

**Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy, 2015  
List of Respondents and Summary of Responses to Consultation on Proposed Main Modifications  
and Sustainability Appraisal Update February 2017**

**Summary of Representations accepted by Oxfordshire County Council**

	Support	Object	Support/ Object	Not Stated	Total
Local Resident	12	12	0	14	<b>38</b>
Society Group	1	3	0	2	<b>6</b>
Industry - Minerals	3	1	0	0	<b>4</b>
Industry – Waste	2	0	4	0	<b>6</b>
Business	2	0	0	1	<b>3</b>
Parish/Borough/Town	6	2	1	4	<b>13</b>
Local Government	0	1	2	2	<b>5</b>
Statutory/National Body	3	0	1	4	<b>8</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>83</b>

	Sound				Legal			
	Yes	No	Not Stated	Total	Yes	No	Not Stated	Total
Local Resident	0	3	35	<b>38</b>	0	2	36	<b>38</b>
Society Group	0	4	2	<b>6</b>	0	3	3	<b>6</b>
Industry - Minerals	0	3	1	<b>4</b>	2	0	2	<b>4</b>
Industry – Waste	1	4	1	<b>6</b>	1	4	1	<b>6</b>
Business	2	0	1	<b>3</b>	2	0	1	<b>3</b>
Parish/Borough/Town	0	3	10	<b>13</b>	0	1	12	<b>13</b>
Local Government	1	1	3	<b>5</b>	2	0	3	<b>5</b>

<b>Statutory/National Body</b>	3	1	4	8	3	0	5	8
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>83</b>

<b>No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Support/Object?</b>	<b>Sound/Legal?</b>	<b>Main Points of Support/Objection</b>
001mm	Aylesbury Vale District Council	Not stated	Not stated	No comments
012mm	Earthline Ltd.	Support Broadly	Not stated	<p>MM11: Limestone sales are likely to continue at higher rates, and so there is likely to be an additional requirement for limestone to meet minimum landbank reserves.</p> <p>MM14: 2015 Sales figures for crushed rock indicate significant increases, disappointed that LAA2014 crushed rock figure is still used as recent estimates are much higher.</p> <p>MM20: Support inclusion in Policy M3 that extensions to sites may be allocated outside of SRAs.</p> <p>MM21: Support priority for extension of sites in Policy M4.</p> <p>MM22: Support interim position for consideration of applications prior to adoption of Part 2 Plan in Policy M5.</p>
014mm	Raymond Brown Minerals and Recycling Ltd.	Support broadly	Not stated	<p>MM8: Support encouragement of recycled and secondary aggregate.</p> <p>MM40: Support no 'need' test and no ceiling on capacity.</p> <p>MM46: Support provision for retention of temporary facilities.</p> <p>MM47, MM48, MM51: Waste spatial strategy supported in so far that non-strategic facilities should be within 5km towns or with good access to lorry routes. But disappointed that 'tight' definition of small scale waste facilities has been retained (20,000tpa) it would have been helpful if this was increased.</p> <p>MM52: Support amendment to policy W5 regarding greenfield land.</p> <p>MM68: Support Policy C8 as it now refers to major</p>

				developments test in NPPF.
015mm	Anglian Water Services Ltd	Not stated	Not stated	MM58: The modifications reflect the agreed statement of common ground.
017mm	Oxfordshire Against Gravel Extraction (OXAGE)	Object	Sound – No Legal – No	<p>The Inspector's report is flawed. The County Council is not obliged to follow the recommendations if they are not sound, and should justify why it has followed the recommendations based on the LAA 2014 in the interim report. OXAGE do not accept LAA 2014 figures for sharp sand and gravel for reasons already stated in previous reps and examination.</p> <p>MM9, MM10: Annual adjustment of requirement figures should be reinstated.</p> <p>MM11, MM14: Figures should use 10 year average for sharp sand and gravel instead of LAA 2014 requirement, therefore no additional tonnage requirement. In addition, the base year should be moved to 2017.</p> <p><i>N.B. Some of the alternative wording suggested does include an additional tonnage requirement (calculated from a 2017 base year).</i></p> <p>MM12, MM14, MM16, MM20: The introduction of productive capacity is unworkable. Provision should only relate to the maintenance of landbanks.</p> <p>MM15, MM16, MM17, MM20: There is no evidence or justification for the rebalancing strategy. The Bampton/Clanfield area should be included as a strategic resource area.</p> <p>MM22: Policy M5 should not provide for permission to be granted in advance of the Part 2 Plan as there are sufficient landbanks for long enough for Part 2 to be adopted.</p> <p>SEA/SA: This is flawed as it has failed to assess the 10 year past sales average for sharp sand and gravel as an alternative to the 2014 LAA figure.</p>

021mm	Anti-Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
022mm	Clanfield Parish Council	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
023mm	Bampton Parish Council	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
025mm	Siemens Magnet Technology Ltd.	Support	Sound – yes Legal – yes	MM20: This business is a sensitive receptor located within SRA 6. Support M3, but reserves the right to respond to specific site allocations. MM21: From a specialist local business perspective, support mitigation provided in Policies M4, C3, C4 and C5 from potential adverse effects associated with quarrying.
035mm	Hanborough Borough Council	Support/Object	Sound – No Legal – Not stated	MM20: Object to location of SRA6 and specific (previous) nomination within this SRA. Request boundary and description of SRA 6 is changed.
051mm	Councillor Lynda Atkins	Object	Sound – No Legal – No	Fully endorse OXAGE representation. MM20: In addition, Policy M3 is not sound because underlying evidence base is flawed – Bampton/Clanfield should be included as an SRA and rebalancing element should be removed.
063mm	Eynsham Parish Council	Object	Sound – No Legal – Not stated	The 2014 LAA is flawed and the figure for sharp sand and gravel is too high. MM28: The theory of safeguarding is supported but Policy M9 is too restrictive. MM29: In general M10 is supported but there should also be a requirement for a remediation fund for restoration. Object to (previous) site nomination and request re-introduction of buffer zones.
070mm	Hills Quarry Products Ltd.	Object	Sound – No Legal – Not	MM21, MM22: The reference in Policy M4(l) and M5 to new Policy C12 (Green Belt) should be removed as minerals

			stated	development is already appropriate development in the Green belt and so should not be subject to the Green Belt policy. To include this would be inconsistent with national policy (Case Law cited: <i>Europa Oil and gas Ltd. v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government</i> ) MM70: The second paragraph of Policy C12 should be removed as Mineral Planning authorities already have the authority to impose conditions where necessary to make the development acceptable.
077mm	CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) Oxfordshire	Object	Sound – No Legal - No	Entirely support OXAGE Rep with regards to provision for sharp sand and gravel. MM20: Is neutral on rebalancing issue although previously discounted sites should not be reintroduced.
082mm	Grundon Waste Management Ltd.	Support broadly	Sound – Yes Legal – Yes	Support MM1, MM2, MM3, MM5, MM6, MM8, MM11, MM12, MM14, MM15, MM16, MM19, MM20, MM22, MM25 & MM27. Suggest further clarifications/changes for MM21, MM32, MM33, MM35, MM38, MM41, MM44, & MM46.
083mm	The Eynsham Society	Object	Sound – No Legal – No	A single plan should be produced and further consultation is necessary. MM14: 2014 LAA figures too high and not based on sound evidence. MM20: Stop extraction in the west pending a fair balance between the north/south of the Thames. MM21: Policy M4 and others are not effective to provide mitigation from dust etc. for other land uses – introduce buffer zones. MM29: No confidence that Policy M10 will be effective.
084mm	Clifton Hampden Parish Council	Object	Sound – No Legal – No	Fully support OXAGE Representation
091mm	Mayor of London	Not stated	Not stated	No comments
093mm	Mr P C Power	Object	Sound – No	MM20: SRAs (SRA6 in particular) are too general and

			Legal – Not stated	should not include areas that are currently too constrained to support a site allocation. Two (previous) site nominations should be removed due to these constraints.
097mm	Highways England	Not stated	Not stated	No comments although previous comments still stand.
098mm	West Oxfordshire District Council	Support/object	Not stated	<p>MM6, MM8: Welcome reintroduction of a specific target in Policy M1 However, it is not clear why the list of examples of material to be recycled has been taken out.</p> <p>MM12, MM13, MM14: Generally support the changes to Policy M2. Regard will still need to be had to the latest position when determining applications.</p> <p>MM16, MM17, MM20: Strongly supports more explicit emphasis in rebalancing. It is also essential that this is enacted in the interim before Part 2 is adopted. Support the exclusion of Bampton/Clanfield as SRA. Disappointed that buffer zones have not been included.</p> <p>MM21: Object to removal of rebalancing element in Policy M4. It should be reintroduced so that Policy M3 can be applied. Also have reservations about the change in words from 'in accordance with' to 'take into account'.</p> <p>MM22: Support proposed changes in principle although it is important that the locational strategy in Policy M3 is applied.</p> <p>MM29: Disappointing that the policy merely requires the factors to be taken into account, rather than ensuring that the restoration is appropriate and sympathetic. Also no notice has been taken of previous suggestions that transfer of land to community/wildlife trusts may work to secure long-term management. Support the inclusion of consultation with communities.</p> <p>MM51: Much of the Oxford area for strategic facilities that crosses the river Thames east of Stanton Harcourt lies in Flood Zone 2 and has poor access to Oxford. This area</p>

				<p>should be removed from the locational strategy.</p> <p>MM68: Concern that wording has been changed such that only significant adverse impacts will be offset through compensatory enhancements. Any adverse impacts should be compensated for if not avoided, or mitigated.</p> <p>C10: No changes are proposed to this policy, however WODC has continuing concerns over the Oxfordshire Lorry Route Map.</p>
113mm	Sheehan Haulage and Plant Hire Ltd.	Support/Object	Sound – No Legal – No	<p>MM5: It should be recognised that advances in technology has meant that secondary and recycled aggregate are increasingly able to provide a substitute for land won sand and gravel.</p> <p>MM8: The figure in policy M1 should be for supply only. The policy should be worded ‘significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’. The fourth waste principle agreed in H10 should be incorporated into the policy.</p> <p>MM31, MM32, MM33, MM37, MM40, MM41: It is not appropriate to include any reference to CDE figures as this was not discussed or tested at the examination hearings.</p> <p>MM38: Policy W1 should aim to deliver the waste management target levels, not provide theoretical capacity.</p> <p>MM40: Recycling levels do not equate to capacity required as facilities do not operate to full capacity. This was agreed as common ground. Therefore capacity needs to be greater than target levels.</p> <p>MM42, MM43, MM44: These are superfluous as they serve to set a specified capacity requirement when there is now no ‘target’ or ceiling. In addition, Tables 6 &amp; 7 use figures that have not been subject to examination.</p> <p>MM46: As agreed at the examination, the waste figures were not discussed and so it is not appropriate to include</p>

				<p>any figure in Policy W3. As with M1 change wording to 'significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits' in line with waste principles. The fourth waste principle should be incorporated.</p> <p>MM47, MM48, MM51: Support waste spatial strategy.</p> <p>MM53: Use of waste as operational fill should be provided for and prioritised in addition to restoration of quarrying. Provision should also be made for on 'other sites' not only existing facilities and site allocations.</p> <p>MM59: Policy W11 remains complicated and does not provide the clarity/certainty required by NPPF.</p> <p>MM61, MM63, MM66: Policies C4, C6 and C7 should be amended to accord with the seventh waste principle.</p>
114mm	M&M Skip Hire Ltd.	Support/Object	Sound – No Legal – No	As for 113mm
115mm	David Einig Contracting Ltd.	Support/Object	Sound – No Legal – No	As for 113mm
116mm	McKenna Environmental Ltd.	Support/Object	Sound – No Legal – No	As for 113mm
120mm	Historic England	Support	Sound – Yes Legal – Yes	MM18, MM21: Welcome modifications in line with the agreed Statement of Common Ground. Also support MM60 and MM61
125mm	Mineral Products Association (MPA)	Support broadly	Sound – No Legal – Yes	Support MM5, MM11, MM12, MM14, MM16, MM20, MM24, MM25, MM27. However regarding MM76 (Definition of SRAs) the MPA still consider these should be a nationally recognised term and in practise (particularly in the interim) SRAs will act as Areas of Search.
126mm	Natural England	Not stated	Sound – Yes Legal – Not stated	No concerns with the soundness of the Plan.
131mm	Oxfordshire Mineral Producers Group	Support broadly	Sound – No Legal – Yes	Support MM5, MM11, MM12, MM14, MM16, MM20, MM24, MM25, MM27. However regarding MM76 (Definition of



	(OMPG)			SRAs) the MPA still consider these should be a nationally recognised term and in practise (particularly in the interim) SRAs will act as Areas of Search (as for 131mm).
133mm	Environment Agency	Support	Not stated	MM29 & MM61: Support amendments to Policy M10 and C4.
140mm	Magnox Ltd.	Support	Sound – Yes Legal – Yes	MM56: Support modifications to Policy W9 in line with the agreed Statement of Common Ground.
142mm	Surrey County Council	Not stated	Not stated	No comments
146mm	Chilterns Conservation Board	Support/Object	Sound – No Legal – Yes	Support MM68 in line with agreed Statement of Common Ground. MM67: Change wording of paragraph to reflect wider remit of AONBs than ‘character’. Change footnote 105 to refer to purposes of AONB designation.
147mm	South Oxfordshire District Council	Object	Sound – No Legal – Yes	MM10, MM14: Concern over how 2014 LAA figures have been calculated. Increased demand has not been quantified or translated into the Plan. Also concerned that the mechanism for review in previous version of the policy has been removed. Previously used extraction sites have not all been depleted. These should be used first before opening up new extraction sites. MM15, MM20, MM22: Concerns over the north/south split and rebalancing. There is no justification for a north/south split, and a split could be done in any other number of ways (e.g. east/west). There is no clarity over how extraction would be divided between South Oxfordshire DC and VOWH DC. MM16: There is no evidence that provision for additional sharp sand and gravel should be in the first half of the Plan period. MM20: SRA5 covers large parts of South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse Districts, including housing allocations, a proposed bridge crossing over the Thames and ‘Science

				Vale'. The Core Strategy should not prejudice any of this development. MM20, MM21, MM46: The Plan should include site allocations – without this it threatens the certainty of other development plans in the County.
152mm	Vale of White Horse District Council	Support/Object	Sound – Yes Legal – Yes	A new Thames river crossing is proposed in VOWH district Plan and South Oxfordshire District Plan, and a safeguarded water reservoir in VOWH. VOWH is also proposing to safeguard land for a South Marcham bypass road- this partly falls within SRA 7. Proposals in SRA5 and SRA7 should not prejudice these. MM20: Continuing concern over the 'north/south' split and evidence behind this. MM27: Support M8, in particular provision to take into account allocated sites in local development plans.
162mm	Prof Philip Hutchinson DL	Not stated	Not stated	The present waste disposal site at Stanford in the Vale should be maintained in operation for the disposal of household waste by the public.
163mm	Aston, Cote, Shifford & Chimney Parish Council	Support broadly	Not stated	MM30: Agree Bampton/Clanfield area should be included as a Mineral safeguarding Area only. MM14: Continue to question the high extraction volumes significantly above recent levels.
164mm	Northampton Borough Council	Not stated	Not stated	No comments
165mm	Broadwell Parish Meeting	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
166mm	Ms. M Smith	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. (* see note below)
167mm	The Canal and River Trust	Not stated	Not stated	No comments
168mm	Glyn James	Support	Not stated	Support AGGROW Rep MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield

				area from Policy M3.
169mm	Dr. Stuart Evans	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
170mm	Richard Stallabras	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
171mm	The Society for the Protection of Bampton	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
172mm	Margaret Williams	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
173mm	Janet Rouse	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
174mm	The Hon Mrs Buchan	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
175mm	Mark Mostyn	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
176mm	Nicola Saward	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
177mm	Richard and Julie Smith	Support	Not stated	Support AGGROW Rep MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
178mm	Alec Jones	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
179mm	Martin Cobden	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
180mm	Robin Shuckburgh	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
181mm	Peter House	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
182mm	Mark Booty	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
183mm	Mark McArthur	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for

	Christie			sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
184mm	Mrs Gaynor Cooper	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
185mm	Lord Donoughmore	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
186mm	Robin & Veronica Baker	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
187mm	Tim Gray	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support Broadwell Parish Meeting Representation.
188mm	JP Jackson	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
189mm	Bryn Torrington	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
190mm	Dennis & Jane Walker	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
191mm	Grafton and Radcot Parish Meeting	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
192mm	Dr. Robert Landray	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
193mm	Countess of Donoughmore	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
194mm	Ian and Rosemary Smith	Support	Not stated	Support AGGROW Rep MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
195mm	Dr. Judith Hillier	Support	Not stated	Support AGGROW Rep MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
196mm	Dr RJ Preston	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
197mm	Carterton Town Council	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. ( <i>* see note below</i> )
198mm	Julian & Elizabeth Stevens	Support	Not stated	Support AGGROW Rep MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield

				area from Policy M3.
199mm	Nigel Johnson	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. (* see note below)
200mm	Keith A Glazier	Not stated	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. (* see note below) MM27: Support safeguarding of SRA1 for crushed rock.
201mm	Woodstock Town Council	Not stated	Not stated	(a) Explore the possibility of the Cotswold Line being used for transportation of sand and gravel extraction. (b) Reduce the number of trips to Slape Hill waste transfer station. (c) Support keeping extraction sites away from Blenheim Park (d) Woodstock Town Council is against Fracking
202mm	Kencot Parish Meeting	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. (* see note below)
203mm	Tessa Milne-Day	Object	Not stated	MM20: Do not support Bampton/Clanfield as an area for sand and gravel extraction. (* see note below)
204mm	Steve Dixon	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3.
205mm	Dr Judith Webb	Not stated	Not stated	MM21: Safest not to allow any extraction from the catchment of Cothill Fen SAC. There should also be catchment protection for non-designated Fen habitat.
206mm	Black Bourton Parish Council	Support	Not stated	MM20: Support Council's original stance on the exclusion of the Bampton/Clanfield area from Policy M3. Do not feel that plans should be changed at this late stage. (* see note below)
207mm	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Support	Sound – Yes Legal – Yes	MM56: Support modifications to Policy W9 in line with the agreed Statement of Common Ground.
208mm	Oxford Preservation Trust	Object	Sound – No Legal – Not stated	MM47, MM48: The protection for the Green Belt has been removed from paras 5.33 and 5.34 and moved to Policy C12, which is not adequate. Specific protection for the

				Green Belt should be moved back to 5.33 and 5.34.
209mm	Rosemary and Stephen Parrinder	Object	Sound – No Legal – No	MM14: There is no evidence for the 1.015mtpa extraction rate for sharp sand and gravel. Recent evidence is that demand is declining. MM20: Stop extraction in the west pending a fair balance between the north/south of the Thames. MM21: The inclusion of SRA6 is in direct conflict with Policy M4 – the area surrounding Eynsham should be removed from this. MM29: No confidence that Policy M10 will be effective.

*\* Note: Some respondents appear to have misunderstood the proposed modifications in thinking that the Bampton/Clanfield area is being proposed to be included as a Strategic Resource Area in policy M3, or that there is a current proposal for mineral working in this area. The County Council has sought to correct this misunderstanding when acknowledging these representations.*