**Annex 1 – Review of Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste
Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy**

Introduction

1. The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy (Core Strategy) was adopted in September 2017.

2. The Plan covers the administrative area Oxfordshire County Council.

3. The Plan is based upon the principle of ensuring an adequate and steady supply of minerals; and sustainable management of waste. It contains policies to enable minerals and waste decision making and covers the period to the end of 2031.

4. The effectiveness of the policies in the Core Strategy has been reviewed through Monitoring Reports on an annual basis from 2018.

5. The annual Authority Monitoring Reports (AMRs) can be viewed here:

   https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/minerals-and-waste-policy/new-minerals-and-waste-plan

6. Regulation 10A of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, state that a local planning authority must review a local development document within five years of the adoption of the local plan. This is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which requires that Local Plans should be reviewed to assess whether they require updating at least once every five years.

7. A recent update to the Planning Practice Guidance suggests that if a local planning authority decides not to update their policies, they should publish the reasons within 5 years of the adoption date of the plan. The adoption of such a statement must be carried out in accordance with section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

8. The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) for the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan part 2 – Sites Allocations Document (Site Allocation Document), shows the adoption of the Sites Plan as being after the review of the Core Strategy is due. The Core Strategy is therefore required to be reviewed prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations Document, and it is sensible to carry out the review before the next round of consultation on the Sites Plan.

9. The purpose of this report is therefore to review the effectiveness of the policies of the Plan, provide an assessment on the delivery of allocated sites to date, review and consider what national and regional policy may have an impact on

the delivery of the Plan and summarise what policies, if any, need to be updated.

10. The outcomes of the report will be subject to public consultation, and a final review will be produced taking into account the consultation responses.

Structure of this review

11. This review comprises the following sections:

- Effectiveness of Plan Policies – outlines the findings of the review of the annual AMRs in order to provide information since the adoption of the Core Strategy against each of the policies within the Plan. A Monitoring RAG (Red, Amber and Green) status is provided for each policy.
- Issues relating to the use of policies – this highlights any issues in relation to the application of the policies in the core strategy, and whether there is a need to revise those policies.
- Effects of updates to planning legislation and guidance – this looks at any changes to the national policy context and whether that has led to a need to update the Core Strategy.
- Conclusion and next steps – outline the summary of findings and a proposed way forward in relation to the need to update the Core Strategy.

Effectiveness of Plan Policies (review of Monitoring Reports)

12. This section considers each of the 33 (10 Minerals, 11 Waste and 12 Common Core) policies contained within the Core Strategy in turn. This considers the monitoring indicators and triggers for each policy.

13. Where relevant to the indicator, contextual information is provided on how the statistics compare to the total number of applications or permissions since September 2017 which are:
- Oxfordshire County Council has determined 121 applications;
- A total of 107 permissions have been granted (52 Minerals / 55 Waste); and
- A total of 12 new development sites have been permitted (3 Minerals / 9 Waste)

14. Due to the delay in the production of the MHCLG survey, the production of the AMR for 2019 has been delayed. As a result, there is at this stage only one full year AMR that has been published since the adoption of the plan. This review has been based on data from that one AMR.

15. A RAG (Red, Amber and Green) Monitoring status is provided for each policy and is determined as follows:

Monitoring shows no issues	Green
Monitoring shows some issues to be Reviewed	Amber
Monitoring shows issues to be reviewed	Red

Policy M1: Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

16. Monitoring indicators
   - Permissions granted for recycled and secondary aggregates.
   - Capacity of recycled and secondary aggregate supply facilities.
   - Annual production of recycled and secondary aggregate.
   - Proportion of total aggregate supply from secondary and recycled aggregates.

17. Monitoring triggers (threshold) for policy review:
   - Processing capacity falling below target capacity.
   - Proportion of total aggregate supply from secondary and recycled aggregate changes +/- 10%.
   - Sites for secondary and recycled aggregate permitted not in accordance with policies W4, W5 and C1 – C12.

   The target capacity is 0.926 mtpa.

18. Monitoring Results

   Indicators

19. There has been one permission granted for facilities producing secondary and recycled aggregates with a capacity of 50,000tpa, giving an operational capacity of 1.2mtpa across the County. There are also facilities with planning permission that are not currently operating which brings the total capacity up to 1.3mtpa.

20. The annual production of recycled and secondary aggregates in 2018 was 406,000t which was a decrease of 11,000 on the 2017 figure of 417,000. This is just over a third of the total capacity for the production of recycled and secondary aggregates.

21. In Oxfordshire in 2018, recorded sales of secondary and recycled were approximately 18.5% of the total sales of aggregates produced in Oxfordshire, which was slightly lower than the previous year which was 19% of total sales.

   Triggers

22. The processing capacity has not fallen below the target capacity. It is approximately 0.4mt above the target capacity.

23. The proportion of total aggregate supply has not changed by +/- 10%. The change from 2017 to 2018 from secondary and recycled aggregates decreased by only 0.5% from 2017 to 2018.

24. There have been no sites for secondary and recycled aggregate allocated/permitted not in accordance with policies W4, W5 and C1-C12.

RAG Monitoring status

25. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated. There is some indication that the sales of recycled and secondary aggregate have dropped slightly, but the capacity for further recycling has been provided by the plan.

Green

Policy M2: Provision for Working Aggregate Minerals

26. Monitoring indicators
    - Permissions granted for working of land won aggregate mineral aggregates.
    - Permitted reserves for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock.
    - Production capacity for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock split between northern Oxfordshire and southern Oxfordshire.
    - Landbanks of permitted reserves for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock.
    - Annual sales of sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock extracted in Oxfordshire.

27. Monitoring triggers (threshold) for policy review
    - One site allocated that does not fall within the locations specified
    - Production capacity increases proportionally in northern Oxfordshire for two consecutive years
    - Production capacity in southern Oxfordshire above 60%.

28. Monitoring Results

Indicators

29. 3,000,000t of aggregate extraction was permitted in 2018. This was an increase of 385,000t in 2017.

30. Permitted reserves for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock at 31.12.18 were:

- Sharp sand and gravel 12.925mt
- Soft sand   3.091mt
- Crushed Rock   7.718mt

31. Between 2017 and 2018, there was a 19.6% increase in permitted reserves of sharp sand and gravel. However, over the same period there was a 0.45% decrease in soft sand and a 17.2% decrease in crushed rock.

32. Production capacity for aggregates minerals in 2018 was:
- Sharp Sand and Gravel   1.624mtpa
- Soft Sand   0.390mtpa
- Crushed Rock   1.700mtpa

33. Landbanks of permitted reserves for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock:
- Sharp sand and gravel 3.091mt   12.7 years
- Soft Sand   0.243mt   12.7 years
- Crushed Rock   7.718mt   9.9 years

34. The landbank for Sharp Sand and Gravel at the end of 2018 were both above the 7 year landbanks required in the NPPF. The landbank for crushed rock however is 9.9 years and this falls just below the 10-year NPPF requirement.

Mineral Type	2018 (million tonnes)	2017 (million tonnes)	2016 (million tonnes)
Sharp Sand and Gravel	0.796	0.703	0.651
Soft Sand	0.252	0.251	0.227
Crushed rock	0.751	0.867	0.715

35. Annual sales of both sharp sand and gravel, and soft sand have increased each year over the last three years. Annual sales of crushed rock have been declined since 2017, however there has been a rise since 2016.

Triggers

36. The targets have been achieved for sharp sand and gravel, and for soft sand. No triggers have been met and the landbanks are well above the necessary levels.

37. The land bank for crushed rock has dropped below 10 years and this has triggered the need for a review, as the permitted reserve fell to below 10% above the landbank target. Indeed, it is now also below the NPPF requirement of 10 years. This is due to the increase in the LAA 2019 provision requirements. This has seen the landbank decrease from 13 years in 2017 to 9.9 years in 2018.

RAG Monitoring status

38. One of the indicators has been triggered for crushed rock. If no additional allocations are made, policy M5 of the Core Strategy would enable planning permissions to be granted if the locational strategy in policy M3 is met. There is a mechanism for approvals to come forward to meet the landbank deficit, however relying on Policy M5 alone, has not resulted in sufficient planning permission coming forward and therefore the Plan does not meet the requirements of the NPPF.

Red

Policy M3: Principal locations for working aggregates minerals

39. Monitoring indicators
- Sites allocated for aggregates minerals.
- Production capacity for sharp sand and gravel, soft sand and crushed rock split between northern Oxfordshire and southern Oxfordshire

40. Monitoring triggers (threshold) for policy review
- One site allocated that does not fall within the locations specified.
- Production capacity increases proportionally in northern Oxfordshire for two consecutive years.
- Production capacity in southern Oxfordshire above 60%.

41. Monitoring Results

Indicators

42. At this stage no sites have been allocated for aggregates minerals.

43. Production capacity remains unevenly split between northern Oxfordshire (58%) and southern Oxfordshire (42%). It is an aim of the Core Strategy to achieve a balanced distribution of production capacity by the end of the plan period (2031). This will be considered through the production of the Site Allocations Plan.

Triggers

44. No site allocations have been made, the northern production capacity has not increased proportionally, and the production capacity in southern Oxfordshire is at 42%. Therefore, no triggers have been activated.

RAG Monitoring status

45. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated. There is still some inequality between provision in northern and southern, but that will be addressed in the Site Allocations Document.

Policy M4: Sites for working aggregates minerals

46. Monitoring indicators
   - Sites allocated for aggregates minerals.

47. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
   - One site allocated that does not fall within the locations specified
   - Production capacity increases proportionally in northern Oxfordshire for two consecutive years
   - Production capacity in southern Oxfordshire above 60%.

48. Monitoring Results

   Indicators

49. There have been no allocations made at this stage.

   Triggers

50. No triggers are possible until allocations are made in the Site Allocations Plan.

   RAG Monitoring status

51. This policy can only be monitored after the adoption of the Site Allocations Document.

Policy M5: Working of aggregate minerals

52. Monitoring indicators
   - Permissions granted for working aggregate minerals – spatial distribution and quantity of resource.
   - Permissions granted for borrow pits.

53. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
   - Prior to adoption of the Site Allocations Document, one permission granted that is not required to meet provision requirements in policy M2 and/or not in accordance with policies M3, M4 and C1 – C12.
   - Following adoption of the Site Allocations Document, one application permitted outside allocated sites (unless it is to prevent sterilization or because the requirement set out in policy M2 cannot be met from within the specific sites identified) and/or not in accordance with policies M3 and C1 – C12.

- Permission granted for borrow pit/s that does/do not meet the requirements of the policy.
- Working of ironstone permitted contrary to policy.

54. Monitoring Results

Indicators

55. There were two permissions granted for further mineral extraction in 2018, These were for a new sharp sand and gravel site at New Barn Farm, Cholsey and an extension for sharp sand and gravel extraction at Bridge Farm, Sutton Courtenay. Both fall within Mineral Strategic Resource Area 5, Thames and Lower Thames Valley. They both contributed to the provision for working of aggregate minerals (sand and gravel) in accordance with Policy M2. Additionally, they were in locations for working aggregate minerals that met the locational strategy in in Policy M3, the criteria in policy M4, and they were in accordance with policies C1 – 12.

56. No permissions were granted, or applications submitted, for borrow pits in 2018.

Triggers

57. No triggers have been activated as there have been no permissions that were not required to meet provision requirements in Policy M2 and/or not in accordance with policies M3, M4 and C1-C12; there were no permissions granted for borrow pits; and there were no permissions for ironstone working.

58. The Site Allocations Document has not been adopted and so the trigger relating to applications after that cannot be activated at this time.

59. RAG Monitoring status

60. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

Green

Policy M6: Aggregate Rail Depots

61. Monitoring indicators
- Permissions granted for new aggregates rail depots.

62. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- One permission granted for new aggregate rail depot that does not have suitable access to lorry route and/or meet requirements in policies C1 – C12.

63. Monitoring Results

Indicators

64. There were no planning permissions for new aggregate rail depots.

Triggers

65. The trigger has not been activated because no planning permissions for new rail aggregates were granted.

RAG Monitoring status

66. Although the policy did not result in any new permissions for aggregates rail depots, this has also resulted in no triggers being activated.

Green

Policy M7: Non-aggregate mineral working

67. Monitoring indicators
    - Permissions granted for non-aggregate mineral working.

68. Monitoring triggers (threshold) for policy review
    - One application permitted that does not meet relevant policy requirements.

69. Monitoring Results

Indicators

70. No applications were permitted in 2018 for non-aggregate minerals.

Triggers

71. The trigger has not been activated because no planning permissions for non-aggregate minerals were granted.

RAG Monitoring status

72. As there were no permissions for non-aggregates minerals, the policy trigger could not be activated.

Green

Policy M8: Safeguarding mineral resources

73. Monitoring indicators
    - Number and area of applications granted for non-minerals development in mineral consultation areas, which sterilise mineral resources.

- Number and area of site allocations made by District Planning Authorities for non-minerals development in mineral consultation areas, which sterilise mineral resources.
- OCC objections to district development on safeguarding mineral resources grounds.
- Number of applications consulted on from District to OCC within a minerals consultation area.

Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- One DC application approved with an objection from OCC on mineral safeguarding grounds.
- One application permitted by OCC leading to development that would sterilise mineral resources.
- One District site allocations made with an objection from OCC on minerals safeguarding grounds.

74. Monitoring Results

Indicators

75. Of the applications on which Oxfordshire was consulted, it made two objections on minerals sterilisation grounds. One application was refused, and the other was withdrawn.

76. During 2018, West Oxfordshire District Council adopted their Local Plan. It made reference Minerals and Minerals safeguarding. Oxfordshire, in response to allocation EW1, raised safeguarding of sand and gravel as an issue, and also the need to safeguard the existing waste recycling facility that would be within the allocated area. Following the Examination, the adopted Plan Policy EW1 (2018) includes the text "appropriate measures to safeguard and take account of the operational requirements of the existing aggregate recycling facility within the site and also to safeguard sand and gravel deposits where appropriate having regard to the policies of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan"

77. The County Council Minerals and Waste Planning Policy Team were consulted on 149 planning applications from the Districts for major applications through the County Councils Single Response System in addition to the 67 consultations received directly from Cherwell District Council.

78. No applications were permitted by the County Council in 2018 that would result in the sterilisation of mineral resources.

Triggers

79. No district council application approved with an objection from OCC on mineral safeguarding grounds, no applications permitted by OCC lead to development which would sterilise mineral resources, and no site allocations were made with an objection on mineral safeguarding grounds.

RAG Monitoring status

80. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated. There have been some instances where Oxfordshire has objected or made comments, but these have always been addressed to the County's satisfaction.

<div style="background-color:green;color:white;padding:4px">Green</div>

Policy M9: Safeguarding minerals infrastructure

81. Monitoring indicator
   - Number and type of safeguarded mineral infrastructure sites in Oxfordshire.
   - Number of safeguarded aggregate rail depots in Oxfordshire.
   - District development which is incompatible with or prejudicial to a safeguarded site.
   - OCC objections to district development on safeguarding mineral infrastructure grounds.

82. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
   - One safeguarded mineral infrastructure site lost to other development.
   - One permission issued which would lead to significant harm or prejudice to a safeguarded site (permitted with an objection from OCC)
   - One District site allocation made that would sterilise mineral infrastructure with objection from OCC.
   - Reduction in number of safeguarded rail depots in Oxfordshire.

83. Monitoring Results

   Indicators

84. There are four safeguarded aggregate rail depots in Oxfordshire. Of these, three are existing (Banbury, Sutton Courtenay and Kidlington) and one permitted (Shipton-on-Cherwell). Whilst there is also a depot at Hinksey Sidings, Oxford, this has been used solely by the rail industry to bring in rail ballast for internal use on the rail network.

85. No applications were determined in 2018 that would be incompatible with, or prejudicial to, a safeguarded mineral infrastructure site.

86. OCC did not object to any district development on the grounds of safeguarding mineral infrastructure in 2018.

   Triggers

87. No safeguarded mineral infrastructure site was lost to other development. No permission has been issued which would lead to significant harm or prejudice to a safeguarded site (permitted with an objection from OCC). No District site allocation made that would sterilise mineral infrastructure with objection from

OCC. There was no reduction in number of safeguarded rail depots in Oxfordshire.

RAG Monitoring status

88. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

> Green

Policy M10: Restoration of mineral working

89. Monitoring indicator
- Number of approved mineral restoration schemes.
- Proportion gain of biodiversity in restoration schemes.

90. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- One application approved for which the restoration does not take into account the considerations set out in the policy.
- One application permitted including a restoration scheme which does not provide a net gain in biodiversity.

91. Monitoring Results

Indicators

92. There were six mineral restoration schemes approved in 2018, including two new sites and four revisions to previously approved schemes.

93. The County Council Environment team did not have any outstanding objections to any of the seven new/revised restoration schemes. As part of their assessment of whether to object, they consider whether the development would result in a net gain in biodiversity. In 2018, the County Council was not requiring the use of a biodiversity accounting metric on all applications and therefore it is not possible to measure the proportion gain in biodiversity from the restoration schemes. However, a net gain in biodiversity was sought in each planning decision.

Triggers

94. No applications were approved that did not take into account. No applications were permitted that included a restoration scheme which did not provide a net gain in biodiversity.

RAG Monitoring status

95. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

> Green

Policy W1: Oxfordshire waste to be managed

96. Monitoring indicator
- Total amounts of waste managed within Oxfordshire for the specified waste streams.
- Waste management capacity in Oxfordshire for the specified waste streams.

97. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- Amount of waste managed within Oxfordshire falls or rises to +/- 20% of the figures set out in the policy, as updated by the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Reports.
- Waste management capacity falls below that required to manage the waste streams set out in the policy, as updated by the annual monitoring reports.

98. Monitoring Results

Indicators

99. The table below shows the waste produced in Oxfordshire. This shows the actual total for Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), and estimated values for Commercial and Industrial (C&I), and Construction, Demolition and Excavation (CDE).

Waste Type	Total – Actual/Estimate
Municipal Solid Waste	280,676t
Commercial and Industrial Waste	540,000t
Construction, Demolition and Excavation Waste	1,288,413t

100. Based on the management targets in policy W2, and the forecast tonnages for waste streams for 2021 as identified in Table 5 of the Core Strategy, the total requirement for each waste type is Table 20 below shows that there is currently sufficient waste management capacity to manage these waste streams in line with the management targets for 2021.

Projected Capacity Requirement	MSW	C&I	CDE (non-inert proportion)	Total Requirement (tpa)	Available Capacity (operation
2018[1]					
Composting/ food waste	77,647	45,309	7,730	130,686	239,600
Non-hazardous waste	83,268	324,905	20,099	428,272	640,900
Non-hazardous waste residual	109,418	91, 839	0	201,257	326,300

Triggers

101. The 2018 report gives a baseline figure and no further AMRs have been published at this time so the rise or fall against that baseline is not known. Future monitoring will assess whether this trigger is activated.

102. Waste management capacity has not fallen below that required to manage the waste streams; in fact it is substantially higher than is needed.

RAG Monitoring status

103. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

Green

Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets

104. Monitoring indicator
- Quantity of waste managed in Oxfordshire.
- Quantity of Oxon Non-hazardous waste to landfill.
- Quantity of Oxon waste to genuine MRF.
- Quantity of Oxon waste to EfW.
- Quantity of Oxon waste to land recovery and inert landfill.
- Recycled/secondary aggregate sales.
- Quantity of Oxon waste to composting/AD plants.

105. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- Percentage of waste diverted from landfill lower than set out in the policy for three consecutive years.

106. Monitoring Results

Indicators

MSW:
107. Of the 280,676t of MSW managed in Oxfordshire in 2018: 83,268t was recycled; 57,847t was composted or treated food waste; 109,418t went to EfW. The overall diversion from landfill was around 97%.

108. In 2016, 94% of Oxfordshire's MSW was diverted from landfill by means of recycling, composting, food waste treatment or energy recovery. In 2018, this increased to 97%. Overall, the percentage of waste diverted from landfill has increased from 59% in 2012/2013, to 97% in 2018.

C&I:

109. Of the 540,000t of C&I waste estimated to require management in Oxfordshire: 324,905t was recycled; 45,309 required composting or food waste treatment; 91, 839 tonnes required treatment in other ways including residual waste treatment. Overall diversion from landfill was around 86 % which is below the total landfill diversion target of 90% however, these are 2018 against 2021 targets. Some increase is still needed to meet the 2021 target of 90%, but the rates appear to be on track to meet that target.

CDE:

110. From 2016 to 2018, the estimated amount of CDE waste produced in Oxfordshire decreased from 1,393,000t to 1,288,413t. The proportion recovered increased significantly between 2016 and 2018 from 9% to 64%, whilst the proportion of CDE waste disposed of decreased from 49% to 3%. The proportion of CDE Waste recycled also decreased from 42% to 33%.

Triggers

111. The percentage of waste diverted from landfill is not lower than set out in Policy for 2018 based on 2016 targets. The processing capacity has not fallen below the target capacity. It is approximately 0.4mt above the target capacity. The trigger has not therefore been activated.

RAG Monitoring status

112. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated. There is a need to continue to increase diversion from landfill, but the figures appear to be on track.

<div style="background-color:green; color:white; padding:4px;">   Green</div>

Policy W3: Provision for waste management capacity and facilities required

113. Monitoring indicator
- Total amounts of waste managed within Oxfordshire for the specified waste streams.
- Waste management capacity in Oxfordshire for the specified waste streams.
- Permissions granted for reuse, recycling, composting/food waste treatment and treatment of residual waste.

114. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- One Additional waste management capacity allocated below additional capacity requirements in this policy for this waste management stream, as updated by Annual Monitoring Report.
- One application permitted for reuse, recycling, composting/food waste treatment and residual waste treatment that does not accord with relevant spatial strategy and policy requirements.
- One application for residual waste treatment permitted for which waste will not be recovered at one of the nearest appropriate installations.

- Residual waste treatment capacity permitted above additional requirement set out in this policy for this waste management stream, as updated by Annual Monitoring Report or not in accordance with policies W4, W5 and C1-C12.
- One site allocated not in accordance with relevant provisions of the policy.

115. Monitoring Results

Indicators

116. The table below shows the waste managed and available capacity for the waste streams identified in policy W3. It shows that there is currently sufficient waste management capacity to manage the principal waste streams in line with management targets

Projected Capacity Requirement	MSW	C&I	CDE (non-inert proportion	Total Requirement (tpa)	Available Capacit e	Surplus/ Deficit
Composting/food waste	77,647	45,309	7,730	130,686	239600	+108,914
Non-hazardous waste	83,268	324,905	20,099	428,272	640900	+212628
Non-hazardous waste residual	109,418	91, 839	0	201,257	326300	+125,045

117. There were three permissions granted in 2018 for reuse, recycling, composting/food waste treatment and treatment of residual waste.

Triggers

118. No sites have been allocated at this stage, so this will be a matter for future monitoring after the adoption of the Site Allocations Plan.

119. No applications were permitted that did not accord with the relevant spatial strategy and policy requirements in 2018, and so the trigger has not been activated.

120. One S73 application for an extension to capacity at an existing residual waste permission for residual waste treatment was determined in 2018. This is in accordance with policy and trigger not activated.

121. The S73 Application for residual waste treatment determined in 2018 did not result in an additional requirement and so this trigger has not been activated.

122. No sites were allocated in 2018, therefore this trigger has not been activated.

RAG Monitoring status

123. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

<div style="background-color:green; color:white; padding:4px;">   Green</div>

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

124. Monitoring indicator
   - Location of permissions for strategic, non-strategic and small scale waste management facilities/capacity.
   - Location of sites allocated for strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities/capacity.

125. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
   - One planning permission granted/site allocated for a facility which does not accord with the policy criteria (in areas within the areas identified as appropriate for facilities of that scale in the policy or with good access to the lorry route network).

126. Monitoring Results

   Indicators

127. The table below shows the three permissions that were granted in 2018. All are in compliance with policy W4.

Site Name	Type of Facility	Type of Facility Scale	Assessment against Policy W4
Cassington/ Worton Farm AD Facility	Composting/ Biological Treatment	Composting/ Biological Treatment	Non-Strategic Within Strategic zone for Oxford City
Wallingford AD	Composting/ Biological Treatment	Composting/ Biological Treatment	Non-Strategic Within Strategic zone for Oxford City
Ardley Energy Recover Facility	Residual Waste	Residual Waste	Strategic 26,300tpa. Within strategic zone for Bicester.

128. Sites will be allocated in the Site Allocations Document and monitoring will commence once the document is adopted

   Triggers

129. No sites have been allocated at this time. Three permissions were granted in 2018, all of which were in accordance with the policy.

RAG Monitoring status

130. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

```
Green
```

Policy W5: Siting of waste management facilities

131. Monitoring indicator
     - Number of approved facilities located on land given priority by the policy.
     - Number of approved facilities located on green field land.
     - Number of allocated sites located on land given priority by the policy.
     - Number of allocated sites located on green field land

132. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
     - One planning permission granted/site allocated in not in accordance with relevant provisions of the policy.

133. Monitoring Results

     Indicators

134. Three planning permissions were granted in 2018 at Worton Farm AD facility, Wallingford AD facility and Ardley Energy Recovery Facility. All three were located on existing waste sites and were therefore on land given priority by the policy.

135. No permissions were given for facilities located on greenfield land.

136. Sites will be allocated within the Site Allocations Plan and monitoring will commence once the document has been adopted.

     Triggers

137. No sites were allocated, and the three sites that were permitted were all in locations that were in accordance with the policy.

     RAG Monitoring status

138. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

```
Green
```

Policy W6: Landfill and other permanent deposit of waste to land

139. Monitoring indicator
    - Number of applications permitted for inert waste landfilling for restoration purposes.
    - Number of applications permitted for the permanent deposit of waste to land, other than to landfill.
    - Existing and permitted landfill capacity relative to estimated requirements.
    - Number of developments permitted that would reduce non-hazardous landfill capacity

140. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
    - Permanent deposit of waste to land, other than to landfill permitted contrary to policy – where there would not be an overall environmental benefit.
    - Inert landfill capacity permitted contrary to policy.
    - Permission granted for additional non-hazardous landfill capacity.

141. Monitoring Results

    Indicators

142. One application was permitted in 2018, for inert waste landfilling for restoration purposes. It was at New Barn Farm and was for 1.4 million m3 of material.

143. One permission was granted for the creation of three new football pitches for community use facilitated through the disposal of waste. This involved 11,900m3 of waste for land raising to achieve levels that were granted planning permission by the district council at Thame Football Club. The permanent deposit of waste to achieve the permitted landform was therefore considered to be an overall environmental benefit.

144. There is currently 7,859,363m3 of inert landfill capacity and 4,359,905m3 of non-hazardous landfill remaining in Oxfordshire.

145. In 2018, approximately 131,207t of non-hazardous waste produced in Oxfordshire was sent to non-hazardous landfill. 821,347t of inert waste was sent to inert landfill. Based on these rates, non-hazardous and inert landfill capacity in Oxfordshire will last to the end of the plan period and beyond.

146. No permissions were granted that would reduce non-hazardous landfill capacity.

147. The processing capacity is approximately 0.4mt above the target capacity.

148. The change from 2017 to 2018 from secondary and recycled aggregates decreased by only 0.5% from 2017 to 2018.

149. There have been no sites for secondary and recycled aggregate allocated/permitted not in accordance with policies W4, W5 and C1-C12.

Triggers

150. There was no permanent deposit of waste to land where there would not be an overall environmental benefit. There was no inert landfill capacity permitted contrary to policy, and no permission was granted for additional non-hazardous landfill capacity.

RAG Monitoring status

151. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated. Those landfill permissions that were granted were for overall environmental benefit.

Green

Policy W7: Management and disposal of hazardous waste

152. Monitoring indicator
- Number, type and capacity of existing and permitted hazardous waste facilities in Oxfordshire.

153. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- Any reduction in total number of existing and permitted hazardous waste facilities.

154. Monitoring Results

Indicators

155. There are 12 hazardous waste facilities in Oxfordshire, located in Oxford, Banbury, Ewelme, Culham, Harwell, Drayton, East Hanney and Standlake. One of the Oxford sites, and the East Hanney sites take hazardous waste only, but the rest take hazardous and radioactive waste. These sites have a combined capacity of 548,665t.

Triggers

156. There was no reduction in the total number of existing and permitted hazardous waste facilities.

RAG Monitoring status

157. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

Green

Policy W8: Management of agricultural waste

158. Monitoring indicator
- Number of applications approved for treatment of agricultural waste within a unit of agricultural production.

159. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- One application approved contrary to the policy.

160. Monitoring Results

Indicators

161. No applications were received or determined for the treatment of agricultural waste within a unit of agricultural production.

Triggers

162. No applications were permitted contrary to the policy.

RAG Monitoring status

163. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

Green

Policy W9: Management and disposal of radioactive waste

164. Monitoring indicator
- Permissions issued for management and disposal of low level and intermediate level radioactive waste.
- Specific provision made in Part 2 Site Allocations Document for treatment and storage of low level and intermediate level waste.

165. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
- One application approved for low level radioactive waste management that does not significantly contribute to meeting needs of Oxfordshire and wider needs can be adequately provided for elsewhere and/or does not meet requirements of C1-C12.
- One application approved for intermediate radioactive waste management that is not at Harwell licensed nuclear site and/or contributes to wider needs that could be adequately provided for elsewhere and/or does not meet requirements of C1-C12.
- Less than one site allocated in Part 2 Site Allocations document that does not accord with the policy.

166. Monitoring Results

Indicators

167. Magnox Ltd (Rutherford Avenue, Didcot) were granted permission for an S73 application to vary condition 2 of planning permission EHE/9294/1 to allow for import of a small amount of Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) from Winfrith to Harwell for encapsulation and interim storage.

168. Magnox Ltd (Harwell Site) were also granted permission for the installation of a semi rigid building for the temporary storage of non-radioactive waste and very low radioactive waste.

169. The Site Allocations Document has not been produced yet. This indicator will be monitored in future AMRs, once the Part 2 Plan has been adopted.

Triggers

170. No application was approved for low level radioactive waste management that: did not significantly contribute to meeting needs of Oxfordshire and wider needs; could be adequately provided for elsewhere; and/or does not meet requirements of C1-C12.

171. No application was approved for intermediate radioactive waste management that: is not at Harwell licensed nuclear site; does not contribute to wider needs that could be adequately provided for elsewhere; and/or does not meet requirements of C1-C12.

172. No allocations have been made at this time.

RAG Monitoring status

173. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated. Those applications that were permitted met the policy considerations.

Green

Policy W10: Management and disposal of waste water and sewage sludge

174. Monitoring indicator
   - Permissions granted for proposals for the management and disposal of waste water and sewage sludge.

175. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
   - One application permitted contrary to the policy.

176. Monitoring Results

Indicators

177. No permissions were granted for the management or disposal of waste water or sewage sludge during 2018.

Triggers

178. No application was permitted contrary to the policy.

RAG Monitoring status

179. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

Green

Policy W11: Safeguarding waste management sites

180. Monitoring indicator
     - Decisions resulting in non-waste management uses on sites with permission for
         - operational waste sites with planning permission,
         - sites with planning permission for waste use not yet brought into operation.
         - vacant sites previously used for waste management uses or
         - sites allocated for waste management in the Site Allocations Document.

181. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
     - One application permitted by District with an objection from OCC.
     - One application permitted by OCC leading to development which would prevent or prejudice the use of a site safeguarded for waste use.

182. Monitoring Results

Indicators

183. No district planning applications were granted by district councils in 2018 for development that would prevent or prejudice the relevant waste management sites from operating.

184. The County Council was signatory to a Statement of Common Ground regarding West Oxfordshire District Council's proposed allocation of a Garden City at Eynsham in their Local Plan (which was adopted in 2018) and the impact on New Wintles Farm waste processing site. The County Council did not object to the allocation, provided that wording was added to the proposed policy to ensure that New Wintles Farm can remain operational. Appropriate wording was included within the Adopted Plan.

Triggers

185. No application was permitted by a District Council with an objection from OCC, and no application was permitted by OCC leading to development which would prevent or prejudice the use of a site safeguarded for waste use.

RAG Monitoring status

186. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated.

Green

Core Policies C1 – C12

187. Monitoring indicator
   - Permissions granted in accordance with policy.

188. Monitoring trigger (threshold) for policy review
   - One application permitted which does not take into account relevant requirements of the policy.

189. Monitoring Results

   Indicators

190. From the monitoring so far taken place, the core policies have been used variously in the applications determined by Oxfordshire County Council as Mineral Planning Authority. The decisions on those applications have been in accordance with the core policies where relevant.

   Triggers

191. There have been no occasions of an application being permitted which did not take into the account the relevant requirements of the core policies that applied to the site.

   RAG Monitoring status

192. All the indicators have been met and none of the triggers have been activated for any of the core policies.

Green

193. Summary of Monitoring Status

Policy Number and Title	RAG Status
Policy M1: Recycled and secondary aggregate	Green
Policy M2: Provision for Working Aggregate Minerals	Red
Policy M3: Principal locations for working aggregate minerals	Green
Policy M4: Sites for working aggregate minerals	Green
Policy M5: Working of aggregate minerals	Green
Policy M6: Aggregate rail depots	Green
Policy M7: Non aggregate mineral working	Green

Policy M8: Safeguarding mineral resources	Green
Policy M9: Safeguarding mineral infrastructure	Green
Policy M10: Restoration of mineral workings	Green
Policy W1: Oxfordshire waste to be managed	Green
Policy W2: Oxfordshire waste management targets	Green
Policy W3: Provision for waste management capacity and facilities required	Green
Policy W4: Locations for facilities to manage the principal waste streams	Green
Policy W5: Siting of waste management facilities	Green
Policy W6: Landfill and other permanent deposit of waste to land	Green
Policy W7: Management and disposal of hazardous waste	Green
Policy W8: Management of agricultural waste	Green
Policy W9: Management and disposal of radioactive waste	Green
Policy W10: Management and disposal of waste water and sewage sludge	Green
Policy W11: Safeguarding waste management sites	Green
Policy C1: Sustainable development	Green
Policy C2: Climate change	Green
Policy C3: Flooding	Green
Policy C4: Water environment	Green
Policy C5: Local environment, amenity and economy	Green
Policy C6: Agricultural land and soils	Green
Policy C7: Biodiversity and geodiversity	Green
Policy C8: Landscape	Green
Policy C9: Historic environment and archaeology	Green
Policy C10: Transport	Green
Policy C11: Rights of way	Green
Policy C12: Green Belt	Green

Issues relating to the use of the policies

194. The monitoring has shown few problems in the way the policies have been working. This section will look at any issues relating to the use of the policies, such as difficulty in applying the policy or lack of clarity.

195. Only policies for which a problem has occurred will be mentioned in this section.

Policies M5, M3 and M4

196. Prior to the adoption of the sites plan these policies are used in the following way:

197. Policy M5 states that prior to adoption of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 2 – Site Allocations Document, planning permission will be granted for the working of aggregates minerals, where this would contribute to meeting the requirements in policy M2, and provided the proposal is in accordance with the locational strategy in policy M3.

198. There is no concern about the meeting of requirements in M2, but it is not clear which parts of policy M3 constitute the locational strategy as this is not clearly stated in the policy.

199. The view of the Policy Team is that the Principal Locations, ie the Strategic Resource Areas is the locational strategy. Within those areas, sites will be allocated in the Sites Plan in accordance with policy M4 which sets out the factors for choosing sites.

200. Policy M3 also states that specific sites for extensions to existing quarries outside the strategic resource areas may also be allocated provided they are in accordance with policy M4. This has led to promoters of quarries outside the Strategic Resource Areas to put forward their view that this makes extensions to quarries outside the Strategic Resource Areas. They additionally put forward the view that because policy M4 states that priority will be given to extensions to existing quarries where environmentally acceptable, extensions to quarries outside the Strategic Resource Areas are to be given preference over new sites within the Strategic Resource Areas.

201. These arguments are currently being tested in an appeal case at Shipton on Cherwell Quarry. The result of that appeal will provide clarity as to how the Planning Inspectorate, and the Secretary of State consider the wording of the policies.

202. The clarity that will be given by the decision will guide future use of the policy and that will take place before any update of the policy through the local plan process, so there is not a need to update the policy now. However, consideration should be given to giving greater clarity when the plan is next updated.

203. Once the Site Allocations Plan is adopted that specific issue will cease to be a problem, but the same issue might occur in future if any of the landbanks drop below required levels. This is because policy M5 also states that permission will not be granted for sites not allocated in the local plan unless the need for a steady and adequate supply of minerals cannot be met from within those sites, and that the site is in accordance with the locational strategy in M3 which continues the issue beyond the adoption of the Sites Plan. The policy is a useful enabling policy and keeps the plan robust, but again it could benefit from greater clarity when the policy is next updated.

Other Policies

204. No issues have been raised in relation to other policies in the Core Strategy.

Effects of updates to Planning Legislation and Guidance

205. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy there has been an update to the National Planning Policy Framework. If a policy in the local plan becomes out

of step with the NPPF, it is the NPPF that will take precedence. There have been no such instances raised, and the policies remain in compliance with the NPPF.

206. Policy C7 of the Core Strategy requires that minerals and waste applications should conserve, and where possible, deliver a net gain in biodiversity. Delivering a net gain in biodiversity is now a legal requirement. This has overtaken the requirement in policy C7, but it does not make the policy out of step with the legislation.

207. There are no changes to legislation, regulation or guidance that make it necessary to update the Core Strategy.

208. The government has produced a White Paper that could have major implications for the production of the Site Allocations Document. If the Site Allocations Document has not reached Regulation 19 stage when the proposed legislation comes into effect, the plan process will have to start again, further delaying the allocation of sites.

Conclusion and next steps

209. This review has identified that the monitoring report has identified one trigger relating to the crushed rock landbank. Our intention had been to address this trigger through our Site Allocations Document based on our Local Aggregate Assessment requirements.

210. However, following a review of the evidence for the Core Strategy and the Inspector's Reports and advice from our "critical friend" North Northamptonshire Council, we have determined that the Site Allocation Document is required to identify only the sites needed to meet the requirement as set out in the Core Strategy; not the requirements of the latest Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA). Therefore, the shortfall in crushed rock and the Monitoring trigger will not be able to be addressed through the Site Allocations Document.

211. If we are unable to use the LAA and identify sites, we will not be accordance with the NPPF and in addition, the trigger for the Core Strategy review will still be outstanding and this therefore needs to be addressed.

212. It is therefore proposed that we carry out a consultation on the Core Strategy Review which has at this stage identified the need for a Partial Update of the Core Strategy in relation to Policy M2, and that all of the other Polices are working effectively.

213. Once the consultation has been carried out and this review has taken into account the responses to that consultation, the review will be taken to full Council for decision and any resulting update required of the Core Strategy will be carried out alongside the Site Allocations Document process.

214. To reduce the delay in the production of the Site Allocations Document an issues and options paper will be consulted on at the same time as the consultation on the Core Strategy review. This will reduce the number of consultations and enable those issues to be fed into the process once the decision is made.

215. The Local Plan would be reviewed again, following the adoption of the Sites Allocations Document or if further triggers are activated through our Annual Monitoring Report.