting from changes to policy W1.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3. See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.																																																
MM35	64	Table 4	<p>Table 4: Forecasts of amounts of principal waste streams (<u>excluding CDE</u>) to be managed – Oxfordshire waste arisings 2012 – 2031 (million tonnes)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2012</th> <th>2016</th> <th>2021</th> <th>2026</th> <th>2031</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MSW</td> <td>0.300</td> <td>0.320</td> <td>0.343</td> <td>0.360</td> <td>0.376</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C&I</td> <td>0.710</td> <td>0.736</td> <td>0.758</td> <td>0.766</td> <td>0.773</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td><u>0.542</u></td> <td><u>0.564</u></td> <td><u>0.573</u></td> <td><u>0.583</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CDE</td> <td>1.005</td> <td>1.220</td> <td>1.483</td> <td>1.483</td> <td>1.483</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0.932</td> <td>1.133</td> <td>1.379</td> <td>1.379</td> <td>1.379</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2.015</td> <td>2.276</td> <td>2.584</td> <td>2.609</td> <td>2.632</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1.942</td> <td>2.189</td> <td>2.480</td> <td>2.505</td> <td>2.528</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: <u>Supplement to the Oxfordshire Waste Needs Assessment, BPP for OCC 2015</u> 2016</p>		2012	2016	2021	2026	2031	MSW	0.300	0.320	0.343	0.360	0.376	C&I	0.710	0.736	0.758	0.766	0.773			<u>0.542</u>	<u>0.564</u>	<u>0.573</u>	<u>0.583</u>	CDE	1.005	1.220	1.483	1.483	1.483		0.932	1.133	1.379	1.379	1.379	Total	2.015	2.276	2.584	2.609	2.632		1.942	2.189	2.480	2.505	2.528	Consequential amendment resulting from changes to policy W1.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3. See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.
	2012	2016	2021	2026	2031																																																
MSW	0.300	0.320	0.343	0.360	0.376																																																
C&I	0.710	0.736	0.758	0.766	0.773																																																
		<u>0.542</u>	<u>0.564</u>	<u>0.573</u>	<u>0.583</u>																																																
CDE	1.005	1.220	1.483	1.483	1.483																																																
	0.932	1.133	1.379	1.379	1.379																																																
Total	2.015	2.276	2.584	2.609	2.632																																																
	1.942	2.189	2.480	2.505	2.528																																																

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
					No implications for the HRA.
MM36	65	5.8	The commercial and industrial waste forecast takes account of economic growth forecasts for Oxfordshire and Defra national forecasts. A <u>high moderate</u> growth rate has been used (as explained in the <u>Supplement to the Waste Needs Assessment 2016</u>), based on a compound annual growth in waste arisings of 0.7% to 2021 and 0.2% thereafter. This results in an overall increase in <u>arisings the amount of waste to be managed of approximately 7% from the 2014 baseline figure to the forecast for 2031.</u> some 9% between 2012 and 2031.	Factual updates and corrections.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3. See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.
MM37	65	5.9	Future construction, demolition and excavation waste arisings will be largely governed by the rate of new building work. <u>The national Planning Policy Guidance for waste states that when forecasting future arisings for this waste stream, waste planning authorities should start from the basis that net arisings will remain constant over time as there is likely to be a reduced evidence base on which forward projections can be based*.</u> <u>Following this guidance, it can be taken that a minimum of 1.033 mtpa of CDE waste will require management in Oxfordshire throughout the plan period to 2031.</u> Forecasts also take account of policy, legislation and standards — all of which are pushing the sector to more sustainable waste management methods. Again, a high growth rate scenario has been used (as explained in the Waste Needs Assessment), but this has been partly checked by pressures to reduce waste. Steady growth in this waste stream is anticipated each year to 2021, based on an assumption that the rate of construction will increase as the economy picks up and house building increases in response to recently assessed demands³⁶. An increase of 50% in this type of waste is possible, with waste levels stabilising thereafter.	Amendment to approach to CDE waste growth to reflect national planning guidance.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3. See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA															
			<p><i>*Insert new footnote: National Planning Practice Guidance for waste, paragraph 033 (October 2014)</i></p> <p><i>Delete footnote 35: Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, GL Hearn, March 2014</i></p>		the HRA.															
MM38	66	Policy W1 (5.12)	<p>Policy W1: Oxfordshire waste to be managed</p> <p>Provision will be made for waste management facilities <u>to provide capacity that allows</u> Oxfordshire to be net self-sufficient in the management of its principal waste streams – municipal solid waste (or local authority collected waste), commercial and industrial waste, and construction, demolition and excavation waste – over the period to 2031.</p> <p>The amounts of these wastes that need to be managed for which waste management capacity needs to be provided is as identified in the most recent Oxfordshire Waste Needs Assessment or update of these amounts in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. follows:</p> <p><u>Forecasts of waste for which waste management capacity needs to be provided 2016 – 2031 (million tonnes per annum)</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Waste Type</u></th> <th><u>2016</u></th> <th><u>2021</u></th> <th><u>2026</u></th> <th><u>2031</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>Municipal Solid Waste</u></td> <td><u>0.32</u></td> <td><u>0.34</u></td> <td><u>0.36</u></td> <td><u>0.38</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Commercial and Industrial Waste</u></td> <td><u>0.54</u></td> <td><u>0.56</u></td> <td><u>0.57</u></td> <td><u>0.58</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>These forecasts will be kept under review and updated as necessary in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports.</u></p> <p>Provision of for facilities for hazardous waste, agricultural waste, radioactive waste and waste water/sewage sludge will be in accordance with policies W7, W8, W9 and W10 respectively.</p>	<u>Waste Type</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2031</u>	<u>Municipal Solid Waste</u>	<u>0.32</u>	<u>0.34</u>	<u>0.36</u>	<u>0.38</u>	<u>Commercial and Industrial Waste</u>	<u>0.54</u>	<u>0.56</u>	<u>0.57</u>	<u>0.58</u>	Update estimated waste management capacity following inspector's interim report.	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
<u>Waste Type</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2031</u>																
<u>Municipal Solid Waste</u>	<u>0.32</u>	<u>0.34</u>	<u>0.36</u>	<u>0.38</u>																
<u>Commercial and Industrial Waste</u>	<u>0.54</u>	<u>0.56</u>	<u>0.57</u>	<u>0.58</u>																

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA																																				
MM39	69	Policy W2 (5.22)	<p>Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets</p> <p>Provision will be made for capacity to manage the principal waste streams in a way that provides for the maximum diversion of waste from landfill, in line with the following targets:</p> <p><i>Delete current table and replace with:</i></p> <p><u>Oxfordshire waste management targets 2016 – 2031</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="4">Year</th> </tr> <tr> <th><u>2016</u></th> <th><u>2021</u></th> <th><u>2026</u></th> <th><u>2031</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5" style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">MUNICIPAL WASTE</td> <td><u>Composting & food waste treatment</u></td> <td><u>29%</u></td> <td><u>32%</u></td> <td><u>35%</u></td> <td><u>35%</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u></td> <td><u>33%</u></td> <td><u>33%</u></td> <td><u>35%</u></td> <td><u>35%</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous residual waste treatment</u></td> <td><u>30%</u></td> <td><u>30%</u></td> <td><u>25%</u></td> <td><u>25%</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Landfill</u> <u>(these percentages are not targets but are included for completeness)</u></td> <td><u>8%</u></td> <td><u>5%</u></td> <td><u>5%</u></td> <td><u>5%</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Total</u></td> <td><u>100%</u></td> <td><u>100%</u></td> <td><u>100%</u></td> <td><u>100%</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Year				<u>2016</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2031</u>	MUNICIPAL WASTE	<u>Composting & food waste treatment</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>Non-hazardous residual waste treatment</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>Landfill</u> <u>(these percentages are not targets but are included for completeness)</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<p>Changes to reporting of additional capacity requirements to reflect changes to policies W1 (C&I waste) and exclude inert waste (proportion of CDE waste) from capacity requirement calculations in line with Examination Hearing Document H10.</p> <p>Changes to reporting of additional capacity requirements to reflect changes to policies W1 (C&I waste) and exclude inert waste (proportion of CDE waste) from capacity requirement calculations in line with Examination Hearing Document H10.</p>	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
		Year																																							
		<u>2016</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2031</u>																																				
MUNICIPAL WASTE	<u>Composting & food waste treatment</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>35%</u>																																				
	<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>35%</u>																																				
	<u>Non-hazardous residual waste treatment</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>																																				
	<u>Landfill</u> <u>(these percentages are not targets but are included for completeness)</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>																																				
	<u>Total</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>																																				

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification					Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA	
			COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL WASTE	<u>Composting & food waste treatment</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>		
				<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>65%</u>		
				<u>Non-hazardous residual waste treatment</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>		
				<u>Landfill</u> <u>(these percentages are not targets but are included for completeness)</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>		
				<u>Total</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		
			CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION & EXCAVATION WASTE	<u>Proportion of Projected Arisings taken to be Inert*</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>	<u>80%</u>		
				<u>Inert waste recycling (as proportion of inert arisings)</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>70%</u>		
				<u>Permanent deposit of inert waste other than for disposal to landfill** (as proportion of inert arisings)</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>		

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification				Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<u>Landfill</u> (as proportion of inert arisings) (these percentages are not targets but are included for completeness)	<u>20%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>5%</u>	
			<u>Total</u> (inert arisings)	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
			<u>Proportion of Projected</u> <u>Arisings taken to be</u> <u>Non-Inert*</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>20%</u>	
			<u>Composting</u> (as proportion of non-inert arisings)	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	
			<u>Non-hazardous waste</u> <u>recycling</u> (as proportion of non-inert arisings)	<u>55%</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>65%</u>	<u>65%</u>	
			<u>Non-hazardous residual waste</u> <u>treatment</u> (as proportion of non-inert arisings)	<u>15%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>25%</u>	
			<u>Landfill</u> (as proportion of non-inert arisings) (these percentages are not targets but are included for completeness)	<u>25%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5%</u>	

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA					
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total (non-inert arisings)</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>* It is assumed that 20% of the CDE waste stream comprises non-inert materials (from breakdown in report by BPP Consulting on Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste in Oxfordshire, February 2014, page 7). The subsequent targets are proportions of the inert or non-inert elements of the CDE waste stream.</u></p> <p><u>** This includes the use of inert waste in backfilling of mineral workings & operational development such as noise bund construction and flood defence works.</u></p> <p>Proposals for the management of all types of waste should demonstrate that the waste cannot reasonably be managed through a process that is higher up the waste hierarchy than that proposed.</p>	Total (non-inert arisings)	100%	100%	100%	100%		
Total (non-inert arisings)	100%	100%	100%	100%						
MM40	69	5.23	<p>Table 5 shows how the forecast tonnages of non-hazardous waste for the principal waste streams in policy W1 should be managed in order that for the waste management targets in policy W2 can to be met. Waste management capacity equivalent to these tonnages needs to be provided if Oxfordshire is to be net self-sufficient in meeting its waste needs (policy W1). <u>The non-hazardous element of the CDE waste stream has been calculated based on the arising value of 1.033 mtpa which is considered to be a minimum. The management capacity required for the inert element of this waste stream is not specified in view of the uncertainty over the baseline value and forecast, and consequent absence of figures for CDE waste in policy W1; and also in recognition of the positive approach in policies W3 and M1 towards provision of additional capacity for recycling of CDE waste, particularly for the production of recycled aggregate, whereby there is no requirement for need to be demonstrated against a specified capacity requirement and, subject to proposals being in accordance with other relevant policies, there is no ceiling set on the level of capacity that may be provided.</u></p>	For clarification and update following changes to policies W1, W3 and M1.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3.</p> <p>See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>					
MM41	70	Table 5	<p><i>Delete current Table 5 and replace with:</i></p> <p><u>Table 5: Oxfordshire: estimated non-hazardous waste management capacity</u></p>	Changes to reporting of capacity	No direct implications for the previous SA from					

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA																																																																																					
			<p>required 2016 – 2031 (tonnes per annum)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Projected Capacity Requirement</u></th> <th><u>MSW</u></th> <th><u>C&I</u></th> <th><u>CDE (non-inert proportion)</u></th> <th><u>Total (tpa)</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u></td> <td><u>92,800</u></td> <td><u>27,100</u></td> <td><u>10,300</u></td> <td><u>130,200</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u></td> <td><u>105,600</u></td> <td><u>298,100</u></td> <td><u>113,700</u></td> <td><u>517,400</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u></td> <td><u>96,000</u></td> <td><u>81,300</u></td> <td><u>31,000</u></td> <td><u>208,300</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u></td> <td><u>109,700</u></td> <td><u>28,200</u></td> <td><u>10,300</u></td> <td><u>148,200</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u></td> <td><u>113,200</u></td> <td><u>338,100</u></td> <td><u>124,000</u></td> <td><u>575,300</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u></td> <td><u>102,900</u></td> <td><u>140,900</u></td> <td><u>51,700</u></td> <td><u>295,500</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">2026</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u></td> <td><u>126,000</u></td> <td><u>28,700</u></td> <td><u>10,300</u></td> <td><u>165,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u></td> <td><u>126,000</u></td> <td><u>372,500</u></td> <td><u>134,400</u></td> <td><u>632,900</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u></td> <td><u>90,000</u></td> <td><u>143,300</u></td> <td><u>51,700</u></td> <td><u>285,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">2031</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u></td> <td><u>131,600</u></td> <td><u>29,100</u></td> <td><u>10,300</u></td> <td><u>171,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u></td> <td><u>131,600</u></td> <td><u>378,600</u></td> <td><u>134,400</u></td> <td><u>644,600</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u></td> <td><u>94,000</u></td> <td><u>145,600</u></td> <td><u>51,700</u></td> <td><u>291,300</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Projected Capacity Requirement</u>	<u>MSW</u>	<u>C&I</u>	<u>CDE (non-inert proportion)</u>	<u>Total (tpa)</u>	2016					<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>92,800</u>	<u>27,100</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>130,200</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>105,600</u>	<u>298,100</u>	<u>113,700</u>	<u>517,400</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>96,000</u>	<u>81,300</u>	<u>31,000</u>	<u>208,300</u>	2021					<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>109,700</u>	<u>28,200</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>148,200</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>113,200</u>	<u>338,100</u>	<u>124,000</u>	<u>575,300</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>102,900</u>	<u>140,900</u>	<u>51,700</u>	<u>295,500</u>	2026					<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>126,000</u>	<u>28,700</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>165,000</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>126,000</u>	<u>372,500</u>	<u>134,400</u>	<u>632,900</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>90,000</u>	<u>143,300</u>	<u>51,700</u>	<u>285,000</u>	2031					<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>131,600</u>	<u>29,100</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>171,000</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>131,600</u>	<u>378,600</u>	<u>134,400</u>	<u>644,600</u>	<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>94,000</u>	<u>145,600</u>	<u>51,700</u>	<u>291,300</u>	<p>requirements to reflect changes to policies W1 (C&I waste) and exclude inert waste (proportion of CDE waste) from capacity requirement calculations in line with Examination Hearing Document H10.</p>	<p>this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3.</p> <p>See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
<u>Projected Capacity Requirement</u>	<u>MSW</u>	<u>C&I</u>	<u>CDE (non-inert proportion)</u>	<u>Total (tpa)</u>																																																																																						
2016																																																																																										
<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>92,800</u>	<u>27,100</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>130,200</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>105,600</u>	<u>298,100</u>	<u>113,700</u>	<u>517,400</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>96,000</u>	<u>81,300</u>	<u>31,000</u>	<u>208,300</u>																																																																																						
2021																																																																																										
<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>109,700</u>	<u>28,200</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>148,200</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>113,200</u>	<u>338,100</u>	<u>124,000</u>	<u>575,300</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>102,900</u>	<u>140,900</u>	<u>51,700</u>	<u>295,500</u>																																																																																						
2026																																																																																										
<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>126,000</u>	<u>28,700</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>165,000</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>126,000</u>	<u>372,500</u>	<u>134,400</u>	<u>632,900</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>90,000</u>	<u>143,300</u>	<u>51,700</u>	<u>285,000</u>																																																																																						
2031																																																																																										
<u>Composting/ food waste treatment</u>	<u>131,600</u>	<u>29,100</u>	<u>10,300</u>	<u>171,000</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste recycling</u>	<u>131,600</u>	<u>378,600</u>	<u>134,400</u>	<u>644,600</u>																																																																																						
<u>Non-hazardous waste residual</u>	<u>94,000</u>	<u>145,600</u>	<u>51,700</u>	<u>291,300</u>																																																																																						
MM42	71	Table 6	Table 6: Oxfordshire – capacity available to manage waste at existing facilities 2016 – 2031 (tonnes per annum)	Factual update and clarifications	No direct implications for the																																																																																					

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification					Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			Facility type Type of waste management	2012	2016	2021	2026		
			Non-hazardous waste recycling	600,300	598,900	429,900	429,900	317,800	<p>previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3.</p> <p>See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
			Composting / food waste treatment	219,600	219,600	219,600	214,600	214,600	
			Non-hazardous residual waste treatment	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	
			Inert waste recycling	1,153,100	1,145,100	1,105,100	889,600	889,600	
			<p>Source: Oxfordshire County Council Municipal and Commercial and Industrial wastes are managed at non-hazardous waste facilities Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste is managed at inert waste facilities</p>						
MM43	71	5.25	<p>Table 7 shows when and for which types of facility a need is expected to arise for additional waste management capacity and the amount required. Shortfalls arise where the capacity provided by existing facilities (table 6) is insufficient to meet the estimated waste management capacity requirement (table 5). Policy W3 provides for these requirements to be monitored and kept up to date in the Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. Waste management capacity requirements will be kept under review and updated in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. These reports will also set out how the waste management capacity requirements are expected to be met, including the capacity that is expected to be provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Permanent and established waste management facilities;</u> • <u>Time-limited waste management facilities;</u> • <u>Sites with planning permission for waste management facilities that have not yet been built;</u> • <u>Sites allocated for waste development in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document; and</u> • <u>Any further sites that may be needed to meet updated capacity requirements identified by monitoring in the Annual Monitoring Reports following adoption of the Site Allocations Document.</u> 					Inclusion of paragraph moved from policy W3 and consequential amendment.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3.</p> <p>See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA																																		
MM44	71	Table 7	<p>Delete current Table 7 and replace with:</p> <p><u>Table 7: Oxfordshire – Capacity surplus/deficit available to manage the non-hazardous element of the principal waste streams 2016 – 2031 (tonnes per annum)</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Facility Type</th> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="4">Target Year</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2016</th> <th>2021</th> <th>2026</th> <th>2031</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Composting/ food waste treatment</td> <td>Capacity surplus or shortfall against target</td> <td>+89,400</td> <td>+71,400</td> <td>+49,600</td> <td>+43,600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-hazardous waste recycling</td> <td>Capacity surplus or shortfall against target</td> <td>+81,500</td> <td>-145,400</td> <td>-203,000</td> <td>-326,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-hazardous residual waste treatment</td> <td>Capacity surplus or shortfall against target</td> <td>+91,700</td> <td>+4,500</td> <td>+15,000</td> <td>+8,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Overall Non-Hazardous Waste Diversion Capacity Balance</td> <td>+262,600</td> <td>-69,500</td> <td>-138,400</td> <td>-274,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>N.B. + denotes a surplus capacity - denotes a shortfall in capacity</p> <p>Source: Oxfordshire County Council</p>	Facility Type		Target Year				2016	2021	2026	2031	Composting/ food waste treatment	Capacity surplus or shortfall against target	+89,400	+71,400	+49,600	+43,600	Non-hazardous waste recycling	Capacity surplus or shortfall against target	+81,500	-145,400	-203,000	-326,800	Non-hazardous residual waste treatment	Capacity surplus or shortfall against target	+91,700	+4,500	+15,000	+8,700	Overall Non-Hazardous Waste Diversion Capacity Balance		+262,600	-69,500	-138,400	-274,500	Changes to reporting of additional capacity requirements to reflect changes to policies W1 (C&I waste) and exclude inert waste (proportion of CDE waste) from capacity requirement calculations in line with Examination Hearing Document H10.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the changes to policies W1 - W3.</p> <p>See the Main Modifications to policies W1 - W3 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
Facility Type		Target Year																																					
		2016	2021	2026	2031																																		
Composting/ food waste treatment	Capacity surplus or shortfall against target	+89,400	+71,400	+49,600	+43,600																																		
Non-hazardous waste recycling	Capacity surplus or shortfall against target	+81,500	-145,400	-203,000	-326,800																																		
Non-hazardous residual waste treatment	Capacity surplus or shortfall against target	+91,700	+4,500	+15,000	+8,700																																		
Overall Non-Hazardous Waste Diversion Capacity Balance		+262,600	-69,500	-138,400	-274,500																																		
MM45	72	5.28	<p>Facilities for <u>preparation for re-use, transfer, recycling, and composting of waste</u> and treatment (of food waste) help move the management of waste up the waste hierarchy. These types of facilities should <u>are</u> generally be encouraged, particularly having regard to the shortfall in non-hazardous recycling capacity that is expected to arise later in <u>over</u> the plan period. <u>Transfer facilities do not manage waste themselves but can assist the efficient transportation of waste to facilities that do, thereby helping to move the management of waste up the waste hierarchy.</u> Recycling, and <u>composting and food waste treatment</u> facilities may manage some waste from other areas at the same time as providing capacity that helps to meet Oxfordshire's waste management needs.</p>	Consequential amendment and clarification following changes to policy W3	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy W3.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy W3 for an update to the</p>																																		

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
					assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.
MM46	72	Policy W3 (5.30)	<p>Policy W3: Provision for waste management capacity and facilities required</p> <p>Provision will be made for the following additional waste management capacity to manage the non-hazardous element of the principal waste streams: through this policy and policies W4, W5 and W6 sufficient to meet the need for management of the principal waste streams identified in policy W1 and the waste management targets in policy W2, including any provision that needs to be made for additional waste management capacity that cannot be met by existing facilities.</p> <p><u>Non-hazardous waste recycling:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>by 2021: at least 145,400 tpa</u> • <u>by 2026: at least 203,000 tpa</u> • <u>by 2031: at least 326,800 tpa</u> <p>Waste management capacity requirements will be kept under review and updated in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports. The Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports will also set out how the waste management capacity requirements are expected to be met, including the capacity that is expected to be provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent and established waste management facilities; • Time limited waste management facilities; • Sites with planning permission for waste management facilities that have not yet been built; • Sites allocated for waste development in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document. <p>Account will be taken of any requirements for additional waste management capacity (as identified in Table 7 or the most recent update in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports) in the consideration of proposals for new waste management facilities for the principal waste streams.</p>	To clarify that provision for facilities further up the waste hierarchy (recycling, preparation for re-use, composting and food waste treatment) will not be capped according to a capacity requirement, to give weight to the benefits of recycling facilities, and that the Part 2: Plan will allocate such suitable sites in line with Examination Hearing Document H10.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Proposals for facilities for re-use, transfer and pre-treatment of waste (recycling, composting and treatment of food waste) will normally be permitted. Proposals for the treatment of residual waste will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the development would not impede the achievement of the waste management targets in policy W2 and that it would enable waste to be recovered at one of the nearest appropriate installations.</p> <p><u>Specific sites for strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities (other than landfill) to meet the requirements set out in in this policy, or in any update of these requirements in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports, at locations that are in accordance with policies W4 and W5 and other relevant policies of this Plan and of other development plans will be allocated in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document. Other sites which are suitable for strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities and which provide additional capacity for preparation for re-use, recycling or composting of waste or treatment of food waste (including waste transfer facilities that help such provision) at locations that are in accordance with policies W4 and W5 and other relevant policies of this Plan and of other development plans will also be allocated in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document.</u></p> <p><u>Permission will be granted at allocated sites for the relevant types and sizes of waste management facilities for which they are allocated provided that the requirements of policies C1 – C12 are met.</u></p> <p><u>Permission will normally be granted for proposals for waste management facilities that provide capacity for preparation for re-use, recycling or composting of waste or treatment of food waste (including waste transfer facilities that help such provision) at other sites that are located in accordance with policies W4 and W5 and that meet the requirements of policies C1 – C12, taking into account the benefits of providing additional capacity for the management of waste at these levels of the waste hierarchy, and unless the adverse impacts of doing so demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Where permission is granted for such a facility at a time-limited mineral working or landfill site this will normally be subject to the same time limit as that applying to the host facility and the site shall be restored in</u></p>		

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>accordance with the requirements of policy M10 for restoration of mineral workings at the end of its permitted period. Except where a new planning permission is granted for retention of the facility beyond its permitted end date, temporary facility sites shall be restored at the end of their permitted period.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals for non-hazardous residual waste treatment will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the development would not impede the movement of waste up the hierarchy and that it would enable waste to be recovered at one of the nearest appropriate installations, and provided that the proposal is located in accordance with policies W4 and W5 and meets the requirements of policies C1-C12. Account will be taken of any requirements for additional non-hazardous residual waste management capacity that may be identified in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports in the consideration of proposals for additional non-hazardous residual waste management capacity for the principal waste streams.</u></p> <p>Proposals for disposal by landfill will be determined in accordance with policy W6.</p>		
MM47	74	5.33	<p>Strategic <u>waste management</u> facilities are likely to serve the county as a whole, or at least large parts of it. <u>Banbury, Bicester, Oxford, Abingdon and Didcot</u> (figure 2) are large centres of population linked by A34/M40. Bicester, Oxford and Didcot are expected to experience considerable growth and together with <u>Banbury and Abingdon</u> will account for a very significant portion of the county's waste <u>production</u>. Any strategic waste management facilities should normally be within <u>40 15 kilometres of Oxford City centre (which is approximately equivalent to a zone of 12km from the built up area of Oxford)</u> or 5 kilometres of the specified towns, but avoiding the <u>Oxford Green Belt and North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</u> (see policy <u>policies W5 and C8</u>). Facilities in these locations will be closer to <u>large quantities of waste arisings</u>, thereby avoiding the need for long distance movements by <u>lorry road</u>. They can also benefit from the linkage provided by the A34/M40, which allows for movement of waste <u>by road</u> without directly impacting on local communities. Growth at <u>these towns, particularly the key growth areas of Bicester, Oxford and Didcot,</u> may also bring forward site opportunities for <u>new additional waste management</u> facilities. Locations further from these towns may also be suitable where there is good access to the Oxfordshire lorry route</p>	Consequential amendments to changes to policy W4 and clarifications.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy W4.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy W4 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA			
			network (policy C10). Whilst Banbury is the second largest town in Oxfordshire, it is not included as a location for strategic waste management facilities because it is located in the north of the county, away from the main concentration of population and development, and it is not one of the key growth areas.		the HRA.			
MM48	74	5.34	Non-strategic waste <u>management</u> facilities are likely to serve an area equivalent to that of a district and should normally be located close to Oxford City or the larger towns: Abingdon, Bicester, Didcot, Banbury, Witney and Wantage & Grove (figure 2). Growth at these towns, particularly the key growth areas of Bicester, Oxford, Didcot and Wantage & Grove, may bring forward site opportunities for new <u>additional waste management facilities</u> . <u>Non-strategic waste management facilities may also be located at or close to the small towns of Carterton, Chipping Norton, Faringdon, Henley-on-Thames, Thame and Wallingford. Any non-strategic waste management facilities should normally be within 15 kilometres of Oxford City centre or 5 kilometres of the specified large towns or 2 kilometres of the small towns; but non-strategic facilities are also unlikely to be compatible with the aims of planning in the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (policy C8).</u> Locations further from the large <u>specified</u> towns may also be suitable where there is good access to the Oxfordshire lorry route network (policy C10) or other benefits can be demonstrated (e.g. <u>providing a local supply of recycled aggregates or making good use of previously developed land</u>). Locations in the Oxford Green Belt should be avoided (see policy W5). <u>Non-strategic facilities are also unlikely to be compatible with the aims of planning in the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (policy C8).</u> The locations <u>locational areas for both strategic and/or non-strategic waste management facilities around Oxford, Abingdon, Didcot and Wantage and Grove exclude the Oxford Meadows, Cothill Fen, Little Wittenham and Hackpen Hill Special Areas of Conservation and a 200 metre dust impact buffer zone adjacent to these SACs. Locations in the Green Belt for both strategic and/or non-strategic waste management facilities will be considered against policy W5 C12 in line with the NPPF.</u>	Consequential amendments to changes to policy W4 and clarifications.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy W4 and the introduction of new policy C12. See the Main Modification to policy W4 and new assessment for policy C12 for an update to the assessment for this topic area. No implications for the HRA.			
MM49	75	5.36	The hierarchical <u>sequential</u> nature of the <u>spatial</u> strategy is illustrated in Table 9. <u>Table 9: Locations for different sizes of waste management facilities</u> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">Town</td> <td style="width: 30%;">Strategic</td> <td style="width: 30%;">Non-strategic</td> </tr> </table>	Town	Strategic	Non-strategic	Consequential amendment and clarifications.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will
Town	Strategic	Non-strategic						

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA												
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Abingdon, Bicester, Didcot, Oxford, Banbury</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Banbury, Witney, Wantage & Grove</td> <td>x</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small Towns*</td> <td>x</td> <td>✗-✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> </table> <p>Source: Oxfordshire County Council * Carterton, Chipping Norton, Faringdon, Henley-on-Thames, Thame, Wallingford</p>	Abingdon, Bicester, Didcot, Oxford, Banbury	✓	✓	✓	Banbury, Witney, Wantage & Grove	x	✓	✓	Small Towns*	x	✗-✓	✓		<p>result from the change to policy W4.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy W4 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
Abingdon, Bicester, Didcot, Oxford, Banbury	✓	✓	✓														
Banbury, Witney, Wantage & Grove	x	✓	✓														
Small Towns*	x	✗-✓	✓														
MM50	75	5.37	<p>One of the aims of the plan is to achieve a <u>more</u> balanced distribution of waste management capacity across the county in relation to population and consequent waste arisings. Table 10 shows that with the exception of Oxford there is a reasonably well balanced distribution in the number of existing waste facilities between the districts, but that the distribution of the waste management capacity these facilities provide is less well balanced. This should be taken into account in making decisions on locations for facilities. The spatial strategy in policy W4 provides opportunity for this imbalance to be addressed, subject to suitable sites for waste management facilities being available. In particular, any opportunities that arise to add to <u>There is a particular need for additional waste management capacity in or close to Oxford should where possible be taken, although the constraint of the Green Belt and pressures for other forms of development suggest that Oxford is unlikely to be able to provide the balance of waste management capacity achieved in the other districts.</u></p>	For consistency with policy W4 and clarifications and consequential amendments	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy W4 and the introduction of new policy C12.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy W4 and new assessment for policy C12 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>												
MM51	76	Policy W4 (5.39)	Policy W4: Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams	Update to spatial strategy following	Policy amendment has implications for												

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Facilities (other than landfill) to manage the principal waste streams should be located as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Strategic waste management facilities should normally be located in or close to <u>Banbury, Bicester, Oxford, Abingdon and Didcot</u>, as indicated on the <u>Key Waste Key Diagram</u>. <u>Locations further from these towns may be appropriate where there is access to the Oxfordshire lorry route network in accordance with Policy C10.</u> b) Non-strategic waste management facilities should normally be located in or close to <u>Banbury, Bicester, Oxford, Abingdon and Didcot, and the other large towns (Banbury, Witney and Wantage & Grove) and the small towns (Carterton, Chipping Norton, Faringdon, Henley-on-Thames, Thame and Wallingford)</u>, as indicated on the <u>Key Waste Key Diagram</u>. <u>Locations further from these towns may be appropriate where there is access to the Oxfordshire lorry route network in accordance with Policy C10.</u> c) Elsewhere in Oxfordshire, and particularly in more remote rural areas, facilities should only be small scale, in keeping with their surroundings. <p><u>The locations for strategic and/or non-strategic waste management facilities around Oxford, Abingdon, Didcot and Wantage and Grove exclude the Oxford Meadows, Cothill Fen, Little Wittenham and Hackpen Hill Special Areas of Conservation and a 200 metre dust impact buffer zone adjacent to these SACs.</u></p> <p><u>As indicated on the Waste Key Diagram, strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities (that comprise major development) should not be located within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty except where it can be demonstrated that the ‘major developments test’ in the NPPF (paragraph 116), and as reflected in policy C8, is met.</u></p> <p>Specific sites for waste management facilities (other than landfill) to meet the requirements set out in Policy W3 will be allocated in accordance with this locational strategy in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site</p>	<p>updated Sustainability Appraisal report.</p>	<p>the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			Allocations Document. The suitability of any new sites for allocation in the Site Allocations Document will be assessed against the criteria in policies W5 and C1 – C11.		
MM52	78	Policy W5 (5.49)	<p>Policy W5: Siting of waste management facilities</p> <p>Priority will be given to siting waste management facilities on land that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is already in waste management or industrial use; or • is previously developed, derelict or underused; or • is at an active mineral working or landfill site; or • involves existing agricultural buildings and their curtilages; or • is at a waste water treatment works. <p><u>Waste management facilities may be sited on other land in greenfield locations where this can be shown to be the most suitable and sustainable option.</u></p> <p>Proposals for temporary facilities must provide for the satisfactory removal of the facility and restoration of the site at the end of its temporary period of operation, including at mineral working and landfill sites where the facility shall be removed on or before the cessation of the host activity. Temporary facility sites shall be restored in accordance with the requirements of policy M10 for restoration of mineral workings.</p> <p>Waste management facilities will not be permitted on green field land unless this can be shown to be the most suitable and sustainable option for location of the facility.</p> <p>Waste management development that is inappropriate in the Green Belt will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances why it should not be located in the Green Belt. Conditions may be imposed on any permission granted to ensure that the development only serves to meet a need that comprises or forms part of the very special circumstances.</p> <p>Proposals for new waste management facilities shall meet the criteria in policies C1 – C11.</p>	<p>Changes to policy to move some functional aspects to policy W3 and clarify that development on greenfield locations may be possible where it is the most suitable and sustainable option in line with national guidance.</p> <p>Green Belt provisions moved to new policy C12.</p>	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
MM53	84	Policy W6 (5.65)	<p>Policy W6: Landfill <u>and other permanent deposit of waste to land</u></p> <p>Non-hazardous waste disposal facilities</p> <p>Provision for disposal of Oxfordshire’s non-hazardous waste will be made at existing non-hazardous landfill facilities which will also provide for the disposal of waste from other areas (including London and Berkshire) as necessary. Further provision for the disposal of non-hazardous waste by means of landfill will not be made.</p> <p>Permission may be granted to extend the life of existing non-hazardous landfill sites to allow for the continued disposal of residual non-hazardous waste to meet a recognised need and where this will allow for the satisfactory restoration of the landfill in accordance with a previously approved scheme.</p> <p>Permission will be granted for facilities for the management of landfill gas and leachate where required to fulfil a regulatory requirement or to achieve overall environmental benefit, including facilities for the recovery of energy from landfill gas. Provision should be made for the removal of the facilities and restoration of the site at the end of the period of management.</p> <p>Inert waste disposal facilities</p> <p>Provision for the <u>permanent deposit to land or disposal to landfill</u> of inert waste which cannot be recycled will be made at existing facilities and in sites that will be allocated in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document. Provision will be made for sites with capacity sufficient for Oxfordshire to be net-self-sufficient in the management and disposal of inert waste.</p> <p>Priority will be given to the use of inert waste that cannot be recycled as infill material to achieve the satisfactory restoration and after use of active or unrestored quarries. Permission will not otherwise be granted for development that involves the <u>permanent deposit or disposal</u> of inert waste on land unless there would be overall environmental benefit.</p> <p>General</p>	Update to clarify that the policy relates to both landfill and applications involving the permanent deposit of waste to land.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Proposals for landfill sites shall meet the <u>requirements of criteria in policies C1 – C11</u> C12.</p> <p>Landfill sites shall be restored in accordance with the requirements of policy M10 for restoration of mineral workings.</p>		
MM54	86	Policy W7 (5.73)	<p>Policy W7: Management and disposal of hazardous waste</p> <p>Permission will be granted for facilities for the management and disposal of hazardous waste where they are designed to manage waste produced in Oxfordshire. Facilities that are likely to serve a wider area should demonstrate that they will meet a need for waste management that is not adequately provided for elsewhere.</p> <p>Proposals for new waste management facilities shall meet the criteria in <u>requirements of policies W4, W5 and C1 – C11</u> 12.</p>	Clarification and consequential amendment.	Policy amendment has no implications for the SA or the HRA.
MM55	87	Policy W8 (5.78)	<p>Policy W8: Management of agricultural waste</p> <p>Proposals for the treatment of agricultural waste within a unit of agricultural production will normally be acceptable; and such proposals will be encouraged to provide for the generation of energy from this waste or heat for local use.</p> <p>Proposals that are designed to treat agricultural waste in conjunction with other wastes at facilities not located on an agricultural unit will be assessed in accordance with policies W4 and W5.</p> <p>Provision for the management of non-organic agricultural waste will be made at facilities designed to manage inert, non-hazardous and hazardous wastes in accordance with policies W3 and W7.</p> <p>All proposals shall meet the criteria in <u>requirements of policies C1 – C11</u> 12.</p>	Clarification and consequential amendment.	Policy amendment has no implications for the SA or the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
MM56	91	Policy W9 (5.92)	<p>Policy W9: Management and disposal of radioactive waste</p> <p>Permission will be granted for proposals for the management or disposal of low level radioactive waste where it is demonstrated that a significant contribution could be made to the management or disposal of waste produced in Oxfordshire. <u>Permission will be granted for proposals for management of intermediate level radioactive waste produced in Oxfordshire at the Harwell nuclear licensed site. Permission will be granted for proposals relating to low level radioactive waste or intermediate level radioactive waste that provide for the needs of a wider area should demonstrate where it is demonstrated that they would meet a need for waste management that is not adequately provided for elsewhere, and are consistent with national strategy for radioactive waste management.</u></p> <p>The Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document will allocate sites to make specific provision for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the treatment and storage of Oxfordshire’s intermediate level legacy radioactive waste at Harwell Oxford Campus and Culham Science Centre pending its disposal at a national disposal facility; • the treatment and storage of low level legacy radioactive waste at Harwell Oxford Campus and Culham Science Centre pending its eventual disposal; and • the disposal of low level radioactive waste at bespoke facilities at Harwell Oxford Campus or at Culham Science Centre if this is demonstrated to be the most sustainable option for disposal of this waste. <p>All proposals shall meet the criteria in <u>requirements of policies C1 – C4412.</u></p>	To address representation 140/2 and Matter 7, Issue 9 to clarify that management and disposal of radioactive waste may be across the NDA estate.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.
MM57	93	Policy W10 (5.97)	<p>Policy W10: Management and disposal of waste water and sewage sludge</p> <p>Permission will be granted for proposals for the treatment and disposal of waste water and sewage sludge where they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the interests of long term waste water management; or • to improve operational efficiency; or • to enable planned development to be taken forward. 	Consequential update	Policy amendment has no implications for the SA or the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			Proposals should accord with policies C1 – C112 and will otherwise only be considered favourably if there is an over-riding need that cannot be met in a more suitable location and provided that any adverse environmental impact is minimised.		
MM58	94	5.103	Pending the adoption of the Site Allocations Document the District Councils are requested to consult the County Council (as Waste Planning Authority) on all planning applications for non-waste development that are proposed on a safeguarded site, thereby ensuring that any waste planning issues can be properly taken into account. The District Councils are also requested to consult the County Council on proposals for development close to a safeguarded site to allow consideration to be given to whether it may be incompatible with or prejudicial to current or future waste use of the safeguarded site. The Site Allocations Document will confirm where consultation may not be necessary, but pending the adoption of that document a consultation zone of 250m will be applied to all safeguarded sites <u>except sewage treatment works, where a 400m consultation zone will apply.</u>	Clarification to address representations 015/2 and 015/ac/2.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM59	94	Policy W11 (5.105)	<p>Policy W11: Safeguarding waste management sites</p> <p>The Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document will identify sites that will be safeguarded for waste <u>management</u> use for the duration of <u>their planning permission</u> the plan period, comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>operational waste management sites in waste use and with planning permission allowing the use to continue for the remainder of the plan period;</u> • <u>sites with planning permission for waste management use which have not yet been brought into operation but where the use or development permitted has not yet been undertaken;</u> • vacant sites last used for waste <u>management</u> purposes; and • sites allocated for waste management development in the Site Allocations Document. <p>Pending the adoption of the Site Allocations Document existing and permitted waste management sites (as specified in Appendix 2) are safeguarded for future waste management use the sites safeguarded for waste management</p>	To address representations 113/12 and 113/ac/5.	Policy amendment has implications for the SA. Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy. No implications for the HRA.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>use are specified in Appendix 2.</u></p> <p>The list of sites safeguarded for future waste management use will be monitored and kept up to date in the Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>Proposals for development that would <u>directly or indirectly</u> prevent or prejudice the use of a site safeguarded for waste management will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development is in accordance with a site allocation for development in an adopted local plan or neighbourhood plan; or • equivalent waste management capacity can be appropriately and sustainably provided elsewhere; or • it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer required for waste management. 		
6. CORE POLICIES FOR MINERALS AND WASTE					
MM60	101	6.XX (new paragraph to be inserted after 6.20)	<p><u>Archaeological remains sometimes exist in waterlogged conditions. In such cases, their preservation relies on them remaining saturated with water. Where waterlogged remains are present, appropriate measures should be taken to afford their preservation.</u></p>	To provide context in addressing representation 120/22.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy C4.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy C4 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
MM61	101	Policy C4 (6.21)	<p>Policy C4: Water environment</p> <p>Proposals for minerals and waste development will need to demonstrate that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on or risk to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quantity or quality of surface or groundwater resources required for habitats, wildlife and human activities; • The quantity or quality of water obtained through abstraction unless acceptable provision can be made; and • The flow of groundwater at or in the vicinity of the site; and • <u>Waterlogged archaeological remains.</u> <p>Proposals for minerals and waste development should ensure that the River Thames and other watercourses and canals of significant landscape, nature conservation, or amenity value are adequately protected <u>from unacceptable adverse impacts.</u></p>	To address representation 070/14 and 120/22.	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM62	104	6.30	<p><u>Sites on BMV agricultural land should usually be restored to a similar standard. Where a significant area of BMV agricultural land would not be restored after mineral extraction, proposals will need to demonstrate that there is an overriding need for the mineral which cannot reasonably be met on lower grade land, that all options for reinstatement without loss of quality have been considered (for example by infilling with inert materials, low level drainage or engineered landform) and that there is good planning reason to justify the development in that location. Any Other benefits, such as a net gain in biodiversity, that may result from a different form of restoration after-use will also be a relevant consideration. Where restoration would not be to agriculture, provision for the sustainable management and use of soils disturbed during extraction should be demonstrated, such that if required the soils would be in a state capable of supporting agriculture. This should include stripping handling and storage of soils in ways that maintain soil quality and safeguards BMV land so that it retains its long term capability. Where BMV agricultural land is not restored, proposals must show how alternative and beneficial use is to be made of any surplus high quality soils that are not being replaced.</u></p>	To address representation 126/2.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy C6.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy C6 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM63	105	Policy C6 (6.31)	Policy C6: Agricultural land and soils	To address representation	Policy amendment has implications for

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Proposals for minerals and waste development shall demonstrate that they take into account the presence of any best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The permanent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land will only be permitted where it can be shown that there is an <u>overriding</u> need for the development which cannot reasonably be met using lower grade land, <u>and where all options for reinstatement without loss of quality have been considered</u>, taking into account other relevant considerations.</p> <p>Development proposals should make provision for the management and use of soils in order to maintain <u>agricultural land quality (where appropriate)</u>, soil quality, including making a positive contribution to the long-term conservation of soils in any restoration.</p>	126/2.	<p>the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM64	106	6.35	<p>Oxfordshire also has a large number of sites designated locally for their importance to wildlife or habitat including Local Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Sites of Local Importance for Nature Conservation. Development should avoid any adverse effects on <u>ensure that no significant harm would be caused to these areas.</u></p>	Consequential amendment following changes to policy.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy C7.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy C7 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM65	106	6.35a (new paragraph from	<p>In general (other than for SACs), if avoidance of adverse effects significant harm is not feasible, adequate mitigation or as a last resort compensatory measures that will result in the maintenance or enhancement of biodiversity (or geodiversity)</p>	Consequential amendment following changes	No direct implications for the previous SA from

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
		second half of 6.35)	should be provided. If the effects cannot be avoided or mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, then the development should not be allowed to proceed.	to policy.	<p>this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy C7.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy C7 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM66	107	Policy C7 (6.40)	<p>Policy C7: Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>Minerals and waste development should conserve and, where possible, deliver a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>The highest level of protection will be given to sites and species of international nature conservation importance (e.g. Special Areas of Conservation and European Protected Species) and development that would be likely to adversely affect them will not be permitted.</p> <p><u>In all other cases, development that would result in significant harm will not be permitted unless the harm can be <u>avoided</u>, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for to result in a net gain in biodiversity (or geodiversity) or, if the impact cannot be fully mitigated or compensated for, the benefits of the development on that site clearly outweigh the harm. In addition:</u></p> <p>(i) Development that would be likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other development) will not be permitted except where the benefits of the development at this site clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the Site of</p>	To address representation 136/2.	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>Special Scientific Interest and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest.</p> <p>(ii) Development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees, will not be permitted except where the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.</p> <p>(iii) Development shall ensure that no significant harm would be caused to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local Nature Reserves; - Local Wildlife Sites; - Local Geology Sites; - Sites of Local Importance for Nature Conservation; - Protected, priority or notable species and habitats, <u>except where the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the harm.</u> <p>All proposals for mineral working and landfill shall demonstrate how the development will make an appropriate contribution to the maintenance and enhancement of local habitats, biodiversity or geodiversity (including fossil remains and trace fossils), including contributing to the objectives of the Conservation target Areas wherever possible. Satisfactory long-term management arrangements for restored sites shall be clearly set out and included in proposals. These should include a commitment to ecological monitoring and remediation (should habitat creation and/or mitigation prove unsuccessful).</p>		
MM67	108	6.43	<p>Parts of the Cotswolds, and North Wessex Downs and Chilterns AONBs are situated close to towns <u>the large towns of Witney, Wantage and Didcot, which are locations where growth is expected and additional waste will be produced, and are included in the towns specified in Policy W4. The small towns of Chipping Norton, Henley, and Wallingford, which are also specified in policy W4 as locations for waste facilities, are situated close to the Cotswolds, Chilterns and North Wessex Downs AONBs respectively. Small scale* waste management facilities for local needs could be acceptable in AONBs where the development would not</u></p>	To address representation 146/4 and clarify spatial strategy for waste management facilities.	No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>compromise the objectives of their designation¹⁰⁵. Policy W4 looks to steer larger scale Any new waste facilities that are required should be located ** to be in or close to these towns and specified towns, but at Witney, Wantage, Didcot, Chipping Norton, Henley, and Wallingford, such facilities will need to be located in a way that does not adversely affect the character or setting of the AONB. Larger scale facilities are unlikely to be acceptable in or close to the AONB. Small scale waste management facilities for local needs could be acceptable where the development would not compromise the objectives of their designation. Proposals for development (both minerals and waste) within AONBs should have regard to the relevant AONB Management Plan.</p> <p><i>*Insert new footnote: Facilities less than 20,000 tonnes per annum (small-scale facilities in Policy W4)</i></p> <p><i>Footnote 105: In May 2013 an appeal decision in West Berkshire (APPAW0340/A/12/2188549) found that a proposal for a MRF of 25-30,000tpa capacity would be “out of character with the beauty and tranquillity of the AONB.” The Waste Strategy Topic Paper provides information on appeal decisions where waste facilities of this size have been proposed in AONBs.</i></p> <p><i>** Insert new footnote: Facilities 20,000 tonnes per annum and over (strategic and non-strategic facilities in Policy W4)</i></p>		<p>C8.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy C8 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>
MM68	109	Policy C8 (6.46)	<p>Policy C8: Landscape</p> <p>Proposals for minerals and waste development shall demonstrate that they respect and where possible enhance local landscape character, and are informed by landscape character assessment. Proposals shall include adequate and appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impacts on landscape, including careful siting, design and landscaping. <u>Where significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, compensatory environmental enhancements shall be made to offset the residual landscape and visual impacts.</u></p> <p>Great weight will be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and high priority will be given to the enhancement of their natural beauty. Proposals for minerals and waste</p>	To address representations 146/4 and 126/3 and Examination Document H10 and to provide a more logical ordering of the policy.	<p>Policy amendment has implications for the SA.</p> <p>Appendix F of the SA Report provides an updated assessment of this policy.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>development within an AONB or that would significantly affect an AONB shall demonstrate that they take this into account and that they have regard to the relevant AONB Management Plan. Major developments within AONBs will not be permitted except <u>in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest, in accordance with the 'major developments test' in the NPPF (paragraph 116)</u>. Development within AONBs shall normally only be small-scale, to meet local needs and should be sensitively located and designed.</p> <p>Where adverse impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, compensatory environmental enhancements shall be made to offset the residual landscape and visual impacts.</p>		
MM69	115	New paragraphs (based on 5.46 – 5.48)	<p><u>The Oxford Green Belt</u></p> <p>Most In accordance with the NPPF (paragraphs 87-88), proposals for waste management facilities <u>that constitute inappropriate development are, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering planning applications, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. are likely to be inappropriate in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that substantial weight be given to any harm that is likely to be caused by development in the Green Belt. Development that is harmful to the Green Belt should only be approved in very special circumstances; and where the potential harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other planning considerations.</u> National Policy (NPPF paragraph 90) is that mineral extraction in the Green Belt is <u>not inappropriate development, provided it preserves the openness of the Green Belt, and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt.</u></p> <p>In the past, planning permissions have been granted for some waste development to take place in the Oxford Green Belt, recognising the difficulty of finding suitable sites in and close to Oxford. Until recently <u>Previous national policy stated that the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities, together with the allowed for 'significant weight' to be given to the wider environmental and</u></p>	To ensure provision for Green Belt is in line with national policy and moved to relevant section of the plan.	<p>No direct implications for the previous SA from this update to the supporting text on top of those that will result from the change to policy C12.</p> <p>See the Main Modification to policy C12 for an update to the assessment for this topic area.</p> <p>No implications for the HRA.</p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>economic benefits of sustainable waste management <u>are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be given planning permission. when considering sites for waste development in the Green Belt. This is no longer the case.</u> The National Planning Policy for Waste states that in preparing Local Plans, waste planning authorities should first look for suitable sites and areas outside the Green Belt for waste management facilities that, if located in the Green Belt, would be inappropriate development; and that the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities should be recognised in the preparation of Local Plans. does, however, recognise that some types of waste management facilities may still have to be located in the Green Belt due to their particular locational needs.</p> <p>Any proposal for inappropriate development in the Green Belt must make clear why there are very special circumstances for it to be sited there, including why that type of facility needs to be located in the Green Belt. Consideration should be given as to why other locations, in particular areas around Didcot and Bicester (policy W4) that are outside the Oxford Green Belt, do not provide suitable alternatives options. If it is demonstrated that there are very special circumstances for development on land in the Green Belt, conditions are likely to be imposed to ensure that <u>the permitted any waste facility only serves to meet a need that has been identified as forming part of the very special circumstances.</u> These considerations apply equally to facilities that are intended to operate for a temporary period.</p>		
MM70	115	Policy C12	<p><u>Policy C12: Green Belt</u></p> <p><u>Proposals that constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, will not be permitted except in very special circumstances. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</u></p> <p><u>Conditions may be imposed on any permission granted to ensure that the development only serves to meet a need that comprises or forms an ‘other consideration’ in the Green Belt balance leading to the demonstration of part of the very special circumstances.</u></p>	Section of policy W5 on Green Belt moved to form separate core policy with wording changed to clarify meaning.	This is a new policy which will need to have a full assessment. Appendix F of the SA Report provides the assessment of this policy.
7. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING					

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
MM71	119	7.20 7.21	Observations recorded in the monitoring reports will feed into reviews of the minerals planning strategy. It is intended that the Core Strategy will be reviewed and rolled forward every five years. However, monitoring may indicate a need for review of part or whole of the Core Strategy sooner. For example, if it becomes clear that the provision for minerals supply in the strategy is insufficient or excessive, or that insufficient sites can be allocated or are coming forward as planning applications within the strategic resource areas identified, an earlier review of the Core Strategy may be required. <u>Unless otherwise stated in the monitoring framework, where a trigger is consistently breached for three consecutive years, this would indicate that a review of that policy or part of policy is necessary.</u>	Clarification to how the monitoring framework will be implemented.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM72	124	7.44 7.45	Observations recorded in the monitoring reports will feed into review of the waste planning strategy. It is intended that the Core Strategy will be reviewed and rolled forward every five years. However, monitoring may indicate a need for review of part or whole of the Core Strategy sooner. For example, if it becomes clear that the provision for additional waste facilities in the Core Strategy is insufficient, or that insufficient sites can be allocated or are coming forward as planning applications within the strategy locations identified, an earlier review of the Core Strategy may be required. <u>Unless otherwise stated in the monitoring framework, where a trigger is consistently breached for three consecutive years, this would indicate that an update of the Waste Needs Assessment is required. Where an up to date Waste Needs Assessment indicates differences to the policy, a review of that policy or part of policy is necessary.</u>	Clarification to how the monitoring framework will be implemented.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.
MM73	124	Section 7	<i>Monitoring framework to be included.</i>	To provide a framework against which to monitor the plan.	No implications from including the monitoring framework.
MM74	136	Glossary	<u>Cumulative Impact</u> – changes caused by a development in combination with other similar developments either at the same time or successively over time. <u>Feedstock</u> – Raw material to supply or fuel a machine or industrial process, such as a mineral processing plant or a waste recycling or treatment plant. <u>Strategic Resource Area</u> – a broad area of aggregate mineral resources which, based on available geological information, contains potentially workable mineral	To address representations 082/4, 125/3, 131/3 and 132/5 and for clarification.	No implications from this update to the supporting text.

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>deposits that, in terms of extent and probable depth of mineral, have the potential to provide new mineral working sites either in the form of new quarries or large extensions to existing quarries. Strategic resource areas are areas within which potential sites for mineral working will be identified and assessed for possible allocation in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document. They are defined by natural boundaries such as roads and rivers and by geological mapping information. They exclude Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Areas of Conservation, and buffer zones adjacent to the latter, as well as larger settlements, but other designations and constraints, individual and smaller groups of houses and other more isolated built developments are not excluded. Land allocated or proposed to be allocated for development in adopted or emerging district local plans and neighbourhood plans is also not necessarily excluded. These are all factors to be taken into account in the assessment of site options when the Site Allocations Document is prepared.</u></p> <p><u>Strategic resource areas are different from ‘Areas of Search’. Areas of search are defined in the National Planning Practice Guidance as “areas where knowledge of mineral resources may be less certain but within which planning permission may be granted, particularly if there is a potential shortfall in supply” (Paragraph: 008; Reference ID: 27-008-20140306). Strategic resource areas differ in that permission will normally only be granted for mineral working within them at sites that are allocated in the Site Allocations Document (policy M5). Whilst permission may be granted within a strategic resource area but outside of an allocated site either prior to adoption of the Site Allocations Document or as an exception after adoption of the Site Allocations Document (see policy M5), the main purpose of the strategic resource areas is to define those areas of the county within which sites will be allocated and not areas where planning permission will necessarily be granted.</u></p>		

Oxfordshire County Council
Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy
Suggested Proposed Modifications

Including screening for SEA/SA and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Schedule of the County Council’s Additional Modifications to the Core Strategy

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strike through~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission core strategy, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

Please note that footnotes are only referred to where a change is proposed. Their absence is not indicative of them being removed from the Plan.

SEA/SA and HRA Screening

The table below is based on the Council’s Suggested Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy, with an additional column added to provide the findings of the screening undertaken to determine whether the modifications would have any implications for the previous findings of the SEA/SA or the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
1. INTRODUCTION					
AM1	7	1.6	In view of the age and outdated nature of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted July 1996) and the significant delay in the adoption of a new Plan (the Core Strategy) with up to date policies <u>policies</u> that would result from changing to a single plan, there is a clear justification for continuing with the preparation of separate Core Strategy and Site Allocations Documents.	Typo	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM2	8	1.7	The policies in the Core Strategy will, when it is adopted, replace policies in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996). Appendix 1 sets out a schedule of existing saved development plan policies <u>policies</u> that are replaced by policies <u>policies</u> in the Core Strategy. It also lists existing saved development plan policies <u>policies</u> that will be replaced by policies <u>policies</u> in the Site Allocations Document.	Typos	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
2. BACKGROUND					
AM3	10	2.1	Oxfordshire is renowned for its knowledge-based economy and research and development facilities. It is also the most rural county in the South East of England. It has seven Special Areas of Conservation, protected by European legislation; numerous Sites of Special Scientific Interest and other sites of importance for biodiversity and geodiversity; a rich variety of landscapes, with almost a quarter of the land area within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; numerous historic buildings <u>and historic assets; Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site;</u> extensive archaeological assets; and areas of high grade agricultural land, including where sand and gravel is located along the River Thames and its tributaries. An area around Oxford is Green Belt. Figure 1 shows the main protected areas in the county.	To address representation 120/2.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM4	22	2.22	The Government published a new <u>the</u> national Waste Management Plan for England in December 2013. This sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management. It is a high level document which provides an analysis of the current waste management situation in England and evaluates how it will support implementation of the objectives and provisions of the Waste Framework Directive. It sets out the policies that are in place to help move towards a zero waste economy as part of the transition to a <u>more</u> sustainable economy.	Points of clarification	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA												
AM5	22	2.23	<p>The National Planning Policy for Waste was published in October 2014, replacing Planning Policy Statement 10 ‘Planning for Sustainable Waste Management’, March 2011. It sets out the role that planning plays in delivering the country’s waste <u>Government’s ambitions for more sustainable waste management</u>, including through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering sustainable development and resource efficiency by driving waste management up the waste hierarchy; • Ensuring waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns; • Providing a framework in which communities and businesses take more responsibility for their own waste, including enabling waste to be disposed or recovered in line with the proximity principle; and • Helping to secure re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health or harming the environment. 	Point of clarification													
AM6	24	2.31	<p>The Development Plan for Oxfordshire comprises the <u>City and District Councils’</u> adopted Local Plans, the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan and any adopted Neighbourhood Plans. Local plans prepared by the City and District Councils contain policies that are also relevant to minerals and waste planning. The current position with local plans in Oxfordshire <u>at January 2017</u> is shown in the following table.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>District Council</th> <th>Adopted Plan</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cherwell</td> <td>Local Plan (1996 2015)* – saved policies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oxford City</td> <td>Core Strategy (March 2011)**_</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Oxfordshire</td> <td>Core Strategy (December 2012)*****</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vale of White Horse</td> <td>Local Plan (July 2006) – saved policies</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West Oxfordshire</td> <td>Local Plan (June 2006) – saved policies</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><small>* The non-statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 is also relevant to the determination of planning applications. ** a Sites and Housing Development Plan Document and 2 Area Action Plans have also been adopted and there are saved policies of the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 (2006). *** **There are also saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 (2006).</small></p>	District Council	Adopted Plan	Cherwell	Local Plan (1996 2015)* – saved policies	Oxford City	Core Strategy (March 2011)**_	South Oxfordshire	Core Strategy (December 2012)*****	Vale of White Horse	Local Plan (July 2006) – saved policies	West Oxfordshire	Local Plan (June 2006) – saved policies	To address representations 033/2 and 129/1 and clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
District Council	Adopted Plan																
Cherwell	Local Plan (1996 2015)* – saved policies																
Oxford City	Core Strategy (March 2011)**_																
South Oxfordshire	Core Strategy (December 2012)*****																
Vale of White Horse	Local Plan (July 2006) – saved policies																
West Oxfordshire	Local Plan (June 2006) – saved policies																
AM7	30	2.51	<p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment screening report has been reviewed and updated in the light of responses to consultation on the draft Core Strategy and changes that have been made to it and the passage of time. Natural England has been consulted on the screening report and their comments have been taken into account. The consultants’ report (January 2012) continues to be relevant and forms an</p>	Typos	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA												

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			addendum to the updated screening report. Changes have been made to the Core Strategy where necessary to take account of conclusions from the assessment, including the consultant's report. The screening report finds that the policies <u>policies</u> and proposals of the Core Strategy are not considered to have a likely significant effect on any Special Area of Conservation.		
3. VISION AND OBJECTIVES FOR MINERALS AND WASTE IN OXFORDSHIRE					
AM8	32	3.3	<p>The vision for minerals planning in Oxfordshire in 2031 is that:</p> <p>...</p> <p>b) Mineral workings and supply facilities will be located and managed to minimise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the distance that aggregates need to be transported by road from source to market; • the use of unsuitable roads, particularly through settlements; and • other harmful impacts of mineral extraction, processing and transportation on Oxfordshire's communities and <u>natural and historic</u> environment. <p>...</p>	To address representation 120/5.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM9	34	3.6	<p>The vision for waste planning in Oxfordshire in 2031 is that:</p> <p>...</p> <p>c) Waste management facilities will be distributed across the county, with larger-scale and specialist facilities being located at or close to Oxford and other large towns, particularly the growth areas, and close to main transport links, and with smaller-scale facilities serving more local areas. Facilities will be located and managed to minimise the use of unsuitable roads, particularly through settlements, and other harmful impacts of waste management development on Oxfordshire's communities and <u>natural and historic</u> environment. This network of waste management facilities will have helped to build more sustainable communities that increasingly take responsibility for their own waste and keep to a minimum the distance waste needs to be moved within the county.</p>	To address representation 120/7.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM10	35	3.7	<p>The Oxfordshire Waste Planning Vision is supported by the following objectives which underpin the waste strategy and policies in this plan:</p> <p>...</p>	To address representation 070/6	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p>iv Seek to provide for waste to be managed as close as possible to where it arises, and encourage other <u>Waste Planning Authorities areas</u> to become net self-sufficient in meeting their own waste needs, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimise the distance waste needs to be transported by road; • reduce adverse impacts of waste transportation on local communities and the environment; and • enable communities to take responsibility for their own waste. 		
AM11	37	4.4	<p>In line with national policy, the contribution that recycled and secondary material can make to aggregate supply in Oxfordshire should be taken into account before the extraction of primary minerals is considered. Recycled and secondary aggregate in Oxfordshire currently includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locally derived construction, and demolition <u>and excavation</u> waste; • Locally derived road planings; • Spent rail ballast (brought in by rail to a site at Sutton Courtenay); • Incinerator bottom ash (from Ardley energy recovery facility). 	Clarification	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM12	38	4.7	<p>National policy is to aim to source mineral supplies indigenously but there may also be opportunities for recycled <u>aggregate</u> or secondary aggregate materials <u>or feedstock to produce these materials</u> to be supplied from outside the county. For example, china clay waste from Cornwall is supplied to London and use of this material as an aggregate in Oxfordshire could become economic in future, although there is no indication of this happening at least in the short term. In the interests of achieving an overall sustainable supply of minerals to Oxfordshire, where such material is sourced from distance it should where practicable be transported by rail rather than by road. <u>This is supported by policy M9 which safeguards existing aggregate import rail depots and policy M6 which provides for the development of additional rail depot capacity.</u></p>	Clarification and reference to updated policies.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM13	38	4.10	<p>The targets in policy W2 for recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste (increasing to 60% by 2024 <u>70% by 2031</u>) and Policies <u>W1, W3, W4 and W5 on making provision for waste management capacity and the location requirements and provision and siting</u> of facilities will operate in conjunction with policy M1 to <u>enable delivery of facilities for recycled aggregate production, which is expected to form the majority of recycled and secondary aggregate supply in Oxfordshire.</u></p>	Consequential update (CDE 70% recycling target) and clarifications.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM14	40	4.15	Due to particular factors in Oxfordshire, as identified in the Local Aggregate Assessment <u>2014</u> , for sharp sand and gravel and crushed rock these figures are higher than the 10 year average (2004 – 2013) of sales from Oxfordshire’s quarries. In the case of soft sand the 10 year sales average (2003 – 2012) has been used. These figures are higher than the levels of sales in 2013 and <u>in the case of sharp sand and gravel are higher than sales in 2014 and 2015</u> . They provide significant headroom to accommodate possible changes in local circumstances such as an increase in economic activity and consequent demand for aggregates. Oxfordshire has been a net importer of sharp sand and gravel in recent years but these levels of provision will allow local production to increase again such that Oxfordshire meets its own needs for sharp sand and gravel, with flexibility for appropriate cross-boundary movements of aggregates. These provision figures will also allow Oxfordshire to continue to be a net exporter of soft sand, which is a <u>less common widely distributed</u> mineral.	To address representation 070/8 in part and factual update.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM15	43	4.22	Minerals can only be extracted where they exist in the ground. The identification of locations where extraction is likely to be able to take place acceptably provides greater certainty of where mineral working will take place and where it will not take place. Policy M3 identifies the broad locations – strategic resource areas – within which it is proposed that future working for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock should take place. The strategic resource areas are indicated on the Minerals Key Diagram <u>shown on the Policies Map</u> . The term ‘Strategic Resource Area’ is defined in the Glossary, which explains that these areas differ from ‘Areas of Search’.	For clarification	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM16	43	4.23	Within these strategic resource areas, sites for working will be allocated in the Site Allocations Document, taking into account all the other relevant policies <u>policies</u> of the Core Strategy.	Typo	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM17	43	4.24	The strategic resource areas have been broadly <u>drawn based on available geological information broadly to encompass the areas of potentially workable mineral deposits within each area which, in terms of extent and probable depth of mineral, have the potential to provide new mineral working sites either in the form of new quarries or large extensions to existing quarries. Areas of mineral deposits that are limited in extent or depth and are unlikely to have potential for new mineral working sites other than small extensions to existing quarries have not been included in the strategic resource areas</u> . The strategic resource areas include most of Oxfordshire’s existing	To provide clarification and additional factual explanation.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<p><u>aggregate quarries (excluding ironstone quarries and quarries within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and buffer zones to Special Areas of Conservation) but the existing quarries at Finmere (sharp sand and gravel) and Shipton-on-Cherwell (limestone), which have limited areas of mineral resource around them, are not included. In addition, the sharp sand and gravel deposits in the area around Bampton and Clanfield have not been included in a strategic resource area (see paragraph 4.33 below).</u></p> <p><u>In defining the strategic resource areas, natural boundaries such as roads and rivers have been used where possible but elsewhere geological mapping information has been used. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Areas of Conservation, and buffer zones adjacent to the latter, have been excluded but other designations and constraints have not been taken into account at this stage. Larger settlements have also been excluded, but individual and smaller groups of houses and other more isolated built developments have not been excluded at this stage. These areas also do not necessarily exclude land allocated or proposed to be allocated for development in adopted or emerging district local plans and neighbourhood plans. All these factors will be taken into account in the assessment of sites for allocation in the Site Allocations Document.</u></p>		
AM18	43	4.25	<p>Policy M4 sets out the factors that will be taken into account in assessing criteria that will be used to assess potential sites for inclusion in the Site Allocations Document. Except where specified in the policy, these criteria These factors are not listed in any order of priority. The strategic areas identified and the specific sites that are subsequently allocated will provide a basis for the minerals industry to select sites for working and submit planning applications; and for those applications to be considered by the County Council, also taking into account all the other relevant policies of the Plan. Policy M5 provides for permission to be granted for applications for mineral working within identified sites. It also sets out <u>how applications submitted prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations Document will be considered and</u> the circumstances under which permission may exceptionally be granted for mineral working in locations that are not identified.</p>	For clarification and consequent to modifications to policies M4 and M5.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM19	44	4.26	<p>The amount of provision that needs to be made through the allocation of sites for mineral working will be established in the Site Allocations Document, having regard to the levels of provision in the most recent Local Aggregate Assessment but also taking</p>	Consequent to modification to policy M2, to	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			into account the need for appropriate flexibility to allow for possible changes in demand and the level of certainty that allocated sites will come forward for working. Table 2 above indicates that there is currently no requirement for additional provision for crushed rock working. The areas for crushed rock working identified in policy M3 are included as a contingency in the event that the requirement for local crushed rock increases significantly and additional permitted reserves are required to maintain the landbank and ensure an adequate level of supply.	include provision figures, which renders this paragraph redundant.	
AM20	44	4.27	At the current (2014) Local Aggregate Assessment <u>2014 requirement provision rate</u> (1.015 million tonnes a year per annum), existing planning permissions could on average provide for a supply of sharp sand and gravel until 2027 <u>2028</u> , although in practice some sites will be exhausted sooner and others will last longer. In the case of Gill Mill Quarry, it is expected that part of the permitted reserve will not be worked until after the end of the plan period, i.e. after 2031 (see Table 2, note 2* in paragraph 4.19). The strategy in this document makes provision for sharp sand and gravel for the rest of the plan period, to 2031.	For clarification and factual update.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM21	44	4.28	Production of sharp sand and gravel in Oxfordshire has become increasingly concentrated in the northern part of the county (Cherwell and West Oxfordshire Districts), particularly in West Oxfordshire <u>District</u> , with a decline in the proportion coming from quarries in the southern part (South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Districts). Over the last 10 years period 2006 – 2015 , an average of 74% <u>70%</u> of production has been from northern Oxfordshire. <u>Similarly, of the total permitted reserves of sharp sand & gravel remaining at the beginning of 2016 (including permissions granted in 2016) estimated to be available for working during the plan period, 65% are in northern Oxfordshire. Oxfordshire's production capacity for sharp sand and gravel in 2016 is estimated to be subdivided 55% in northern Oxfordshire and 45% in southern Oxfordshire and without further planning permissions being granted the proportion in northern Oxfordshire is expected to steadily increase over the plan period, to 100% by around 2028. Although there are extensive remaining sand and gravel resources in the West Oxfordshire District part of northern Oxfordshire, including within the current working areas of the Lower Windrush Valley and around Cassington, there are concerns about the rate and intensity of mineral working in the this area and the consequent cumulative impact on local communities, generation of traffic, including on the A40, and impacts on local rivers and groundwater flows.</u>	For clarification and factual update and to provide additional relevant information.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM22	45	4.32	Some of the requirement may be met by sharp sand and gravel extracted in the construction of the proposed new flood relief channel (from Botley to Sandford-on-Thames) for the Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme. The Environment Agency have has estimated this could involve the extraction of approximately 500,000 cubic metres of sand and gravel (approximately 0.75 million tonnes). This proposal is still in preparation and a scheme has not yet been approved, designed or had planning permission granted. The earliest that approval will be given for a scheme to go ahead is spring 2018. <u>Subject to approval and funding, the earliest that work is expected to start is spring 2018, with completion by 2022.</u>	Factual update and typo.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM23	46	4.37	At the current (2014) Local Aggregate Assessment <u>2014 requirement provision</u> rate (0.189 million tonnes a year per annum), existing planning permissions could on average provide a supply of soft sand until 2024, although in practice some sites will be exhausted sooner and others will last longer. The additional requirement for soft sand working over the plan period should be met from sites within the two resource areas, but mainly from the more extensive Corallian Ridge area. <u>Actual sales of soft sand in 2014 and 2015 were above the provision rate. If on-going annual monitoring shows this to be a continuing trend, existing permitted reserves will be extracted more quickly and the additional requirement for additional sites to be released would be brought forward.</u>	Factual update and for clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM24	47	4.40	At the current (2014) Local Aggregate Assessment <u>2014 requirement provision</u> rate (0.584 million tonnes a year per annum), current permitted reserves of crushed rock <u>remaining at the end of 2015</u> could on average last until 2034 <u>2030</u> , although in practice some sites will be exhausted sooner and others will last longer. Production of crushed rock has fluctuated considerably over past years. Existing working areas of limestone are south east of Faringdon, south of Burford and north west of Bicester. There is one existing area of ironstone working in the north of the county at Alkerton / Wroxton.	Factual update and for clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM25	47	4.42	There is no need to permit any additional land for ironstone working for aggregate use during the plan period. In any case, better quality aggregate is generally available from within the limestone deposits than from the ironstone deposits. Any additional provision that is required for crushed rock should be made within the limestone areas. <u>Permission for new areas of ironstone working for aggregate use will therefore not be</u>	For clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			granted unless the applicant is willing to give up an equivalent existing permitted area, and this can be ensured through revocation of the permission or other appropriate mechanism without payment of compensation, and where there would be an overall environmental benefit.		
AM26	47	4.43	The Local Aggregate Assessment 2014 indicates no requirement for further areas for crushed rock working during the plan period, <u>due to the relatively high level of permitted reserves of this mineral remaining to be worked. Actual sales of crushed rock in 2014 and 2015 were well above the provision rate of 0.584 million tonnes a year. Consequently, the level of permitted reserves remaining has fallen more than expected, as they have been extracted more quickly. If on-going annual monitoring shows this to be a continuing trend, but, if demand increases significantly, additional permissions could be needed towards the end of the plan period and there could be a requirement for additional provisions to be made through the allocation of sites for working in the Site Allocations Document.</u> If required, this additional provision should preferably be made through extensions to existing quarries rather than from new quarries, to make efficient use of existing plant and infrastructure, and minimise additional impact. It is unlikely that any new quarries will be needed during the period of this plan. In view of this, and given that crushed rock resources in Oxfordshire – in particular the resources of limestone outside of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty – are extensive, strategic resource areas for possible future crushed rock working are included in policy M3 but there may not be any requirement for specific sites to be allocated in the Site Allocations Document.	Factual update and for clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM27	51	4.48	Aggregates are imported <u>into Oxfordshire</u> through three rail depots at Banbury, Sutton Courtenay and Kidlington. Planning permission has been granted for a further rail depot at Shipton on Cherwell. There is also a depot at Hinksey Sidings, Oxford but this has been used solely by the rail industry to bring in rail ballast for internal use on the rail network, and its use for the transhipment of rail ballast has been intermittent. <i>Footnote 23: The Kidlington rail depot is being has been relocated to a nearby permitted <u>permitted an adjacent site to the north east</u> to enable the construction of a <u>the new Oxford Parkway railway</u> station at Water Eaton.</i>	Factual update and for clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM28	51	4.49	There will be an ongoing need for importation of aggregate materials that cannot be	For consistency	No implications

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			quarried locally, particularly hard rock for roadstone. <u>There may also be opportunities for importation of recycled and secondary aggregate (see paragraph 4.7 and policy M1).</u> Rail and water transport should take priority over road, particularly for longer distance movements. Existing and permitted depots should therefore be safeguarded <u>under policy M9</u> ; and additional depots should be permitted at suitable locations should the opportunity arise.	with policy M1 and for clarification.	for SEA/SA or HRA
AM29	52	4.55	Clay has been worked at certain sand and gravel quarries to produce material for lining landfill sites and for use in restoration and landscaping. Policy M4 requires that within the Eynsham / Cassington / Yarnton part of the Thames, Lower Windrush and Lower Evenlode Valleys area proposals for sand and gravel extraction must demonstrate that there <u>there</u> will be no change in water levels in the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation; this requirement will apply equally to any proposal for the working of clay from a sand and gravel quarry in this area.	Typo.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM30	53	4.58	There is currently no exploration for or production of oil or gas in Oxfordshire. Exploratory work in the past did not find any oil or gas fields, although gas was encountered in some of the holes drilled. In addition to requirements for planning permission, oil and gas exploration and production can only be undertaken within areas that have been licensed by the government. There are currently no licence areas covering Oxfordshire. In July 2014 the government invited applications for onshore oil and gas licences under the 14 th Landward Licensing Round. Under this licensing round, large parts of the UK are potentially available for licence, including some parts of Oxfordshire, as identified in a strategic environmental assessment that was published by the government in December 2013. <u>In December 2015, the Oil & Gas Authority announced that licences for a total of 159 blocks were formally offered to successful applicants under the 14th Onshore Oil and Gas Licensing Round. None of the areas for which licences have been offered are within Oxfordshire or include any part of the county. It is not yet known whether licences have been applied for or will be awarded covering any parts of the county.</u>	Factual update.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM31	53	4.59	In the event that licences are awarded covering parts of Oxfordshire <u>under a future further licencing round</u> , it is possible that proposals for exploratory drilling would come forward, which could be followed by proposals for production in the event that significant oil or gas reserves were found. Proposals could be for drilling either by	Factual update.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			conventional means or by hydraulic fracturing (fracking). The section on oil and gas in policy M7 will provide a policy basis consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and national planning guidance on oil and gas against which any such planning applications can be considered.		
AM32	61	4.84	Policy M10 sets out the general approach to restoration of mineral workings. Core policies C2 to C44 C12 are also relevant when considering the type of after-use that may be appropriate and the content of a restoration scheme.	Consequential to the addition of policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
5. WASTE PLANNING STRATEGY					
AM33	63	5.1	This section sets out the County Council's waste planning strategy and policies for the period to 2031. Provision must <u>is to be</u> made for the facilities that will be needed for the management of waste in the county during that period. The Council intends that this will be achieved in a way that promotes and enables the movement of waste up the waste management hierarchy, away from landfill and towards increased re-use, recycling, composting and recovery of resources from waste.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM34	63	5.2	How many and what sort of waste management facilities will be needed in Oxfordshire over this period cannot be predicted with absolute accuracy. The strategy can only be based on the best information currently available. A separate Waste Needs Assessment sets out estimates of the quantities of waste that will need to be managed in Oxfordshire; the waste management capacity currently available; and the additional capacity that may be required up to 2031. These will be monitored regularly and updated in the Council's Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM35	63	5.3	The strategy includes a spatial framework for the delivery of new waste infrastructure (as illustrated on the waste key diagram – Figure 12 at the end of this section) and policies which provide the context for considering future proposals for waste development. The strategy provides a strategic policy framework for the identification of suitable sites in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document and against which planning applications for new <u>facilities that provide additional waste management facilities</u> capacity will be considered.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM36	63	5.4	Attitudes and behaviour towards waste and waste management practice continue to change, and the amount of waste produced per person has fallen along with the amount of waste disposed in landfill has fallen and the amount of household waste	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			produced per person has reduced. However, the amount of waste produced arising in Oxfordshire requiring provision for management is still expected to grow as population increases and the local economy develops, particularly in the main urban areas of Oxford, Banbury, Bicester, Witney, Abingdon, Didcot, and Wantage and Grove. The types of waste that need to be planned for are shown in Table 3, which sets out the 2012 baseline figures of waste produced in Oxfordshire that are used in the Core Strategy. The Waste Needs Assessment provides more detail on the amount of waste that is currently managed and how much may need to be managed in future.		
AM37	64	5.5	<u>Municipal Solid Waste (also referred to as local authority collected waste), commercial and industrial waste and construction, demolition and excavation waste are estimated to comprise approximately just over two thirds of the total waste produced requiring management in the county</u> comprises municipal solid waste (also referred to as local authority collected waste), commercial and industrial waste and construction, demolition and excavation waste. Collectively these are referred to as the principal waste streams and forecasts for each of these over the plan period are set out in Table 4. It is an aim of the plan for Oxfordshire to be net self-sufficient in managing and disposing of these wastes and forecasts are needed to plan for this. Agricultural waste makes up almost a third of total waste but most is managed on site (on individual farming units), much of it in ways that are outside beyond normal planning control. This is not therefore included in the principal waste streams and is addressed separately in policy W8. The other types of waste are also important but the quantities to be managed are far lower and require specialist forms of management and disposal: these are addressed in policies W7 (hazardous waste), W9 (radioactive waste) and W10 (waste water).	Clarifications.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM38	65	5.10	The National Planning Policy for Waste sets out the role of planning for waste, which includes providing a framework in which communities and businesses take more responsibility for their own waste, including enabling waste to be requiring disposed or mixed waste destined for recovery to be managed in line with the proximity principle. It also requires that, in preparing waste local plans, waste planning authorities should identify quantities of waste requiring different types of management in their area over the plan period. These principles underpin the aim for Oxfordshire to be net self-sufficient in the management (including disposal) of each of the principal waste streams. In addition the National Planning Policy for Waste requires that waste planning authorities:	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider the need for additional waste management capacity of more than local significance; take into account any need for waste management (including disposal of residues from waste treatment) arising in more than one waste planning authority area where only a limited number of facilities would be required; and work collaboratively in groups with other waste planning authorities to provide a suitable network of facilities. <p>Some cross boundary movement of waste is inevitable but planning for net self-sufficiency should reduce the level of movement that is necessary.</p>		
AM39	66	5.11	<p>For some time Oxfordshire has been receiving high levels <u>substantial quantities</u> of waste from other areas. A total of 670,000 tonnes of waste was imported into Oxfordshire in 2013, approximately 425,000 tonnes of which was disposed to landfill (see table 1 in section 2). This reflects the availability of <u>non-hazardous waste</u> landfill space in Oxfordshire, the relative proximity of a number of urban centres (e.g. Reading, Wokingham, Bracknell and Newbury) and <u>reduction a growing shortage</u> of <u>non-hazardous waste</u> landfill capacity in other areas – in particular Berkshire and north Hampshire. London also has a shortage of landfill capacity and exports waste for disposal to other areas, including Oxfordshire (much of this waste arrives by rail). The amount of waste from London is expected to reduce⁴⁰, but significant <u>quantities</u> imports of waste can still be <u>are</u> anticipated <u>to continue</u> from other areas elsewhere as long as Oxfordshire's landfills continue to operate. Policy W1 sets the basis for managing the <u>equivalent quantity of waste to that</u> produced in Oxfordshire. The approach to managing waste from other areas is covered by policy W6 (Landfill) and policy W3 (Provision for waste management capacity and facilities required).</p> <p><i>Footnote 40: Waste from West London that was being disposed <u>under contract</u> at Sutton Courtenay is now being <u>disposed in South Gloucestershire managed elsewhere</u>. The London Plan expects the London Boroughs to become <u>net self-sufficient</u> in managing their waste by 2025 <u>and to cease sending recyclable or biodegradable waste to landfill at that time</u>.</i></p>	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM40	67	5.13	<p>The way that waste is managed in Oxfordshire has changed markedly in recent years. Most waste was previously disposed by <u>to</u> landfill, but available data shows that it</p>	For clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			Oxfordshire over half is now recycled or recovered for other use . The recycling and recovery of municipal waste is leading this trend (58% in 2012/13) and further improvement can be expected as a result of investment in new waste facilities.		HRA
AM41	67	5.14	The Core Strategy seeks further improvement as quickly as is practical in the proportion of waste that is recycled, composted and recovered, to minimise <u>minimising</u> the amounts of waste disposed in landfill. Policy W2 sets targets for the way in which the principal waste streams should <u>are to</u> be managed and these help to determine the provision that needs to be made for different types of waste management facilities (see policy W3).	For clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM42	67	5.15	The targets <u>for future waste management in policy W2 reflect the aims and vision of this Core Strategy to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>move waste up the hierarchy; and</u> • <u>maximise landfill diversion.</u> <p><u>They have been formulated following a careful assessment of the composition of each of the principal waste streams and what is understood to be the current management position for each. have evolved from waste management targets in the former South East Plan. They have been modified and updated to reflect local circumstances in Oxfordshire, including the objectives and policies of the Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2013 (which aims to move waste management of municipal waste further up the waste hierarchy). <u>They are considered to be ambitious but achievable.</u></u></p> <p>The targets set by policy W2 reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • higher recycling (and composting) targets that are considered achievable in Oxfordshire; and • maximum diversion from landfill. 	For clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM43	68	5.19	The European Waste Framework Directive requires 70% of construction and demolition waste to be recycled or recovered by 2020. Hard demolition waste makes up about a third of the overall waste stream and the vast majority (98%) is already processed and re-used as recycled aggregate. Construction waste is far <u>more varied in composition and it is estimated that</u> little more than a third is currently recycled and there may be some scope to improve on this.	For clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM44	68	5.20	Naturally occurring excavation waste material is not subject to the Directive target. This waste stream may reflect the greater difficulty of recycling this type of waste, which largely comprises subsoil and amounts to about half of the overall construction, demolition and excavation waste stream. Excavation waste is nevertheless used (disposed or recovered) beneficially in Oxfordshire in the restoration of mineral workings, <u>operational development</u> and associated engineering works.	For clarification.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM45	68	5.21	The former South East Plan set a recycling target of 60% for construction, demolition and excavation waste combined. In Oxfordshire about half of the overall construction, demolition and excavation waste stream (52%) is currently recycled and there is unlikely to be opportunity to significantly increase this. An overall recycling target of 60% is compliant with the Directive target for construction and demolition waste. This will be more readily monitored than would separate targets for construction and demolition waste and excavation waste. The targets in Policy W2 are set at levels that exceed the Directive target for recycling or recovery of construction and demolition waste arising in Oxfordshire by 2020.	Update following changes to policy W2.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM46	70	5.24	Existing waste management facilities will provide much of the waste management capacity required, <u>as identified in Table 5</u> . Table 6 shows the capacity available: this reduces through the plan period as the capacity provided by temporary <u>facilities with time-limited planning permissions</u> is deducted in accordance with the end dates of their planning permissions.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM47	71	5.26	For Oxfordshire to be net self-sufficient in managing its own waste, provision must <u>will</u> be made for sites that are sufficient to enable the waste management requirements set out in table 5 to be met. Policy W4 <u>W3</u> provides for these capacity requirements to be met through the allocation of sites for waste management development in the Site Allocations Document, including in particular the provision that may need to be made for new sites to meet the shortfalls identified in table 7.	Clarification and consequential amendment.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM48	72	5.27	Sites already in use for waste management are likely to provide much of the waste management capacity required in the early part of the plan period. A need for additional commercial and industrial non-hazardous <u>waste recycling facilities</u> and for construction, demolition and excavation waste recycling facilities is likely to arise later in the plan period (table 7). Policy W3 sets out how the assessed need for waste management capacity should be taken into account in the consideration of proposals for waste management facilities.	Consequential amendments	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM49	72	5.29	In the case of facilities for the treatment of residual waste, a more cautious approach should be is taken. Residual waste treatment facilities come below recycling and composting in the waste hierarchy and no need has been identified for additional capacity in Oxfordshire within the plan period. These facilities are expensive to develop and tend to be large scale and would therefore be likely to draw waste into Oxfordshire from other areas. An excess of capacity for this type of facility is more likely to result in <u>mixed</u> waste being 'disposed' <u>managed</u> further from its source, contrary to the proximity principle (see paragraph 2.28). An excess of residual waste treatment capacity could also impede the achievement of recycling and composting targets. These dis-benefits may be reduced if it becomes practical and economic to develop smaller scale facilities <u>were developed</u> . If designed to serve a local need, particularly if linked to local provision of heat and power, smaller scale residual waste treatment facilities may be acceptable where they help to divert waste from landfill and it can be demonstrated that the they would not impede the achievement of recycling and composting targets.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM50	73	5.31	Policy W4 provides the general strategy for the location of new waste facilities, as illustrated on the Key Waste Diagram (Figure 12). Unless otherwise specified (see policies W7, W8, W9 and W10) this policy applies to facilities managing the principal waste streams. The approach to landfill is dealt with separately in policy W6. Specific sites for <u>additional</u> waste management <u>facilities capacity</u> will be <u>identified and</u> allocated in the Site Allocations Document, taking into account the criteria in policy W5 <u>requirements of this policy, policy W5</u> (Siting of waste management facilities) and policies C1 – C44 <u>12</u> .	Clarifications and consequential changes.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM51	73	5.32	The general locational strategy looks to steer larger scale (strategic and non-strategic) facilities towards locations close to the main centres of population (as indicated on figure 2, in section 2) and for facilities in the more rural parts of the county to be of smaller scale. Table 8 provides a guide to differentiation between larger and smaller scale facilities⁴⁷. The following will be used as a guide to differentiation between <u>different scales of facility^{47*}</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Strategic facilities are those that would manage at least 50,000tpa of waste;</u> • <u>Non-strategic facilities are those that manage between 20,000 and 50,000 tpa of waste; and</u> • <u>smaller scale facilities are those that manage less than 20,000 tpa waste or</u> 	Presentational changes.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA																			
			<p><u>25,000 tpa of inert waste for recycling.</u></p> <p>Table 8: Guide to defining the scale of waste management facilities</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Scale</th> <th colspan="3">Recycling/Treatment/Recovery Facilities throughput (tonnes per annum)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>>50,000 tpa</th> <th><50,000 tpa</th> <th><20,000 tpa</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strategic</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✗</td> <td>✗</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Strategic</td> <td>✗</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✗</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small scale</td> <td>✗</td> <td>✗</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: Oxfordshire County Council</p> <p><i>*move footnote 47 here</i></p>	Scale	Recycling/Treatment/Recovery Facilities throughput (tonnes per annum)			>50,000 tpa	<50,000 tpa	<20,000 tpa	Strategic	✓	✗	✗	Non-Strategic	✗	✓	✗	Small scale	✗	✗	✓		
Scale	Recycling/Treatment/Recovery Facilities throughput (tonnes per annum)																							
	>50,000 tpa	<50,000 tpa	<20,000 tpa																					
Strategic	✓	✗	✗																					
Non-Strategic	✗	✓	✗																					
Small scale	✗	✗	✓																					
AM52	75	5.35	<p>Large parts of the county are rural in character and relatively remote from the Oxfordshire Lorry Route Network and the main sources of waste arising. Much of the county comprises attractive countryside with small village communities. These rural areas are only likely to be suitable for small scale waste management facilities. Facilities of such scale are more likely to be in keeping with their surroundings, with traffic movements levels appropriate to rural roads. Where necessary, controls may be imposed on the volume of waste that can to be handled at <u>such</u> facilities, to ensure they remain small scale and do not <u>give rise to</u> have unacceptable impacts. Locations close to towns (figure 2) are more likely to reduce the distances waste needs to be transported, but other locations may could be acceptable where the criteria in policy W5 and policies C1 – C44<u>12</u> are met.</p>	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA																			
AM53	76	5.38	<p>Policy W4 provides a locational framework for <u>the provision of additional waste management facilities capacity</u> that reflects the needs and characteristics of different parts of the county, whilst also providing flexibility for the market to respond to waste management needs.</p>	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA																			
AM54	76	5.40	<p>Policy W5 identifies a number of land uses that are likely to be suitable for waste management. This is not an exhaustive list but, equally, and the suitability of a specific site proposal must <u>will</u> also be assessed against the criteria in policies C1 – C44 <u>C12</u>. These policies are designed to ensure that facilities do not endanger human health or cause unacceptable harm to the environment. Policy W4 will also help determine whether a site can accommodate a particular scale of activity.</p>	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA																			

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM55	77	5.44	<u>The NPPW states that in identifying sites for waste management, priority should be given to the re-use of previously developed land, sites identified for employment uses, and redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages. Waste development should generally be avoided on greenfield land. Green field Other greenfield sites should only may be considered where they can be shown to be the most suitable and sustainable option and where potential harm, particularly landscape impact, can be satisfactorily mitigated. Depending on the area of land involved, these considerations may also be relevant where the extension of an existing site onto green field greenfield land is proposed. Where major urban development is proposed on greenfield land, it may be appropriate to incorporate waste management facilities, for example as proposed for Bicester eco-town.</u>	Consequential amendments as a result of changes to W5 and to address 033/11 in part.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM56	77	5.46	<i>Delete whole paragraph; replaced by new paragraph in section 6, supporting new policy C12.</i>	Paragraph moved, consequent to new policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM57	77	5.47	<i>Delete whole paragraph; replaced by new paragraph in section 6, supporting new policy C12.</i>	Paragraph moved, consequent to new policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM58	78	5.48	<i>Delete whole paragraph; replaced by new paragraph in section 6, supporting new policy C12.</i>	Paragraph moved, consequent to new policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM59	83	5.63	The Site Allocations Document will make provision for any further sites that are needed for the plan period. A number of options have been put forward by waste and mineral operators for the use of inert waste to restore worked out quarries. In addition, new quarries and extensions to existing quarries which involve infilling with inert waste to achieve restoration are expected to come into operation during the life-time of the Core Strategy (through implementation of the plan's minerals strategy). It is unlikely that there will not be sufficient reasonable options to provide for the disposal of residual inert waste arisings; rather, it is more likely that there will be a shortage of this type of waste to achieve satisfactory restoration of worked out quarries (see also policy M10). Policy W6 therefore provides for priority to be given to the use of residual inert waste in	Clarification	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			the restoration of quarries. <u>Inert waste is also managed through operational development schemes and projects such as noise bund construction and flood defence works.</u> Otherwise In such cases, proposals for disposal of inert waste on land should demonstrate that there is a positive environmental benefit and that there will be no adverse landscape impact.		
AM60	86	5.72	Proposals for the management of hazardous waste should also have regard to policies W4 (general locations) and W5 (specific locations) and policies C1-C44 <u>12</u> .	Consequential to the addition of policy C12 and typo.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM61	87	5.76	Policy W8 allows for the construction of facilities for the management of agricultural waste provided they comply with policies C1-C44 <u>12</u> . Treatment of agricultural waste by processes such as anaerobic digestion offer opportunity <u>opportunities</u> to generate energy from waste and the possibility of recovering heat for use locally and this is encouraged. Intensive livestock units offer such opportunities where already located away from housing and benefiting from good access. Attention should be paid to the impact of development on the local landscape, particularly if situated within, or close to, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Consequential to the addition of policy C12 and typo.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM62	88	5.XX (New paragraph to be inserted before 5.80)	<u>The national strategy for the management of radioactive waste is prepared and issued by the NDA. The Energy Act 2004 requires that the NDA Strategy is reviewed and republished at least every five years. UK Government and the Scottish Ministers approved the current Strategy, "NDA Strategy III" in March 2016 and it came into effect in April 2016. The NDA also published its Higher Activity Waste Strategy in May 2016. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy seeks to be consistent with prevailing NDA Strategy, as well as other strategic waste management document published by the NDA, and recognises its status as a national policy in the arena of radioactive waste management.</u>	Factual update to address representation 140/ac/1.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM63	88	5.80	In Oxfordshire, low level and intermediate level wastes arise from the former nuclear energy research facility at Harwell, in vale of White Horse District, and the Joint European Taurus Torus (JET) facility at Culham, in South Oxfordshire District. Most of this waste will be from the decommissioning of facilities, as detailed in table 15.	Clarification to address representation 140/2.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
AM64	89	5.84	The former nuclear energy research facility at Harwell includes an area designated as a nuclear licensed site. The 'licensed area' at Harwell is being progressively decommissioned with a view to its redevelopment as part of the Harwell Oxford Campus. The decommissioning programme provides for the treatment and storage of the legacy radioactive wastes that remain from earlier research activity and this will continue throughout the lifetime of the Core Strategy. Part of the Harwell Oxford Campus (<u>an area separated from the main nuclear licensed site, and containing the Liquid Effluent Treatment Plant</u>) is within the recently designated Science Vale Enterprise Zone. The site is also within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Clarification to address representation 140/2.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM65	89	5.85	Facilities for the treatment and long term storage of intermediate level radioactive waste have already been developed and a new store will be available in 2017. The site operator has not identified a need for further facilities to manage intermediate level radioactive waste <u>and planning permission has been granted for the development of an intermediate level waste store at the Harwell Nuclear licensed site. It is likely that the consented facility will meet the site operator's interim radioactive waste storage requirements throughout the plan period</u> , but policy W9 makes provision for such further development if necessary. Development to facilitate the storage or management of ILW other than that produced in Oxfordshire should demonstrate that it is the best option in terms of sustainability and environmental considerations.	Clarification to address representation 140/2 and a consequential change.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM66	90	5.89	The Culham Science Centre <u>United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA) hosts and operates the Joint European Taurus-Torus (JET) project in building J at Culham Science Centre.</u> Support buildings include a small facility for the treatment and storage of radioactive waste. Some buildings associated with JET will be retained when the project ceases, but others are subject to temporary permission and some radioactive waste will result when decommissioning takes place. The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority's <u>UKAEA's</u> view is that, consistent with policies in the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, the JET site could continue to host further activity. This is not yet confirmed and so the possible need to manage radioactive wastes from decommissioning must be anticipated.	Clarifications to address representation 092/3 and a consequential amendment.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM67	90	5.90	Recent changes to the Environmental Permitting Regulations have reduced the need (and therefore volume) for some waste produced at Culham to be categorised as	Clarification to address	No implications for SEA/SA or

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			radioactive waste. For waste categorised as radioactive the small waste management facility at Culham is not seen as a long term solution for treatment or storage. Policy W9 therefore makes provision for storage at Harwell of intermediate level waste arising at Culham. For low level radioactive waste arising from decommissioning, the site operator has not yet identified a disposal route and provision needs to be made for this in the Core Strategy.	representation 092/3.	HRA
AM68	91	5.91	Disposal of lower activity waste at Culham would conflict with the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority's vision for the site, set out in a recently developed master plan. The site operator also believes that economic and environmental considerations are likely to result in such waste being stored or disposed off-site. However, because of the uncertainties around the disposal of this type of waste, the option of on-site disposal cannot be discounted and so policy W9 makes provision for this if necessary. Culham is in the Green Belt where inappropriate development should only be allowed if there are very special circumstances (policy W5 C12). Application would also need to be made to the Environment Agency for a disposal licence, as part of which, 'Best Available Technique' would need to be demonstrated.	Consequential to the addition of policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM69	92	5.96	This type of development has the potential to impact on the environment, in particular landscape and general amenity. Allowing waste water development to take place on green field greenfield land (contrary to the general presumption in policy W5) allows for it to be sited away from settlements, at a distance from local housing. Development in such locations should still be capable of meeting the requirements of policies C1-C14 12 . Where this is not the case, compelling arguments would be needed to allow the development to proceed. Particular considerations apply in the Green Belt and the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (see policies W5 C12 and C8).	Consequential to the update to policy W5 and the addition of policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM70	96	Figure 12	Update Figure 12: Waste Key Diagram as a result of changes to the waste spatial strategy in Policy W4.	To ensure waste key diagram is up to date.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
6. CORE POLICIES FOR MINERALS AND WASTE					
AM71	103	6.26	Policy C5 addresses general environmental, and amenity and economic considerations only. Other core policies address areas associated with environmental protection, including water quality, the natural environment, the historic environment and landscape.	To address representation 026/3 and a consequential	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
				amendment.	
AM72	104	6.28	Where significant development on agricultural land is <u>demonstrated to be</u> necessary, national policy is that local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. There are extensive areas of high quality agricultural land in Oxfordshire, much of which is underlain by minerals, particularly sand and gravel. Proposals for minerals development will be expected to address the impact of the development on the extent and quality of any best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a). Where appropriate <u>not already available, detailed</u> agricultural land classification survey information should be provided <u>for proposals on agricultural land</u> . Proposals for waste development should be capable of avoiding best and most versatile agricultural land and permanent development involving the loss of such land will not normally be permitted.	To address representation 126/2.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM73	104	6.29	The quality of the existing land and the ability to restore it to high standards will be an important factor when selecting the form of restoration and after-use of mineral workings. Where mineral extraction affects BMV agricultural land, proposals for restoration and aftercare should look to preserve the long-term potential for the land and its soils as a high quality agricultural resource <u>for the future</u> wherever possible. Proposals for restoration need to be realistic, however, and in some cases a return to agriculture may need to be at lower ground level due to a lack of availability of suitable inert infill material. In the floodplain the use of fill to restore mineral working must take account of national policy on flood risk (see also policies C3 and M10) and a return to agriculture may not always be possible; it may not be possible to return land to pre-existing levels and a return to agricultural land at lower ground level may not be practicable due to a high water table.	To address representation 126/2.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM74	111	6.52	The Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2030 (LTP3) <u>2015 – 2031 (LTP4)</u> aims to reduce carbon emissions from transport, improve air quality and reduce other environmental impacts. The County Council recognises that the transport network should be operated in a way that balances the protection of the local environment with efficient and effective access for freight and distribution. To ensure that traffic from new development can be accommodated safely and efficiently on the transport network, contributions are often sought to mitigate adverse impacts: commuted sums can also be sought toward the operation and maintenance of facilities, services and infrastructure ¹¹⁰ .	Factual updates.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
			Footnote 110: Policy SD2 of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2030 (revised April 2012). Policy 34 of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2015 – 2031 (2016)		
AM75	112	Figure 13	<i>The most up to date Oxfordshire Lorry Route Map from LTP4 will be used when the plan is published.</i>	To ensure the most up-to-date information is used in the Core Strategy.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
7. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING					
AM76	118	7.10	Site options for possible allocation in the Site Allocations Document will be assessed against the criteria in policy M4 and the core policies C1-C4412. Proposals for aggregate mineral working within sites that are allocated in the Site Allocations Document, and therefore accord with the minerals planning strategy, will normally be permitted under policy M5. Proposals for mineral working may come forward in other locations, but these will not normally be permitted unless the provision required to deliver the strategy cannot be met from identified areas.	Consequential to the addition of policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM77	119	7.15	The core policies C1 to C4412 have been developed to ensure the minerals strategy is delivered in an environmentally acceptable way, including by setting out criteria against which site options will be assessed and planning applications will be considered. These policies will be implemented by the County Council through the development management process.	Consequential to the addition of policy C12.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM78	120	7.24 <u>7.20</u>	An implementation and monitoring framework for the Core Strategy minerals planning strategy will be included in the Minerals and Waste Monitoring Reports <u>is included at the end of this section.</u> Indicators and targets will be <u>have been</u> developed to provide a consistent basis for monitoring the performance of the Core Strategy's vision, objectives and policies for minerals development to 2031. The indicators will reflect the intent of the strategy objectives and the sustainability appraisal framework identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
AM79	120	7.22	In the case of some of the core policies it will not be possible to set a specific target but it will still be possible to assess the effectiveness of these policies in relations to	Typo	No implications for SEA/SA or

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification	Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA																																			
			minerals development.		HRA																																			
AM80	124	7.45 7.44	An implementation and monitoring framework for the Core Strategy waste planning strategy will be included in the Minerals and Waste Monitoring Reports is included at the end of this section. Indicators and targets will be have been developed to provide a consistent basis for monitoring the performance of the Core Strategy's vision, objectives and policies for waste development to 2031. The indicators will reflect the intent of the strategy objectives and the sustainability appraisal framework identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Report.	Clarifications	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA																																			
AM81	124	7.46	In the case of some of the core policies it will not be possible to set a specific target but it will still be possible to assess the effectiveness of these policies in relation to waste development.	Typo	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA																																			
AM82	128	Appendix 2	<p><i>N.B. only additions/deletions are shown for Appendix 2</i></p> <p>Appendix 2. Existing and Permitted Waste management Sites Safeguarded under Policy W11</p> <p>These sites are safeguarded under Policy W11 pending adoption of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Document</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">CHERWELL DISTRICT</th> </tr> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th>Site and (Operator)</th> <th>Parish</th> <th>Grid Ref</th> <th>Type of Facility</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>284</td> <td>Ardley STW (Anglian Water)</td> <td>Ardley</td> <td>SP544280</td> <td>Waste Water Treatment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>285</td> <td>Fringford STW (Anglian Water)</td> <td>Fringford</td> <td>SP609290</td> <td>Waste Water Treatment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>286</td> <td>Fritwell STW (Anglian Water)</td> <td>Fritwell</td> <td>SP526287</td> <td>Waste Water Treatment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>287</td> <td>Hardwick Hethe Klargestor STW (Anglian Water)</td> <td>Hardwick with Tusmore</td> <td>SP577295</td> <td>Waste Water Treatment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>289</td> <td>Hethe STW</td> <td>Hethe</td> <td>SP596294</td> <td>Waste Water</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CHERWELL DISTRICT					No.	Site and (Operator)	Parish	Grid Ref	Type of Facility	284	Ardley STW (Anglian Water)	Ardley	SP544280	Waste Water Treatment	285	Fringford STW (Anglian Water)	Fringford	SP609290	Waste Water Treatment	286	Fritwell STW (Anglian Water)	Fritwell	SP526287	Waste Water Treatment	287	Hardwick Hethe Klargestor STW (Anglian Water)	Hardwick with Tusmore	SP577295	Waste Water Treatment	289	Hethe STW	Hethe	SP596294	Waste Water	To address representations 015/2 and 015/ac/2 and factual update.	No implications for SEA/SA or HRA
CHERWELL DISTRICT																																								
No.	Site and (Operator)	Parish	Grid Ref	Type of Facility																																				
284	Ardley STW (Anglian Water)	Ardley	SP544280	Waste Water Treatment																																				
285	Fringford STW (Anglian Water)	Fringford	SP609290	Waste Water Treatment																																				
286	Fritwell STW (Anglian Water)	Fritwell	SP526287	Waste Water Treatment																																				
287	Hardwick Hethe Klargestor STW (Anglian Water)	Hardwick with Tusmore	SP577295	Waste Water Treatment																																				
289	Hethe STW	Hethe	SP596294	Waste Water																																				

Ref	Page	Policy/ paragraph	Suggested Proposed Modification					Reason for Change	Implications for SEA/SA &/or HRA
				(Anglian Water)			Treatment		
			290	Stoke Lyne STW (Anglian Water)	Stoke Lyne	SP565284	Waste Water Treatment		
VALE OF WHITE HORSE DISTRICT									
			No.	Site and (Operator)	Parish	Grid Ref	Type of Facility		
			255	Didcot Power Station (RWE Npower)	Milton	SU 508918	Recycle/Transfer		