

Division(s):

CABINET – 19 JUNE 2018

MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN: SITE ALLOCATIONS – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Report by Director for Planning & Place

Introduction

1. The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on 12 September 2017. The Core Strategy states that Part 2 of the Plan – Site Allocations will be prepared after its adoption. The eighth revision of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, approved by Cabinet on 19 December 2017, includes a programme for the Site Allocations Plan (Sites Plan). The first key stage is public consultation on site options (issues and options consultation), which is timetabled for June – July 2018. The target date for adoption of the Sites Plan is November 2020.

Initial Informal Stakeholder Consultation

2. The Proposed Site Assessment Methodology and the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report were published on 8 January 2018 for a six-week consultation. The consultation documents were published on the Council's website, with an invitation to comment, and relevant stakeholders were directly informed, including local community groups, parish and district councils, adjoining county / unitary councils, the minerals and waste industry, and statutory bodies.
3. Only 32 responses were received, 5 of which made no comment and a further 6 made comments on specific sites rather than on the consultation documents. The remaining 21 responses made comments on the proposed site assessment methodology and 7 also made comments on the draft sustainability appraisal scoping report. The respondents are listed in Annex 1.
4. The comments made on the two consultation documents are mainly on matters of relative detail rather than challenging fundamental principles. Some changes should be made to the site assessment methodology and the sustainability appraisal scoping report in the light of these comments. It is proposed that the revised site assessment methodology and sustainability appraisal scoping report be published on the Council's website alongside the Site Allocations Plan issues and options consultation document. This will provide a further and wider opportunity for public comment on these documents, in particular on the site assessment methodology.
5. The Proposed Site Assessment Methodology included a renewed 'call' for site nominations. This was circulated to all potentially interested minerals and waste operators, agents and landowners that we are aware of, to encourage

as wide as possible a range of site options to be put forward for assessment for possible inclusion in the Sites Plan.

6. There was a good response on sites for mineral working, with many previous nominations being re-confirmed and some additional sites being put forward. Nominations include potential sites for working of sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock (limestone). A list of nominated minerals sites is at Annex 3. Maps of the nominated sites can be viewed in the Members' Resource Centre.
7. The response on sites for waste management facilities was more mixed. Many of the previous nominations have either not been re-confirmed or are no longer available, with some having now been permitted, although some new sites have been nominated. Information on the nominated sites is still being checked, but it seems that the capacity of nominated sites is less than the requirements identified in the adopted Core Strategy. A list of nominated waste sites is at Annex 4. Maps of the nominated sites can be viewed in the Members' Resource Centre.

Issues and Options Consultation

8. In 2007, issues and options consultations were undertaken on waste sites (February 2007) and mineral sites (April 2007). At that time, it was intended that separate minerals and waste plan documents would be prepared in parallel with the Core Strategy. In the event it was decided to concentrate first on preparation of the Core Strategy and to prepare a combined minerals and waste sites plan afterwards. Whilst many of the site options put forward in 2007 and the responses made to the consultation remain relevant, much has changed over the 11 years since those consultations. Some sites are no longer being promoted and other sites have been nominated, and factors affecting potential sites will also have changed. It is therefore necessary to carry out a new consultation on issues and options as a first key stage in preparation of the Sites Plan, to give people a fresh opportunity to input to this plan at an early stage and gather up to date information on sites.
9. At this stage in the plan preparation process, no decisions are made as to the sites that should or should not be included in the plan or on any other policy matters. The issues and options consultation is about inviting views on what the plan should cover and what the issues the plan should address are, and establishing the options (in particular the potential minerals and waste sites) and seeking information that will help in the assessment of those options. The stages of making decisions on site proposals and policies, and consulting on these, will come further on in the process – the first being consultation on a draft plan in early 2019.

Sites for Mineral Working

10. The Core Strategy, paragraph 4.19 identifies the following additional requirements for provision for mineral working over the plan period 2014 – 2031:

- Sharp sand and gravel – 5.0 mt;
- Soft sand – 1.3 mt;
- Crushed rock – no additional requirement.

These figures take into account the existing permitted reserves as at the end of 2015 and permissions granted in 2016, although permitted reserves that are expected to be worked after the end of the plan period (i.e. after 2031) are not included.

11. These additional requirement figures have been updated to take into account more recent information on permitted reserves at the end of 2016 and planning permissions granted since the end of 2016. Again, permitted reserves that are expected to be worked after the end of the plan period (i.e. after 2031) are not included. The effect of this is to increase the additional requirement for sharp sand and gravel to approximately 6.0 mt; but there is no longer any additional requirement for soft sand. The calculation of these figures is set out in Annex 2. This shows the additional requirement for sharp sand and gravel sub-divided between northern and southern Oxfordshire in accordance with Core Strategy policy M3, i.e. 25% in northern and 75% in southern Oxfordshire:
 - Sharp sand and gravel in northern Oxfordshire – approximately 1.5 mt;
 - Sharp sand and gravel in southern Oxfordshire – approximately 4.5 mt.
12. A planning application for a new sharp sand and gravel extraction quarry at New Barn Farm, Cholsey, in southern Oxfordshire, is the subject of a resolution of the Council's Planning and Regulation Committee that, subject to completion of s106 and routing agreements, planning permission be granted. If permitted, this site is expected to provide 1.8 mt of sharp sand and gravel over the plan period (to 2031). This would reduce the overall additional requirement to approximately 3.7 mt and the additional requirement in southern Oxfordshire to approximately 2.3 mt.
13. The nominated mineral sites are listed in Annex 3. The locations of the nominated sites are shown on maps which can be viewed in the Members' Resource Centre. They are subdivided into sites for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock; and the sharp sand and gravel sites are further subdivided between northern and southern Oxfordshire. In addition, comments are provided on the location of each site in relation to the locational strategy in Core Strategy policy M3, in particular whether the site is within one of the specified strategic resource areas or would be an extension to an existing aggregate quarry; and also on certain other high-level constraints (SACs, AONBs and Scheduled Monuments). On this basis an initial screening is provided as to whether the site should go forward for more detailed assessment or is not suitable for further consideration. Of 62 sites nominated, only 14 are assessed as not suitable for further consideration at this stage, although one other site is partly not suitable. One other site does not need to be assessed as it has planning permission for mineral working and is therefore already included in the planned provision.
14. The Issues and Options consultation document should, however, include all nominated sites, including those screened as not suitable for further

consideration, with the reasons for this initial screening. This would enable comments to be made on whether the initial screening is considered correct.

15. The estimated mineral yield of each site is shown and these are totalled for each group of sites. This shows that for sharp sand and gravel the potential yield of the site nominations is 17 times the additional requirement in northern Oxfordshire and 5 times the additional requirement in southern Oxfordshire.
16. Based on current information, including permitted reserves at the end of 2016, it could be concluded that, as there is no apparent additional requirement for soft sand or crushed rock, there is no need for the nominated sites for these minerals to be considered any further and consequently that they should not be included in the issues and options consultation. However, the position could change over time as further quarrying takes place and the remaining permitted reserves change. The figures will be updated later this year, when sales and reserves data for 2017 becomes available; and the final version of the Site Allocations Plan should be based on the most recent available data.
17. It is considered that the site nominations for soft sand and crushed rock should be assessed for possible allocation in the Sites Plan in case there does prove to be some requirement for site allocations for these minerals in the future. The issues and options consultation document should therefore also include all nominated sites for soft sand and crushed rock.

Sites for Recycled & Secondary Aggregates and Waste Management

18. Core Strategy, policy M1 states that provision will be made for facilities to enable the production and/or supply of a minimum of 0.926 mtpa of recycled and secondary aggregates; and that suitable sites for facilities will be allocated in the Sites Plan. The Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2016, December 2017 records the total capacity of recycled and secondary aggregate facilities in Oxfordshire at the end of 2016 as just over 1 mtpa. However, 0.36 mtpa of this capacity is at facilities with a time-limited consent ending before end of the plan period (end of 2031). The Sites Plan should seek to make provision through site allocations to replace this temporary capacity. However, the provision figure in policy M1 is not a ceiling and if suitable sites are available more capacity can be allocated.
19. Core Strategy, policy W3 identifies a need for additional provision for non-hazardous waste recycling of at least 0.33 mtpa by the end of the plan period (end of 2031) and states that specific sites to meet this requirement (or any update in the Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Annual Monitoring Reports) will be allocated in the Sites Plan. It also states that other suitable sites for recycling, composting or food waste treatment (of non-hazardous and inert wastes) will also be allocated in the Sites Plan. As with sites for recycled and secondary aggregate facilities, there is no ceiling on the provision that may be made through site allocations.

20. Core Strategy, policy W6 states that no further provision will be made for disposal (i.e. landfill) of non-hazardous waste. It does not specify a requirement for inert waste disposal (landfill) but states that provision for permanent deposit to land or disposal to landfill of inert waste that cannot be recycled will be made at existing facilities and sites allocated in the Sites Plan; and that provision will be made for sites with capacity sufficient for Oxfordshire to be net self-sufficient in the management of inert waste.
21. Core Strategy, policy W7 on hazardous waste does not include any requirement for sites to be allocated in the Sites Plan. Core Strategy, Policy W9 on radioactive waste states that the Sites Plan will allocate sites to make specific provision for treatment and storage of radioactive waste at Harwell and Culham; and also for the disposal of low level radioactive waste at Harwell or Culham if this is demonstrated to be the most sustainable option.
22. The nominated waste sites are listed in Annex 4. The locations of the nominated sites are shown on maps which can be viewed in the Members' Resource Centre. They are subdivided into sites for non-hazardous waste recycling; composting/biological treatment; residual waste treatment; inert waste recycling (including recycled aggregates); waste water treatment; hazardous or radioactive waste management; and landfill. The estimated capacity of each site is shown.
23. In view of the more limited number of nominations for recycled & secondary aggregates and waste management, and the absence of a ceiling on the amount of provision to be made for recycled & secondary aggregates and for recycling, composting and food waste treatment, no screening of site nominations has been undertaken at this stage. It is proposed that screening against the locational strategy in Core Strategy policy W4 and high-level constraints should be carried out as part of the detailed assessment of site options. It is therefore considered that all the sites nominated for recycled & secondary aggregates and/or waste management developments should be included in the issues and options consultation document.

Consultation on Nominated Sites

24. The issues and options consultation is principally about gathering information that is relevant to and can be used in the assessment of site options, rather than about getting people's views on whether particular sites should or should not be allocated in the plan. There will be a further stage of consultation, early in 2019, when people will have the opportunity to give their views on a draft of the plan containing the Council's preferred sites following assessment. To help in this process, the consultation should ask the following questions about the site options.
25. Is the Council's initial screening of site nominations correct?
or
Are there valid reasons why any of the sites considered not suitable for further consideration should instead go forward to the detailed assessment stage, or vice versa?

26. To ensure some degree of certainty about delivery, should site allocations in the Sites Plan be drawn only from those sites that have been nominated by landowners or mineral/waste operators?
or
Should other sites, in addition to those nominated, be considered for possible allocation in the Sites Plan and, if so, why?
This question is particularly relevant to sites for recycled / secondary aggregate and waste management facilities, for which relatively few site nominations have been received.
27. In respect of each nominated site:
- What would be the impacts of the proposed minerals or waste development at this site? (including environmental, economic and social impacts, both negative and positive)
 - How could any negative impacts be mitigated to make the development acceptable?
 - Are there any other planning issues that affect this site?
 - What are the potential opportunities for restoration of the site? How should the site be restored and what benefits could be gained through restoration? (for mineral working and landfill sites).
- Similar questions to these were asked in the previous (2007) issues and options consultation.
28. Are there any other sites that the County Council should consider and assess for possible allocation for minerals or waste development in the Sites Plan? For each additional site put forward, a site nomination form should be completed – available on the Council’s website at:
Minerals: <https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/minerals-sites>
Waste: <https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/waste-sites>

Consultation on Other Issues about Allocation of Sites

29. In addition to consulting on site options, the issues and options consultation provides an opportunity to seek views on other issues relating to the allocation of sites. Suggested issues for inclusion in the consultation document are set out in Annex 5. For each issue there is a brief explanation of the issue followed by a suggested question or questions. It is intended that the explanations of the issues will be expanded in the published consultation document, to provide more detail where appropriate and to cross-refer to or quote from relevant parts of the Core Strategy and from national planning policy and guidance.

Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group

30. The Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group has met three times since work commenced on preparation of the Sites Plan. On 23 November 2017, the planned informal stakeholder consultation on site assessment methodology and sustainability appraisal scoping report were discussed; CAG members were subsequently provided with drafts of the consultation documents for

comment before they were published. On 28 March 2018, the CAG considered an initial report on feedback from that consultation, including site nominations. The site nominations were considered further at the CAG meeting on 21 May and there was discussion about the content of the issues and options consultation document, including the sites to be included and what other issues should be raised as consultation questions.

31. The discussion and views of members at the 21 May CAG meeting have informed this report. CAG members have asked to see a draft of the issues and options consultation document before it is finalised for publication.

Conclusion

32. There is some further work to be done on preparation of the issues and options consultation document for publication. I therefore propose that authority to approve the final document for publication, to include the site options listed in annexes 3 and 4 and the consultation questions at paragraph 25 – 28 and annex 5, be delegated to the Cabinet Member for Environment following consultation with other members of the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group.
33. The timetable for preparation of the Site Allocations Plan in the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme 2017 agreed by Cabinet on 19 December 2017 shows public consultation on issues and options being undertaken in June/July 2018. It has proved necessary to allow slightly longer for preparation of the consultation document and it is now proposed that it be published in July 2018. Because the consultation would then run through August, the consultation period should be longer than 6 weeks and be extended into September to compensate. I have looked at the work programme for preparation of the plan and consider that this extension would not cause delay to subsequent stages of the plan. It should still be possible for a draft of the plan to be prepared for and considered by Cabinet in December 2018, for public consultation in January/February 2019. The adoption target of November 2020 would therefore be unaffected.

Financial and Staff Implications

34. The Minerals & Waste Local Plan is included within the work priorities of the Communities Directorate and is in part being progressed within the existing mainstream budget for the Council's minerals and waste policy function. The budget has been increased by £50,000 this year to fund the abnormal costs of plan preparation (including the commissioning of specialist technical evidence studies). Further increases will be required in 2019/20 and 2020/21, in particular to provide the funding required to take the plan through examination and to adoption. There are no additional staff implications.

Equalities Implications

35. None have been specifically identified.

Legal Implications

36. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the County Council is required to prepare a minerals and waste local plan. The European Waste Framework Directive, 2008 (2008/98/EC), as transposed through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, requires waste planning authorities to put in place waste local plans. These requirements have in part been met by adoption of the Core Strategy and will be fully met by preparation and adoption of the Sites Plan.

Risk Management

37. If a new Minerals and Waste Local Plan, including both a Core Strategy and Sites Plan, is not adopted (for example, if the Sites Plan was abandoned or found to be “unsound” following examination), the County Council would not have a full, up to date and locally-determined land-use policy framework against which to determine applications for new mineral working and waste management developments in Oxfordshire. Such a diminution of local control over these operations would leave the authority with much less influence over the location of future minerals and waste operations and make it heavily reliant on the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy for Waste, which are considerably less comprehensive and detailed in their coverage of these matters.

RECOMMENDATION

38. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to authorise the Director for Planning & Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, to approve the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document for publication for public consultation, the document to include the site options listed in annexes 3 and 4 and the consultation questions at paragraphs 25 – 28 and annex 5 of this report, following consultation with the Minerals and Waste Cabinet Advisory Group.**

SUSAN HALLIWELL

Director for Planning & Place

Background papers:

- i. Responses to consultation on Proposed Site Assessment Methodology and Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, January 2018.
- ii. Site nominations for Mineral Working, Recycled & Secondary Aggregate Facilities and Waste Management Facilities submitted for possible inclusion in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Plan.

Background papers can be viewed in the Minerals and Waste Policy Team of the Communities Directorate, 4th Floor, County Hall, Oxford.

Contact Officer: Peter Day – Minerals and Waste Policy Team Leader
June 2018

Annex 1

Respondents to the Consultation on Proposed Site Assessment Methodology and Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, January/February 2018

Number	Respondent	Comments made on		
		Site Assessment Methodology	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	Specific Sites / Other only
001	Hanborough Parish Council			Yes
002	Bicester Town Council			
003	Doncaster Council			
004	Richard Betteridge			Yes
005	Brian Fearneyhough			Yes
006	Watlington Parish Council	Yes		
007	Surrey County Council			
008	Sue Cooper	Yes		
009	Anti Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)	Yes		
010	Office of Road & Rail			
011	Longworth Parish Council			Yes
012	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council	Yes	Yes	
013	Central Bedfordshire Council			
014	Oxfordshire County Council Rights of Way	Yes		
015	Anglian Water	Yes		
016	Highways England	Yes		
017	Dr Judith Webb			Yes
018	Environment Agency	Yes	Yes	
019	M&M Skip Hire Ltd	Yes		
020	McKenna Environmental Ltd	Yes		
021	Sheehan Haulage & Plant Hire Ltd	Yes		
022	Historic England	Yes	Yes	
023	Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities	Yes		
024	South Oxfordshire District Council	Yes	Yes	
025	FCC Environment	Yes		
026	Berks, Bucks & Oxon	Yes		

	Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)			
027	Ministry of Defence – Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Yes		
028	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd	Yes	Yes	
029	Bampton Parish Council			Yes
030	Tarmac	Yes		
031	Natural England	Yes	Yes	
032	Appleford Parish Council	Yes	Yes	

Annex 2

Aggregate provision required over plan period 2014 – 2031

	Sharp Sand & Gravel (million tonnes)	Soft Sand (million tonnes)	Crushed Rock (million tonnes)
A. Annual Provision (from policy M2 / LAA)	1.015	0.189	0.584
B. Requirement 2014 – 2031 (policy M2) (A x 18 years)	18.270	3.402	10.512
C. Sales in 2014, 2015 and 2016	2.058	0.690	2.690
D. Remaining requirement (B – C)	16.212	2.712	7.822
E. Permitted Reserves at end 2016	11.383	1.341	8.545
Ei. Permitted Reserves at end 2016 (North)	8.577	n/a	n/a
Eii. Permitted Reserves at end 2016 (South)	2.806	n/a	n/a
F. Permissions granted from 1 January 2017 to 14 May 2018	0.5	2.015	0.600
G. Total permitted reserves available (from beginning 2017) (E + F)	11.883	3.356	9.145
H. Estimated permitted reserves available to be worked during remainder of plan period (from beginning 2017 to end 2031)	10.733	3.301	9.145
Hi. Estimated permitted reserves available to be worked during remainder of plan period (from beginning 2017 to end 2031) (North)	7.427	n/a	n/a
Hii. Estimated permitted reserves available to be worked during remainder of plan period (from beginning 2017 to end 2031) (South)	3.306	n/a	n/a
I. Remaining requirement to be provided for in Plan (D – H)	5.479	0	0
li. Remaining requirement			

to be provided for in the Plan (North – 25%)	1.370	n/a	n/a
iii. Remaining requirement to be provided for in the Plan (South – 75%)	4.109	n/a	n/a

Notes:

1. Permitted Reserves at end 2016 (Row E) do not include approximately 1.0 million tonnes of sharp sand and gravel at Thrupp Farm Quarry, Radley, which were previously included. Under 'ROMP' procedure the planning permission for this site has gone into suspension, and is currently dormant, and the site cannot be worked until there has been a review of the planning conditions attached to the planning permission. Consequently, in accordance with national Planning Practice Guidance, the 'reserves' at this site should not currently be included as permitted reserves and they do not form part of the landbank.
2. Permissions granted since end 2016 in row F comprise:
 - Sharp sand & gravel
 - Extension to Sutton Courtenay (Bridge Farm) Quarry (0.5 million tonnes) – permission granted 01 June 2018
 - Soft sand:
 - Extension to Duns Tew Quarry (0.415 million tonnes) – permission granted 08 May 2017;
 - Extension to Bowling Green Farm Quarry (1.6 million tonnes) – permission granted 16 June 2017);
 - Crushed rock:
 - Extension to Bowling Green Farm Quarry (0.6 million tonnes) – permission granted 16 June 2017).
3. The County Council's Planning and Regulation Committee on 27 November 2017 resolved that subject to completion of S.106 and routeing agreements permission be granted for the extraction of 2.5 mt of sharp sand and gravel from a new quarry at New Barn Farm, Cholsey, of which it is expected 1.8 mt would be worked within the plan period (to 2031). Completion of these agreements is still outstanding and the planning permission has not yet been issued, therefore this new quarry is not included in the permissions granted from end 2016 to May 2018 (Row F).
4. 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 (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. The permitted reserves of sharp sand and gravel available to be worked during the plan period have therefore been reduced by 1.15 million tonnes, from 11.383 million tonnes (row G) to an estimated 10.233 million tonnes (row H).

5. The planning application for an extension to Bowling Green Farm Quarry submitted in 2016 and permitted in June 2017 is for the working of a total of 1.6 million tonnes of soft sand. Information in the application indicates this will be worked over 19 years from 2018 to 2036 at an average rate of working of approximately 0.08 million tonnes per annum. Mineral working at Bowling Green Farm Quarry is therefore expected to extend beyond the end of the plan period (2031); of the total of 1.5 million tonnes, it is estimated approximately 1.1 million tonnes will be worked within the plan period and approximately 0.5 million tonnes will remain to be worked after 2031.

The planning application for an extension to Duns Tew Quarry submitted in 2014 and permitted in May 2017 is for the working of a total of 0.415 million tonnes of soft sand. Information in the application indicates this will be worked over 16/17 years from 2017 to 2033/34 at an average rate of working of approximately 0.025 million tonnes per annum. Mineral working at Duns Tew Quarry is therefore expected to extend beyond the end of the plan period (2031); of the total of 0.415 million tonnes, it is estimated approximately 0.365 million tonnes will be worked within the plan period and approximately 0.05 million tonnes will remain to be worked after 2031.

The permitted reserves of soft sand available to be worked during the plan period have therefore been reduced by 0.55 million tonnes, from 3.356 million tonnes (row G) to an estimated 3.301 million tonnes (row H).

6. The figures at row E.i and E.ii and row H.i and H.ii for sharp sand and gravel represent the *current* distribution of permitted reserves.

Annex 3

Site Nominations – Potential Mineral Working Sites

Sharp Sand and Gravel					
Northern Oxfordshire – Sites within Strategic Resource Areas or Extension to Existing Quarry					
Site No.	Site Name	Location	Yield (mt)	Comments	Initial Screening
SG-04	Land at Mead Farm	Yarnton	0.2	Outside Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Cassington Quarry. Part of area not included in SRA to screen out likely significant effects on Oxford Meadows SAC.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-05	Land to the East of Cassington Quarry	Gosford	0.2	Outside Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Cassington Quarry. Part of area not included in SRA to screen out likely significant effects on Oxford Meadows SAC.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-08	Lower Road, Church Hanborough	Church Hanborough / Eynsham	2.5	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry or extension to Cassington Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-14	Stonehenge Farm	Northmoor	(1.6)	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Stanton Harcourt Quarry. Site has planning permission for mineral working.	Detailed assessment not needed – already permitted
SG-16	Land at Stonehouse Farm	Yarnton	1.1	Outside Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential	Not suitable for further

				extension to Cassington Quarry. Part of area not included in SRA to screen out likely significant effects on Oxford Meadows SAC.	consideration
SG-18	Land near Standlake	Standlake / Northmoor	0.5	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Stanton Harcourt Quarry	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-20	Land between Eynsham & Cassington	Eynsham / Cassington	1.5	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry or extension to Cassington Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-20a	Wharf Farm	Cassington	1.6	Partly in Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry or extension to Cassington Quarry. Part of site north of River Evenlode not included in SRA to screen out likely significant effects on Oxford Meadows SAC.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment (part south and west of River Evenlode only)
SG-20b	Land at Eynsham	Eynsham	1.9	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry or extension to Cassington Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-23	Windrush North, Gill Mill	Ducklington	0.8	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Gill Mill Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-27	Vicarage Pit, Cogges Lane	Stanton Harcourt / South Leigh	1.6	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-28	Guy Lakes North, adj	Stanton	0.4	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode	Site should go

	B4449	Harcourt		Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry in conjunction with SG-27.	forward for detailed assessment
SG-29	Sutton Farm, Sutton	Stanton Harcourt	5.0	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-30	Home Farm, Brighthampton	Standlake	0.4	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry or satellite extension to Gill Mill Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-31	Land east of Sutton	Stanton Harcourt	9.0	Thames. Lower Windrush & Evenlode Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-63	Finmere Quarry	Finmere	0.3	Outside SRAs. Potential extension to Finmere Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
Total potential yield from sites in North Oxfordshire to be moved on to detailed assessment			25.5	(not including Stonehenge Farm, 1.6 mt – included in existing permitted reserves)	
Southern Oxfordshire – Sites within Strategic Resource Areas or Extension to Existing Quarry					
Site No.	Site Name	Location	Yield (mt)	Comments	Initial Screening
SG-03	Land adjacent to Benson Marina	Benson	0.1	Partly in Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Not an extension to a quarry. Very small to be a free-standing quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-09 and SG-	Land north of Drayton St Leonard and Berinsfield	Drayton St Leonard /	6.0	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for

59	and land at Stadhampton	Stadhampton			detailed assessment
SG-11 and SG-65	Land north east of Sonning Eye (Caversham phases 'D' & 'E')	Eye and Dunsden	3.5	Thames Valley Caversham to Shiplake SRA. Potential extensions to Caversham Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-13	Land at Shillingford	Warborough / Dorchester	5.3	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry. Substantially constrained by Scheduled Monuments and non-designated assets of equal significance.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-17	Land at Culham	Clifton Hampden	2.5	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry. Scheduled Monument reduces potential yield from 4.0 to 2.5 mt. Planning permission refused 2017 but does not rule out consideration for Sites Plan.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-19	Bridge Farm	Sutton Courtenay / Appleford	0.5	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Sutton Courtenay Quarry. Planning permission 'granted' 2017 subject to legal agreements.	Site should go forward detailed assessment
SG-33	Land south of Wallingford, New Barn Farm	Cholsey	3.9	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry. Planning permission 'granted' 2017 for part of site (2.5 mt) subject to legal agreements.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-41	N of Lower Radley	Radley	1.5	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-42	Nuneham Courtenay	Nuneham Courtenay	4.4	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed

					assessment
SG-60	White Cross Farm	Wallingford	0.5	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential new quarry to create proposed marina.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-62	Appleford	Didcot	1.1	Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Sutton Courtenay Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SG-67	Sutton Wick Quarry	Sutton Wick	0.2	Outside Thames & Lower Thame Valleys SRA. Potential extension to Sutton Wick Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
Total potential yield from sites in South Oxfordshire to be moved on to detailed assessment			24.2		
Sharp Sand and Gravel – Sites outside Strategic Resource Areas and not Extension to Existing Quarry					
Site No.	Site Name	Location	Yield (mt)	Comments	Initial Screening
SG-12	Land south of Chazey Wood	Mapledurham	3.0	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-15	Dairy Farm	Clanfield	5.4	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-36	Land at Friars Farm	Stanton Harcourt / South Leigh	0.4	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-37	Land at Grandpont and South Hinksey	Grandpont, Oxford / South	1.5	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry.	Not suitable for further consideration

		Hinksey			
SG-58	Chestlion Farm	Clanfield	5	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-58a	Manor Farm	Clanfield	12	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry.	Not suitable for further consideration
SG-61	Mains Motors	Ewelme	n/k	Outside SRAs. Not an extension to an existing quarry. Within Chilterns AONB.	Not suitable for further consideration
Soft Sand – Sites within Strategic Resource Areas or Extension to Existing Quarry					
Site No.	Site Name	Location	Yield (mt)	Comments	Initial Screening
SS-03	Hatford Quarry South extension	Stanford in the Vale	1.0	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-04	Land at Pinewoods Road	Longworth	1.1	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential new quarry. Planning permission refused 2012 but does not rule out consideration for Sites Plan.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-05	Land at Kingston Bagpuize	Frilford	0.5	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-07	Home Farm	Shellingford	0.5	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-08	Shellingford Quarry -	Shellingford	2.7	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential	Site should go

	western extension			extension to Shellingford Quarry.	forward for detailed assessment
SS-12	Land at Chinham Farm (Chinham Hill)	Stanford in the Vale	0.3	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential extension to Bowling Green Farm Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-15	Hatford Quarry North extension	Hatford	0.5	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-16	Hatford Quarry (Stanford Extension)	Stanford in the Vale	3.5	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-17	Land north and south of A420 near Fyfield and Tubney (replaces previous nomination SS-01 Tubworth Barn)	Tubney	2.0	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
SS-18	Hatford Quarry West extension	Hatford	0.2	Corallian Ridge SRA. Potential extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
Total potential yield from sites to be moved on to detailed assessment			12.3		
Crushed Rock – Sites within Strategic Resource Areas or Extension to Existing Quarry					
Site No.	Site Name	Location	Yield (mt)	Comments	Initial Screening
CR-03	South extension to Rollright Quarry	Rollright	0.6	Outside SRAs. Potential extension to Rollright Quarry. Within Cotswolds	Not suitable for further

				AONB.	consideration
CR-07	Adjacent to Whitehill Quarry	Burford	4.5	Burford – South of A40 SRA. Potential new quarry or extension to Whitehill Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-08	Castle Barn Quarry	Sarsden	0.1	Outside SRAs. Potential extension to Castle Barn Quarry. Within Cotswolds AONB.	Not suitable for further consideration
CR-09	Great Tew Estate Quarry	Great Tew	0.1	Outside SRAs. Potential extension to Great Tew Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-10	Burford Quarry SW extension	Burford	1.6	Burford – South of A40 SRA. Potential extension to Burford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-11	Hatford North Extension	Hatford	1.5	East / South East of Faringdon SRA. Extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-12	Land at Chinham Farm (Chinham Hill)	Stanford in the Vale	0.1	East / South East of Faringdon SRA. Extension to Bowling Green Farm Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-13	Dewars Farm Quarry east extension	Middleton Stoney / Ardley	3.6	North west of Bicester SRA. Potential extension to Dewars Farm Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-15	Land off the B4100, Baynards Green	Ardley / Fritwell	4.5	North west of Bicester SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment

CR-16	Shellingford Quarry - western extension	Shellingford	4.6	East / South East of Faringdon SRA. Extension to Shellingford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-17	Hatford (south extension)	Hatford	1.0	East / South East of Faringdon SRA. Extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-18	Shipton on Cherwell Quarry	Shipton on Cherwell	1.8	Outside SRAs. Potential extension to Shipton on Cherwell Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-19	Dewars Farm Quarry south extension	Middleton Stoney	2.2	North west of Bicester SRA. Potential extension to Dewars Farm Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-20	Land at Burford Road	Brize Norton	3.0	Burford – South of A40 SRA. Potential new quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-21	Hatford Quarry (Stanford Extension)	Stanford in the Vale	2.0	East / South East of Faringdon SRA. Extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
CR-22	Hatford Quarry West extension	Stanford in the Vale	1.2	East / South East of Faringdon SRA. Extension to Hatford Quarry.	Site should go forward for detailed assessment
Total potential yield from sites to be moved on to detailed assessment			32.4		

Other Sites					
Site No.	Site Name	Location	Yield (mt)	Comments	Initial Screening
SG-64	Land at Thrupp Lane, Radley	Radley	1 0 Pulverised Fuel Ash	Outside SRAs. Not for extraction of primary aggregate. No policy in Core Strategy on re-working of PFA from restored mineral workings.	Not suitable for further consideration

Annex 4

Site Nominations – Potential Sites for Recycled & Secondary Aggregates and Waste Management Facilities

Waste Site Nominations for Non-Hazardous Waste Recycling				
Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
002	Prospect Farm, Chilton (Raymond Brown)	17,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Dual facility – non-hazardous and inert waste recycling, total capacity 60,000 tpa (see also row 30). Site is in AONB.
003Aii	Dix Pit, Stanton Harcourt (FCC)	100,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Waste Transfer Station and HWRC currently permitted to 2028/2029 – linked with 030Ai
009	Worton Farm Areas C & D, Yarnton (M&M Skips)	75,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Extensions to Skip Waste Recycling Facility. Dual facility – non-hazardous and CDE waste recycling. Site is in Green Belt.
010Ai	Sutton Courtenay Landfill Area 1 (FCC)	160,000	Previous nomination carried forward	MRF 160,000tpa. Current permission expires 2030.
010Bi	Sutton Courtenay Landfill Area 2 (FCC)	50,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Household, Commercial and Industrial waste recycling and transfer – linked with 010Aii
011Aii	Finmere Quarry (AT Contracting)	150,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Retention of MRF – linked with 011Ai, 011Aiii & 011Aiv
013Ai	Ewelme 2 (Grundon)	15,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Recycling road sweepings - currently permitted for 12 years – linked with 013Ai & 013Aiii
013Aii	Ewelme 2 (Grundon)	50,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Non-hazardous waste recycling, preparation for recovery and transfer - currently permitted for 12 years – linked with 013Aii & 013Aiii
023	Alkerton landfill and Civic Amenity (Sita)	50,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Poorly located for road access and adjoins residential properties in part
180	Elmwood Farm, Black Bourton	13,600	Previous nomination	Recycling of waste wood to produce wood chip.

	(Cotswold Wood Fuels)		carried forward	
236	Dix Pit Complex (ConRec)	35,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Recycling of skip waste.
250	Broughton Poggs Business Park (Recycle-lite)	50,000	Previous nomination carried forward	MRF for mixed wastes
261	The Marshes, Knightsbridge Farm, Yarnton (Sheehan)	35,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Non-hazardous & CDE skip waste recycling. Appeal dismissed 2015 on Green Belt grounds.
282	Field Barn Farm, near Wantage (J James)	20,000	New nomination	Wood recycling & recovery (non-hazardous)
286i	Wally Corner, Berinsfield (FCC)	50,000	New nomination	Household and C&I waste recycling & transfer – part of composite proposal – linked with 286ii

Waste Site Nominations for Composting / Biological Treatment

Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
010Aii	Sutton Courtenay Landfill Area 1 (FCC)	75,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Green Waste Composting 75,000tpa. Current permission expires 2030.
226	Dewars Farm, Ardley (Summerleaze)	45,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Anaerobic Digestion. Location within Dewars Farm Quarry to be decided
249A & 249B	High Cogges Farm, Witney (High Cogges Farm Ptnrs)	10,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Anaerobic digestion of food and farm waste. Two alternative sites; both are green field

Waste Site Nominations for Residual Waste Treatment

Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
010C	Sutton Courtenay Landfill Area 3 (FCC)	200,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Waste Treatment / Biomass Treatment / Waste to Energy – Household, C&I, Wood Waste, Hazardous Waste.

011Aiv	Finmere Quarry (AT Contracting)	150,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Waste treatment facility (EFW) – linked with 011Ai, 011Aii & 011Aiii.
023	Alkerton landfill and Civic Amenity (Sita)	150,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Poorly located for road access and adjoins residential properties in part.
103	Lakeside Industrial Estate, Standlake (Ethos Recycling)	150,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site has benefit of CLEUD in part.
138	Woodside, Old London Road, Ewelme (Main)	150,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Within AONB.
217	Culham No.4 site, Clifton Hampden (Leda)	200,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site is in Green Belt.
Waste Site Nominations for Inert Waste Recycling (including recycled aggregates)				
Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
002	Prospect Farm, Chilton (Raymond Brown)	43,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Dual facility – non-hazardous and inert waste recycling, total capacity 60,000 tpa Site is in AONB.
005	Playhatch Quarry, Playhatch (Grabloader)	100,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Existing capacity 70,000 tpa
008B	New Wintles Farm, Eynsham (Einig)	200,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Current permission limited to 170,000 tpa
009	Worton Farm Areas C & D, Yarnton (M&M Skips)	75,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Extensions to Skip Waste Recycling Facility. Dual facility – non-hazardous and CDE waste recycling. Site is in Green Belt.
009A	Worton Farm (Cresswell Field) Area A, Yarnton (M&M Skips)	250,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site is in Green Belt. Increase of 200,000 tpa to existing capacity.
011Aiii	Finmere Quarry (AT Contracting)	150,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Part of composite nomination – linked with 011Ai, 011Aii & 011Aiv
013Aiii	Ewelme 2 (Grundon)	10,000	New nomination at previous nomination	C&D waste recycling - currently permitted for 12 years – linked with 013Ai & 013Aii

018	Holloway Farm, Waterstock/Milton Common (Sheehan)	100,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site is in Green Belt and is green Field
020B	Faringdon Quarry, Faringdon (Grundon)	10,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Currently has temporary permission for 8 years.
026	Whitehill Quarry, Burford (Smiths)	100,000	Previous nomination carried forward	
030Ai	Shipton on Cherwell Quarry (Shipton Ltd)	Not known	New nomination at previous nomination	Inert waste recycling – part of composite proposal - linked with 030Aii
103	Lakeside Industrial Estate, Standlake (Ethos Recycling)	270,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site has benefit of CLEUD in part.
225	Cedars Lane, Benson (Main)	30,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site is green Field.
229	Shellingford Quarry (Earthline)	30,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Currently permitted to 2021
236	Dix Pit Complex (Sheehan)	175,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site subject to temporary planning permission to 2029; maximum permitted input 100,000 tpa
245	Challow Marsh Farm, West Challow (McDowell)	20,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site is green field.
248	Thrupp Lane, Radley (Tuckwell)	100,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site is in Green Belt.
262	Lower Heath Farm, Cottisford (Direct Farm Eggs)	Not known	Previous nomination carried forward	Land and buildings at farm site; former egg production unit.
265	Woodeaton Quarry, Woodeaton (Mckenna)	40,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Linked to permitted infill of quarry with inert waste. Site is in Green Belt
274	Moor End Farm, Thame (Einig)	130,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Current temporary permission requires restoration by 31/12/2022.
276	Oday Hill, Sutton Wick (Tuckwell)	100,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Site subject to planning permission requiring restoration by 31/12/2028.
278	Adj B4100 (east of Green Farm), Baynards Green (Einig)	200,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Inert waste recycling. Site is largely green field.
279	Rear of Ford Garage, Rycote	70,000	Previous nomination	CDE waste recycling. Site is green field.

	Lane, Thame (Einig)		carried forward	
280	Oxford Shooting School, Enstone Airfield (Einig)	110,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Currently has permission to 2021.
283i	Hatford Quarry, Stanford Extension (Hatford Quarry Ltd)	Not known	New nomination	CDE waste recycling – part of composite proposal - linked with 283ii
286ii	Wally Corner, Berinsfield (FCC)	50,000	New nomination	C&D waste recycling & transfer – part of composite proposal – linked with 286i
Waste Site Nominations for Waste Water Treatment				
Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
232	Banbury Sewage Treatment Works (TWA)	1,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Existing sewage treatment works.
233	Witney Sewage Treatment Works (TWA)	1,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Existing sewage treatment works.
234	Didcot Sewage Treatment Works (TWA)	1,000	Previous nomination carried forward	Existing sewage treatment works.
Waste Site Nominations for Hazardous or Radioactive Wastes				
Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
010Bii	Sutton Courtenay Landfill Area 2 (FCC)	50,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Hazardous waste recycling and transfer – linked with 010Ai
152	Ewelme 1 (Grundon)	5,000	New nomination at previous nomination	Hazardous waste recycling and preparation for recovery
285	Harwell Nuclear Licence Site, Harwell Campus (NDA & Magnox)	Not known	New nomination	Intermediate & low-level radioactive waste management

Waste Site Nominations for Landfill

Site No.	Site Name	Capacity (tonnes per annum)	Previous or New Nomination	Comments
003Ai	Dix Pit, Stanton Harcourt (FCC)	1,000,000 cu.m	New nomination at previous nomination	Inert waste landfill. Currently permitted to 2028 - linked with 030Aii
011Ai	Finmere Quarry (AT Contracting)	Not known	New nomination at previous nomination	Landfill extension – linked with 011Aii, 011Aiii & 011Aiv
030Aii	Shipton on Cherwell Quarry (Shipton Ltd)	200,000 cu.m	New nomination at previous nomination	Inert waste infill to restore quarry – part of composite proposal - linked with 030Ai
222	Land north of Wroxton Fields Quarry (Peter Bennie Ltd)	500,000 cu.m.	Previous nomination carried forward	Inert waste infill to restore quarry
224	Ambrose Quarry, Ewelme (Grundon)	125,000 cu.m.	Previous nomination carried forward	Inert waste infill to restore quarry. Infill at 25,000 cu.m. a year for 5 years
230	Chinham Farm (Hills)	300,000 cu.m.	Previous nomination carried forward	Inert waste infill to restore quarry.
277	Land adjacent the B480 near Chalgrove (Einig)	20,000 cu.m.	Previous nomination carried forward	Inert waste infill for 2 years.
283ii	Hatford Quarry, Stanford Extension (Hatford Quarry Ltd)	3,500,000 cu.m	New nomination	CDE waste infill to restore quarry – part of composite proposal - linked with 283i

Annex 5

Consultation Questions on Other Issues about Allocation of Sites

Issue 1 Level of provision and contingency for mineral working

Question 1

a) Should the plan make only the arithmetic minimum provision in site allocations that is required to meet the additional requirements for mineral working in Annex 2?

or

b) Should provision in allocations also take into account the need to ensure there is sufficient production capacity available throughout the plan period to enable an adequate level of supply (recognising that reserves are not being equally distributed between quarries and quarries have differing levels of output)?

Question 2

a) Should some contingency be added to the additional requirements for mineral working site provision to give flexibility in case sites cannot be brought forward or cannot deliver the expected yield?

if yes,

b) What level of contingency provision would it be appropriate to add: 10%, 20%, 25%, other?

Issue 2 Provision for soft sand and crushed rock

Given that there is uncertainty over whether any site provision is needed for soft sand and crushed rock and that any additional requirement is likely to be towards the end of the plan period:

Question 3

a) Should specific sites be allocated for soft sand and crushed rock?

or

b) Should provision be made in some other way, such as by broader areas of search?

if yes,

c) Which areas should be included in areas of search?

Issue 3 Site size and extensions or new sites for mineral working

There is usually a minimum size of site (by mineral yield) below which mineral working is unlikely to be economic. In addition, the potential impact of a larger number of small sites is likely to differ from that of a smaller number of large sites, including that more communities are likely to be affected.

Question 4

Should a minimum site size (by mineral yield) be applied in the allocation of sites for mineral working?

Core Strategy policy M4 b) says that allocation of sites in the Site Allocations Plan should take into account 'priority for extension of existing quarries, where environmentally acceptable, before working new sites'.

Question 5

To what extent should this priority for extensions be applied in the allocation of sites for: sharp sand and gravel; soft sand; and crushed rock; taking into account other factors, including ensuring sufficient production capacity for these minerals throughout the plan period?

Issue 4 Restoration of mineral working sites

Core Strategy policy M4 c) says that allocation of sites in the Site Allocations Plan should take into account 'potential for restoration and after-use and for achieving the restoration objectives of the Plan in accordance with policy M10'.

Question 6

What weight should be given to the achievement of the restoration objectives of the Core Strategy relative to other factors in the allocation of sites for mineral working?

Question 7

- a) Should the Sites Plan specify how sites allocated for mineral working are to be restored?
- if yes,
- b) How detailed should the specified restoration requirements be?

Issue 5 Sites already permitted for mineral working

Sites that already have planning permission for aggregate mineral working form part of the overall provision for the plan period (and in some cases beyond). If any of these permissions were 'lost' they would have to be replaced by equivalent provision elsewhere.

Question 8

Should areas of land that already have planning permission for mineral extraction also be 'allocated' in the Sites Plan?

Issue 6 Provision for recycling / secondary aggregates and waste management

Waste management facilities come in a range of sizes, both in terms of site area and throughput. This is reflected in the spatial strategy in policy W4 of the Core Strategy, which specifies areas around the large towns where strategic (over 50,000 tpa) and non-strategic (20,000 – 25,000 tpa) facilities should be located but which says smaller scale facilities can be located more widely, including in more rural areas.

Question 9

- a) Should there be a size threshold for sites allocated in the Sites Plan?
- b) Should the Sites Plan only allocate sites for strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities? (Policy W3 refers only to sites for strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities being allocated.)

Relatively few site nominations have been received for facilities.

Question 10

Should the County Council seek to identify other sites for recycling / secondary aggregate and waste management facilities (in addition to those that have been nominated)?

Many types of waste management facilities, particularly for recycling, that are normally accommodated inside buildings can be acceptably located on industrial estates alongside other industrial and commercial premises.

Question 11

- a) Should the sites plan allocate industrial estates and other broad areas of employment land where waste management facilities could potentially be located?
if yes,
- b) Should this be as well as or instead of the allocation of specific sites?

Issue 7 Provision for inert waste disposal

Core Strategy policy W6 says sites for permanent deposit to land or disposal to landfill of inert waste will be allocated in the Sites Plan. This policy also says priority will be given to the use of inert waste that cannot be recycled as infill for restoration of active or unrestored quarries; and deposit or disposal of inert waste on land will not otherwise be permitted unless there would be overall environmental benefit.

Question 12

- a) Should the Site Allocations Plan only allocate active or unrestored quarries as sites for deposit or disposal of inert waste?
or
- b) Should it also allocate other sites where deposit or disposal of inert waste on land would result in overall environmental benefit?

Issue 8 Mineral safeguarding

Policy 8 of the Core Strategy safeguards mineral resources through the identification of mineral safeguarding areas. These are shown on the Policies Map accompanying the adopted plan. They are limited to the strategic resource areas in policy M3 and certain other large areas of sharp sand and gravel resource. There are other areas of

mineral resource within Oxfordshire where potentially workable minerals may exist but which are not safeguarded.

Question 13

a) Should the mineral safeguarding areas be amended to include other areas of mineral resource?

if yes,

b) Which other areas of mineral resource should be included within mineral safeguarding areas?

Core strategy policy M9 safeguards aggregate rail depot sites and says that other mineral infrastructure sites to be safeguarded will be defined in the Sites Plan.

Question 14

Which other mineral infrastructure sites should be defined to be safeguarded?

Issue 9 Waste site safeguarding

Core Strategy policy W11 safeguards existing waste management sites, as listed in Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy, pending adoption of the Sites Plan. It is for the Sites Plan to finalise which sites should be safeguarded for the long term.

Question 15

a) Are there any waste sites in Core Strategy Appendix 2 that should not be safeguarded?

b) Are there any waste sites not included in Core Strategy Appendix 2 that should be safeguarded?

c) What are the reasons for these deletions from or additions to the list of safeguarded waste sites?

Issue 10 – Any other matters the plan should cover

This consultation comes under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). This Regulation requires the local planning authority to notify specific bodies and other appropriate bodies and persons of the subject of the proposed local plan and invite them to make representations about what the plan ought to contain.

Question 16

Is there anything else that the proposed Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Site Allocations Plan should contain?