

Draft Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Strategies

Consultation (September 2011)

Core Policies

| ID                         | Response   |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>CORE POLICIES</b>       |  |
| M240<br>Wood Tr            | 5.1 The opportunities for carbon sequestration through planting trees should be mentioned here.  |
| <b>POLICY C1: FLOODING</b> |  |
| W192<br>EA                 | - Paragraph 5.6 should be amended to ensure that waste treatment is not seen as flood compatible. It is either a more vulnerable or less vulnerable use and therefore preference should be to locate these facilities in areas at lowest risk of flooding. The disruption of a waste site due to flooding could have both environmental and economic impacts.  |
| M465<br>EA                 | <p>- With reference to the Flooding section a clearer distinction should be made between the working of minerals and the processing of minerals. The processing of minerals is not considered a water compatible activity and so stockpiling, sorting and ancillary aspects of minerals development should be located in areas of lowest flood risk within a given site and also not within the functional floodplain.</p> <p>- The preamble to Policy C1 is also very focussed on fluvial flooding. Mineral workings and final site restoration can pose an increase in flood risk for other forms of flooding such as groundwater and surface water. Due to the increased processing of secondary aggregates, materials sent for inert land filling are becoming dominated by silts and clays. These materials are likely to impede the flow of groundwater compared to the surrounding natural deposits. Areas identified for a high density of mineral extraction and restoration with inert fill may have a cumulative impact and lead to increased risk of groundwater flooding. Minerals proposals will need to demonstrate that this is not the case.</p> <p>- It would be better if the preamble to policy C1 (Section 5.5 to 5.10) includes reference to all forms of flooding and the need to</p> |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | <p>assess flood risk at all stages of the development. Policy C1 should highlight this.</p> <p>- Policy C1 could therefore be improved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Changing: 'Where development takes place in an area of identified flood risk this should only be where alternative locations in areas of lower flood risk have been explored and discounted' to 'Where development takes place in an area of identified flood risk this should only be where alternative locations in areas of lower flood risk have been explored and discounted, using the Sequential Test and Exceptions Test.'</li> <li>o The policy should also add that proposals will be expected to demonstrate that the risk of flooding from all sources will not be increased as the current bullet points (though welcomed) concentrate on fluvial flooding. It would be expected that a site specific flood risk assessment will be produced for all sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and also on any site greater than 1 hectare.</li> <li>o In the sentence before the bullet points, the sequential approach should be referred to. This could be done in the following manner [...where a flood risk assessment is able to demonstrate that the sequential approach has been followed and the development will not:]</li> </ul> |
| W81<br>M365<br>Bampton | Bampton Parish Council strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.11 Policy C1   |
| W89<br>M402<br>BEWG    | Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.11 Policy C1  |
| M117                   | Policy C1 does not seem completely clear about the use of extraction sites for landfill. I am sure that you will not normally permit any form of landfill within sites which are in contact with the water table, since even inert waste always contains actually or potentially polluting materials.  |
| M171<br>PAGE           | This policy accords with the sequential test and the requirement to explore minerals and waste development opportunities in areas at low risk of flooding, prior to areas of identified flood risk, is supported.  |
| M241<br>Wood Tr        | 5.10 Restoration to woodland can play a key role in mitigating against flood risk. Trees decrease the rate at which rainfall reaches the ground and runs off into watercourses and drains. In both urban and rural areas this allows more time for natural and man made drainage systems to take water away, reducing the likelihood or severity of rivers flooding or surface water inundating homes. This was recognised in the Natural Environment White Paper and should be reiterated in this local plan.   |
| M378                   | Policy C1 - Comment:   |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
|               | <p>It is noted that the plan recognises that sand and gravel deposits do occur in areas that are liable to flood. When PPG25 was being drafted strong representations were made to ensure that sand and gravel workings were deemed water compatible development.</p> <p>The sequential approach of seeking to locate development outside areas liable to flood is already part of policy PPG25 and it is questioned whether this needs to be repeated in Policy C1. Policy C1 will not be weakened if this is removed as the policy ensures adequate mitigation needs to be incorporated so as not to give rise to any flood risk.</p>   |
| M553<br>SODC  | <p>The draft core strategy does not include sufficient comment on the significance of ensuring adequate measures are in place for the proper management of flood risk. The following should be added to the end of paragraph 5.8</p> <p>No operations should take place on a site until a scheme for flood risk management has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Mineral Planning Authority.</p>   |
| M672<br>Hills | <p>26. Unlike other built forms of development mineral extraction can be managed in the Flood Plain without undue adverse impacts. Your background paper actually confirms that sand and gravel working is "water compatible". Also, unlike other built development, mineral extraction does not generally exacerbate flooding off-site as opportunities exist to develop flood water storage areas both during and after working. With minerals the four points to be demonstrated in the flood risk assessment are sensible and usually achievable. It is however accepted that most waste developments should not be in flood risk areas.</p> <p>27. The policy should be amended to differentiate between waste and mineral types of development. The introduction to Policy C1 should be changed to state:</p> <p>"Waste development will, wherever possible, take place in areas that are not at risk from flooding. Where mineral development takes place in an area of identified flood risk a flood risk assessment should demonstrate that the development will not ....etc".</p> |
| M681<br>RSPB  | <p>Restorations of mineral sites can also provide 'ecosystem services', such as flood alleviation or flood storage. It is possible to restore a site to a biodiversity end-use, and also provide these services. Where sites are in areas liable to flooding, the Council should promote restorations to wetland habitat, such as reed bed or wet grassland, which can also provide flood alleviation or storage.</p>   |
| M1013<br>SEAG | <p>Section 5.9 states that infrastructure (buildings stockpiles etc) will need to be situated in areas that pose the lowest risk to flooding. RAS 16 has little or no scope to achieve this, being almost completely in the flood plain.</p>  |

|                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
|                                     | <p>5.11 Describes in bold type how areas at risk of flooding will be protected when flood risk assessment is able to demonstrate that the development will not:</p> <p>Impede the flow of floodwater<br/> Displace floodwater and increase the risk of flooding elsewhere<br/> Reduce existing flood water capacity.</p> <p>The previous section (2) shows quite clearly that any FRA for the Sonning Eye area which includes RAS 16 cannot possibly give this assurance.</p>  |
| <b>POLICY C2: WATER ENVIRONMENT</b> |  |
| W161<br>Alk PC                      | <p>Policy C2</p> <p>OCC may not be aware that Shenington with Alkerton is situated at the top of a hill / ridge and that leachates are one of our concerns. It is the opinion of the Parish Council that our location at the Thames / Severn-Trent divide renders us unsuitable for minerals or waste developments as we do not wish to contribute to the pollution of water courses. The current waste facility needed to be clay-lined before use.</p>   |
| W190<br>EA                          | <p>- Groundwater protection within Oxfordshire is important and we will use our own policy on Groundwater Policy to respond to planning proposals which involve waste sites. Therefore, we would expect any allocation to avoid locations which are considered a high risk to the pollution of groundwater and would therefore welcome a reference to our GP3 policy in the supporting text to, or, policy C2.</p>   |
| W90<br>BEWG                         | <p>Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)strongly supports:<br/> The whole of 5.14 Policy C2</p>   |
| M55                                 | <p>In both the the current waste consultation and the minerals plan consultation papers the claim is made that (section 5.10) :</p> <p>"Mineral working in the flood plain can offer opportunities to increase flood water storage capacity and reduce the risk of flooding elsewhere. Wherever possible this should be taken into account in planning for the eventual restoration of the site. "</p> <p>Can you please let me know if any calculations have been made to support this, and if so also let me know where I may be able to access these estimates.</p> |
| M103<br>BWB                         | <p>Thank you for your consultation regarding the Oxfordshire Minerals Plan consultation.</p>   |

|      |   |
|------|---|
|      | <p>This comment is submitted on behalf of British Waterways (BW) is a public corporation, which is sponsored by DEFRA. We manage and care for more than 2,200 miles (3,540 km) of canals and rivers in England, Scotland and Wales on behalf of the British people. The Government charges us to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain and develop Britain's inland waterways in a sustainable manner, so that they fulfil their full economic, social and environmental potential;</li> <li>- Fulfil statutory navigation functions;</li> <li>- Conserve waterway heritage and environment for the future;</li> <li>- Promote and enable rural and urban regeneration;</li> <li>- Maintain and enhance leisure, recreation, tourism and educational opportunities for the general public; facilitate waterway transport; and</li> <li>- Play a lead role in co-ordinating with other UK navigation authorities.</li> </ul> <p>Our main concern in this minerals plan is to protect the environment surrounding the Oxford Canal which runs through the County from Oxford to join the Grand Union Canal at Napton Junction.</p> <p>Several areas of extraction are in close proximity to the Canal but haul routes to the existing and proposed rail freight terminals are also of concern..</p> <p>In more detail, we make the following points;</p> <p>Policy C2</p> <p>We would request that the wording of this policy is widened to mention canals which are also susceptible to pollution from groundwater, run of and wind blow. Whilst none of the existing and proposed sites are adjacent to the canal this could be important if other sites come forward during the course of the plan.</p> |
| M118 | Policy C2 answers my observations against C1, and I would urge this to be taken to the limits of the precautionary principle because of the potential problems of groundwater contamination.  |
| M497 | Policy C2. We support the policy to ensure that minerals extraction should not cause adverse effects on the quantity and quality of   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| HW PC                                       | groundwater resources, especially where approved water abstraction is undertaken for business purposes. Due account also has to be taken of the effect that the extraction is likely to have on the existing water table as any significant lowering of the water table will dry out adjacent land. Again independent advice should be sought by the council to ensure that minerals abstractions are not detrimental to water supplies and adjacent farm land.   |
| M861<br>Alk PC                              | OCC may not be aware that Shenington with Alkerton is situated at the top of a hill / ridge and that leachates are one of our concerns. It is the opinion of the Parish Council that our location at the Thames / Severn-Trent divide renders us unsuitable for minerals or waste developments as we do not wish to contribute to the pollution of water courses. The current waste facility needed to be clay-lined before use.  |
| M380  | <p>Policy C2 - Comment:</p> <p>The principle of Policy C2 is acceptable but it would be helpful to make it clear that any water abstractors need to be 'licensed' otherwise it is considered too general.</p>   |
| M466  | <p>- Policy C2 requires the assessment of the impact of mineral extraction on groundwater levels and quality for proposed mineral working locations. However it is not clear if this also considers the impact of restoration proposals. Our Groundwater Protection Policy and Practice document (GP3) available at:<br/> <a href="http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0708BOGU-e-e.pdf">http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0708BOGU-e-e.pdf</a><br/> includes policies on mineral extraction and on restoration and landfilling.<br/> Where policies relate to groundwater source protection zones it is important to remember that all abstractions used for providing drinking water (including private and unlicensed abstractions) have default Source Protection Zones 1 and 2 defined at a radius of 50m and 250m respectively.</p> <p>- Section 5.12 'Sand and gravel extraction can cause disruption to flows of ground water and surface water through de-watering during working and the creation of lakes'. Site restoration of quarry voids via backfilling can also cause disruption of groundwater flows and surface water flows. This should be included in this section.</p> <p>- Section 5.13 'This will include dewatering and the impact dewatering may have on regulated groundwater abstractions'. Not all groundwater abstractions are regulated via abstraction licensing. It would be better to update these sections to 'local groundwater abstractions' to account for both regulated and unregulated abstractions.</p> |
| <b>POLICY C3: ENVIRONMENTAL AND AMENITY</b> |   |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| W42<br>Ox GB   | <p>The Draft Plan is rightly concerned with the need to take account of a range of environmental issues, but our feeling is that the proposals do not adequately recognize the intrusive effects which waste facilities can have upon the local environment and its residents. We are thinking of noise, fumes, smell, lorry movements and parking provision, all of which are expressive of industrialisation and, as such, are unacceptable in the Green Belt and harmful to its amenities. We suggest that this problem and how it might be controlled be recognized in the Draft Plan.</p>  |
| W143<br>CPRE   | <p>Policy C3: Environmental and amenity protection</p> <p>We endorse Policy C3, and OCC's commitment to ensure that proposals for minerals and waste development should "demonstrate that they will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the environment, residential amenity and other sensitive receptors."</p> <p>However, CPRE is concerned that while the conditions placed on permissions for waste facilities by OCC are often proper and rigorous, the operators are not always cognisant of these conditions.</p>  |
| W162<br>Alk PC | <p>Policy C3</p> <p>It is not only important to protect the villages of Shenington and Alkerton but also the centres of employment on Shenington Airfield and at two business parks within the parish. The potential loss of these jobs due to mineral extraction would be both detrimental in the short term to those employed, but will have a far reaching effect in the long term. Any new jobs arising from the mineral extraction would be relatively low skilled and unable to compensate. There is no local pool of unemployed low-skilled workers so recruitment would have to be centred on Banbury</p>   |
| M860<br>Alk PC | <p>These policies should be modified to give local communities and parish councils or otherwise the right to be consulted and provide information and opinion at the planning stage. In many cases, they will have detailed local knowledge that is not available to other agencies. Local information could include areas liable to flood risk, ground water flows after excessive rainfall or snow, amenity as perceived and experienced by residents, specific habitats and biodiversity, the transmission of noise and dust as influenced by local wind patterns and the topography, local road usage and traffic movements and needs for rights-of-way.</p> <p>The parish of Shenington with Alkerton includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a designated Conservation Area</li> <li>- a Scheduled Ancient Monument</li> <li>- a Conservation Target Area</li> </ul> |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- designated Local Wildlife Sites</li> <li>- an area of outstanding natural beauty</li> <li>- listed buildings</li> <li>- tourist attractions</li> <li>- a primary school</li> <li>- a medical centre</li> <li>- a historic WW2 airfield</li> <li>- an international go-karting track</li> </ul> <p>as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- existing and proposed mineral workings</li> <li>- existing waste facilities</li> </ul> <p>If The Trustees of the Needler D4 settlement start extracting ironstone in the neighbourhood, the parish will become highly stressed and unable to accept other minerals or waste developments. Even so, the parish is a sensitive receptor where special attention is required during planning stages to ensure developments unacceptable to the local community do not take place.</p> <p>It is not only important to protect the villages of Shenington and Alkerton but also the centres of employment on Shenington Airfield and at two business parks within the parish. The potential loss of these jobs due to mineral extraction would be both detrimental in the short term to those employed, but will have a far reaching effect in the long term. Any new jobs arising from the mineral extraction would be relatively low skilled and unable to compensate. There is no local pool of unemployed low-skilled workers so recruitment would have to be centred on Banbury.</p> |
| W82<br>M366<br>Bampton | Bampton Parish Council strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.18 Policy C3   |
| W91<br>M403<br>BEWG    | Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.18 Policy C3  |
| M59                    | The proposed strategy contains the following:<br>5.15 The need for minerals and waste developments must be balanced against the need to protect the environment. Policy C3   |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | <p>provides for protection to local residents and other interests from unacceptable impacts caused by minerals and waste development. The actual measures required to do this at any particular site can only be established when detailed information is available in a planning application.</p> <p>Setting standard buffer zone distances can lead to unnecessary restrictions being imposed and minerals being unnecessarily sterilised or to inadequate protection measures being required. The buffer zone distances appropriate to any particular development proposal should be decided on a case by case basis at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996) contained the following: 4.8 Since the late 1970s the County Council has operated a buffer zone policy based on a requirement for a distance of 350 metres between mineral workings and towns, villages and hamlets, and 100 metres between mineral workings and an individual dwelling or a small group of dwellings. \When determining planning applications for mineral or waste development, the County Council will have regard to these established standards, together with the individual circumstances of the site and the other measures which may be used to mitigate the effects of the development proposed.</p> <p>The proposal to avoid defining standard minimum buffer zones and instead to determine buffer zone distances on a case by case basis is a retrograde step and completely unacceptable.</p> |
| M952<br>BWB  | <p>Policy C3</p> <p>The Oxford Canal should be considered as sensitive receptor for the noise and disturbance caused by a mineral working.</p>  |
| M119         | <p>The full implementation of Policy C3 is essential, and it should be made clear to potential extractors that their planning applications must include evidence of full and proper consultation with local people, especially over mitigating visual and other impacts during extraction, and the siting of processing machinery and road access points. Community objections should be taken seriously if this evidence is not available.</p>   |
| M173<br>PAGE | <p>15. A Core Policy should be included in the Core Strategy in relation to protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land. This policy should explain that the sequential test will be applied, with strong preference given to sites which would not impact grades 1 and 2 of agricultural land, and that where high quality agricultural land would be lost as a result of mineral extraction this may preclude extraction taking place.</p>   |
| M265         | <p>5.18 Policy C3: Environment and amenity protection</p>   |

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
|                  | <p>The acceptance that local residents and other interests need to be protected from unacceptable impacts caused by minerals development is welcomed, but BaCHPoRT does not agree that an unrestricted case by case approach as advocated in 5.15 is sufficient. There should be published minimum standards for distance to habitations, noise impact etc, which should be adopted before any individual planning applications are considered. There should also be provision for regular monitoring of observance of these standards, and any other conditions, by operators, and a clear system of proportionate penalties for breaches of standards.</p> <p>The maps included in the consultation draft (Figure 1, Figure 8) clearly show the extent of the Oxford Green Belt, yet the text of the draft makes only one brief passing reference to it (2.2), which does no more than record its existence. Authorities are reminded that planning conditions for mineral working sites in the Green Belt must achieve suitable environmental standards and restoration, and any material change of use from either workings or restoration must not conflict with the purpose of including the land in the Green Belt. Furthermore, BaCHPoRT would like to see a presumption that, other things being equal, development of new quarries within the Green Belt should be avoided if there are alternatives that are not in the Green Belt.</p> |
| M498<br>HW PC    | <p>Policy C3. We disagree that setting standard buffer zones should be decided on a case by case basis. There should be an absolute restricted buffer zone distance together with a secondary zone within which operators have to demonstrate that no adverse impact will be made on residential amenity.</p>  |
| M524<br>Bucknell | <p>A stronger emphasis on the regulation of traffic along lower quality local roads and the impact of increased traffic to workings on other nearby roads need to be highlighted further, and made key criteria for any future planning applications for new or extended sites.</p> <p>Noise pollution also needs to be further considered, with recommendations about the acceptable noise limits in the nearby residential areas from workings, and the time of operation permitted.</p> <p>Airborne pollution limits should also be set out in a similar manner.</p> <p>Appropriate time scales for operation of sites must be laid out. Especially with relation to the restoration of habitats and the use of old sites for the public benefit.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that these are likely to be required in local planning permissions and in order to comply with other national and</p>  |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
|                | <p>European legislation and policy, explicit requirements within the 20y policy statement safeguarding local residential interests would be welcomed.</p> <p>Finally, it is imperative that as far as possible that joined up thinking is use between the Minerals and Waste plans. E.g. the B430 carries traffic for the Ardley stone quarry and will also carry traffic for the incinerator. This double whammy could severely affect the traffic situation in the surrounding villages as the B430 is currently a small road unsuitable for such heavy lorry loading.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing the results of the consultation.</p>   |
| M575<br>CPRE   | We endorse Policy C3, and OCC's commitment to ensure that proposals for minerals and waste development should 'demonstrate that they will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the environment, residential amenity and other sensitive receptors'.   |
| M682<br>RSPB   | <p>Paragraph 5.15</p> <p>We support the intention in this paragraph to consider buffer zone distances on a case by case basis. The restoration of mineral sites presents an opportunity to protect existing sites of biodiversity importance through buffering and extension. The Council's approach enables restorations to be close enough to existing habitat to provide this protection, and yet not damage the existing site. Further, the Council's approach will also enable integration of wetland habitats with rivers, increasing the sustainability of the restoration, and the role of such restorations in, for example, flood alleviation (see our comments for Policy C1 above).</p> |
| M732<br>Smiths | <p>8.1 We strongly welcome the acknowledgement at 5.13 that setting standard buffer zone distances can lead to the unnecessary sterilisation of finite minerals (or indeed to inadequate protection measures being imposed on mineral developments). This will remove the immediate call for a 350m buffer to towns, villages and hamlets, irrespective of impact, which has been based on historic non policy guidance and no longer fit for purpose. We support the determination of the size of buffer zones on a site by site basis through proper assessment at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Policy C3 is supported.</p>   |
| M749           | These policies relate to residential amenities, environmental concerns and archaeological and landscape impact. In these terms the land at Lodge farm Pusey represents a policy compliant location for soft sand extraction. It is highly contained in landscape terms, with very few residential neighbours that can therefore be adequately screened; there are no flooding issues, known archaeological constraints, and no landscape constraints.   |

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| M467<br>EA | <p>- Policy C3 should make reference to the River Basin Management Plan. A number of mineral developments in the county take place in close proximity to watercourses and it is important that minerals development both achieves and promotes the aims of the River Basin Management Plan alongside other biodiversity strategies.</p>   |
| M417       | <p>The proposal to extract minerals at Cholsey is contrary to Policy C3, which states: "Proposals for minerals and waste development should demonstrate that they will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on ... residential amenity."</p> <p>The proposed extraction site is hard against the northern boundary of the residential area and occupies the whole of the Wallingford Road corridor from Cholsey to Wallingford. This corridor, with its unspoiled rural character, is of huge amenity value to the residents of both towns. It is the principal throughfare between the two communities, used daily by pedestrians and cyclists who enjoy making the journey through this green space. It is also a popular route for family walks.</p> <p>The destruction of the field and woodland landscape along the west of Wallingford Road would impoverish the quality of life for thousands of residents in both Cholsey and Wallingford, who must use this route in the course of everyday life.</p> <p>Among the environmental assets that would be lost are high quality grazing, a large traditional stand of coppiced willow and a watercourse that is the habitat for a variety of fish, amphibians and birds including kingfishers.</p> <p>The site shares a boundary with the residential property at 81 Wallingford Road, and ranges along the frontages from No. 52 to No. 62, much to the detriment of their amenity and value.</p> <p>The impact on the landscape will also affect the scenic Cholsey to Wallingford Railway, which runs along the entire north-western boundary of the site. This will have a negative impact on local tourism, will diminish use of the railway and quite possibly condemn its economic future.</p> <p>The Consultation Draft offers no protection for these amenities. Paragraphs 5.15 and 5.16 are contradictory. They say "setting standard buffer zone distances can lead to unnecessary restrictions being imposed ... The buffer zone distances appropriate to any particular development proposal should be decided on a case by case basis at the planning application stage ... Applications for minerals and waste development in proximity to settlements should seek to safeguard the character, setting and amenity of those settlements and should include mitigation measures that incorporate an acceptable separation distance." This ambiguity leaves the developer free to pinch or simply omit any buffer zone on the grounds of "sterilisation".</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | On the grounds of unacceptable damage to local amenity, the Cholsey site should be precluded from consideration.  |
| M974  | The policy for environmental protection may be acceptable as far as it goes, but as stated here it immediately raises the question 'who decides whether a given minerals development has an 'unacceptable adverse impact' and by what criteria do they do so? Despite the general arguments in para 5.15, the absence of any clear statements on minimum buffer distances and their dependance on external factors and prevailing wind conditions seems a recipe for causing the maximum distress and dissatisfaction.  |
| <b>POLICY C4: BIODIVERSITY/GEODIVERSITY</b> |   |
| W59   | This fails to differentiate between biodiversity designations, their hierarchy and their level of protection and therefore mitigation of any adverse effects. It also gives protection to RIGs and Geomorphological Sites, when such sites do not have any statutory designation and there is no formal method of challenging the local geological group from listing such sites.   |
| W144<br>CPRE                                | <p>Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>We fully endorse Policy C4, and OCC's commitment to "protect sites designated as internationally, nationally or locally important for nature conservation, including the Oxfordshire Conservation Target Areas and the setting of those areas."</p> <p>And that "mineral working and waste management development should not damage or destroy irreplaceable habitats or biodiversity, including ancient woodland and species rich grassland."</p> <p>The real test of course is in the implementation of this commendable policy, and CPRE looks forward to working with OCC to ensure that Policy C4 is fully implemented.</p>   |
| W206<br>Frobisher                           | <p>Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity (part support, part object)</p> <p>Part of the Wicklesham Quarry site is designated as an SSSI in connection with its designation as a Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological site. Frobisher Renewables Limited is aware of the significance of the RIGS and SSSI designations and the importance of giving them due consideration when developing any proposals for the site. PPS9 recognises that where sites have significant geological interest, local authorities and developers should aim to retain or incorporate this interest into any redevelopment of the site. In line with PPS9, it is considered that Policy W10 should acknowledge that redevelopment of these sites can take place, providing the important features are retained and/or incorporated.</p> |

|                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| W92<br>M404<br>BEWG | Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG) strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.25 Policy C4  |
| M18<br>Nat Trust    | <p>The test of 'unacceptable adverse' impact does not appear to reflect the guidance that applies to SAC/SPA International habitats. Article 6.3 of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC in effect means that an Appropriate Assessments can be required where plans or projects that are not directly linked to the management of that site may have a 'significant effect' on the conservation objectives and would ultimately affect the integrity of the site. Integrity has been defined as the ability of the site to fulfil its function to continue to support protected habitats or species.</p> <p>As the owner of Cothill Fen, a rare alkaline fen in southern England and a SAC and SSSI, a nearby application for Planning Permission to extract sand and limestone and remove surplus soils at Upwood Park Estate, was the subject of such an Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>The wording of this policy should be substantially tightened to reflect Directive 92/43/EEC.</p> |
| M120                | <p>Policy C4 on bio/geodiversity is encouraging, and could release significant enhancement opportunities, especially for freshwater mosaic habitats, which would in pre-Roman times have dominated the river terrace landscape.</p> <p>Gravel pits like Sutton Courtenay have produced large quantities of Pleistocene mammal remains, and have revealed important snapshots of conditions in back-water silt and peat lenses. Developers should be made to provide access at appropriate times (eg weekends) to scientists (Oxford and Oxford Brookes Universities) and local people with volunteer guides so that the geology revealed can be recorded and all possible educational opportunities realised.</p>   |
| M227<br>Cemex       | Policy C4; Biodiversity and geodiversity<br>Principally agree   |
| M243<br>Wood Tr     | 5.22 and 5.25 (Policy C4) - The loss of irreplaceable habitats should also be a factor here. The Ancient Woodland Inventory should form part of the evidence base alongside the landscape designations  |
| M357<br>P Bennie    | <p>Policy C4</p> <p>This fails to differentiate between biodiversity designations, their hierarchy and their level of protection and therefore mitigation of any adverse effects. It also gives protection to RIGs and Geomorphological</p>   |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
|               | <p>Sites, when such sites do not have any statutory designation and there is no formal method of challenging the local geological group from listing such sites.</p>  |
| M381          | <p>Policy C4 - Comment:</p> <p>The principle of ensuring that there are no unacceptable impacts on designated sites is accepted. Government Guidance recognises that different standards of protection should apply to different levels of designation. The policy does not reflect this guidance and expects the same protection for a local site as it does for an international site.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to reflect the differing levels of designation to reflect Government Guidance.</p> <p>Again, the reference to long term maintenance suggests that aftercare/management requirements will be placed upon mineral operators which does not reflect guidance. Also, if a natural habitat can be created then by definition it should be allowed to develop through its normal life cycle (i.e. like a reed bed reverting to a woodland carr over many years) rather than require constant maintenance.</p>        |
| M660<br>BBOWT | <p>5.23 The Trust broadly supports the principles in this section and strongly supports this paragraph which states that minerals development should seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity, which would be in line with national and regional biodiversity planning policy and guidance. We would suggest that 'Local Biodiversity Action Plan' should be replaced with 'priority species and habitats' to strengthen the policy against future changes in nomenclature.</p> <p>5.25 Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity - we broadly support this policy but would recommend the following amendments to the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- first paragraph should include Local Wildlife Sites</li> <li>- second paragraph should state 'will not damage' rather than 'should not damage'</li> <li>- the third paragraph should reference 'priority species and habitats' as per 5.23 comments</li> </ul> |
| M673<br>Hills | <p>28. HQPL is concerned that mineral extraction will not be permitted unless BAP targets are secured. This assumes that minerals extraction is always able to increase BAP targets whereas that may not always be the case when working agricultural areas.</p> <p>29. Sites of geological interest are often only identified because they have originated in a working quarry. Continued working does not necessarily damage the site although it may through the extraction process be moved to another location. RIGS should</p>  |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
|              | properly be protected from harmful working but need not be retained in situ.  |
| M684<br>RSPB | <p>While we acknowledge that tree planting can be a useful method of screening on mineral sites, such planting is not always appropriate, for example when the restoration is to wet grassland. We therefore encourage the Council to add the words "where appropriate" to the sentence promoting the planting of trees.</p> <p>Further, planting should be of native species and characteristic to the local area, and it would be helpful for this to be emphasised in the Mineral Framework - perhaps in a subsequent DPD if not here.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.22<br/>We agree that features of local and regional importance should be maintained and/or enhanced, however we query why woodland has been included in the list. Woodland is included within the Oxfordshire BAP, so this list effectively presents it twice.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.23<br/>We strongly support the Council's intension that mineral site restorations should aim for "net gain in natural assets and resources" since this reflects the Vision of the Core Strategy to "enhance the quality of Oxfordshire's natural environment." However, we feel net gain would be better achieved through contributions to Biodiversity Action Plan targets (i.e. including the UK BAP), rather than just Oxfordshire BAP targets.</p> <p>Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity.<br/>We are concerned about the combining of 'internationally', 'nationally' and 'locally' important sites together in the same paragraph. Internationally protected sites receive a higher level of protection over nationally and locally important sites. Section 21 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 states that if proposals are 'likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either individually or in combination with other plans or projects)...must make an appropriate assessment of the implication for that site'.</p> <p>Therefore, in order to highlight the different levels of protection and fulfil the legal requirements of the 2010 Regulations, the paragraph should cover internationally and nationally/locally protected sites separately. We also feel the reference to CTAs within the first part of C4 should be omitted, as these areas are not intended to be "designations". CTAs instead highlight specific areas around the county where targeted conservation work would provide the greatest benefit. Any suggestion that CTAs are designations to be protected from development could be mis-interpreted by those</p> |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
|                | <p>opposed to mineral development. As CTAs are mentioned later on in Policy C4 the first reference to them could be removed. This could be worded as follows (new text underlined):</p> <p>"Proposals for minerals and waste development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated demonstrate that the development will have no significant effect on internationally designated sites. Proposals should also not have an unacceptable adverse impact on sites designated as internationally, nationally or locally important for nature conservation, including the Oxfordshire Conservation Target Areas and the setting of those areas."</p> <p>We strongly support the second sentence within the third paragraph requiring the '...long term maintenance of BAP priority habitats and appropriate contributions of Oxfordshire BAP targets through the CTA approach have been secured'. Without such a strong requirement, it is unlikely that proposals will include the creation of high quality habitat, particularly if the option of a more 'lucrative' after-use is favoured. As such, we strongly encourage the Council to retain this requirement. We have commented elsewhere on the need to define exactly what "long-term" means, in the Core Strategy.</p> |
| M704<br>MPA    | <p>Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>The MPA generally supports this policy. We have committed to realising the potential of minerals sites to deliver biodiversity enhancements, including action plan targets in our Biodiversity Strategy. However, our members are concerned about the reference in Background Paper 3 (para 9.4) to the collection of 30 pence per tonne annually from the developer to fund a further 20 years' management beyond the 5 year aftercare period. This clearly needs further discussion and agreement.</p>  |
| M715<br>OMPG   | <p>The MPA generally supports this policy. We have committed to realising the potential of minerals sites to deliver biodiversity enhancements, including action plan targets in our Biodiversity Strategy. However, our members are concerned about the reference in Background Paper 3 (para 9.4) to the collection of 30 pence per tonne annually from the developer to fund a further 20 years' management beyond the 5 year aftercare period. This clearly needs further discussion and agreement.</p>  |
| M733<br>Smiths | <p>9.1 We object to the inclusion in the policy of Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGs). These sites do not have any statutory designation and in part their identification, management and access to them have been secured because their existence does not restrict mineral operations. The inclusion of RIGs alongside SSSIs will be counterproductive, with operators reviewing their approach to these face exposures and to the excellent work carried out by the Oxfordshire Geology Trust.</p>   |

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
|                    | <p>9.2 The elements of C4 which are mineral related appear to repeat parts of policy M6. The line that starts "mineral extraction will not be permitted unless the long term maintenance .....have been secured" appears to be a reference back to policy M6 and is not referred to in the preceding paragraphs. If securing long term maintenance is indeed a reference to funding it is considered that this should be removed as it is already adequately covered.</p>   |
| <p>M741<br/>NE</p> | <p>Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>5.19 - 'protecting and enhancing' could be reworded to say 'conserving and enhancing' to be in line with regulations.</p> <p>5.21 We support Camilla Burrow's comments.</p> <p>5.22 - likewise 'maintain and/or enhance' - we would prefer 'conserve and enhance'. - and we support Camilla Burrow's comments</p> <p>5.23 - 'Local Biodiversity Action Plan' should be replaced with 'priority' to ensure priority habitats and species can be identified and conserved, even if BAPs are no longer in place.</p> <p>5.25 Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the different levels of protection (internationally, nationally and locally protected), are presented in a hierarchy. However, for clarity, it would be preferable for International sites to be dealt with separately, to ensure that the additional level of protection they receive is spelled out.</p> <p>Proposals for minerals and waste development will seek to conserve and enhance nature conservation assets. Proposals will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated demonstrate that the development will have no likely significant effect on internationally designated sites. Proposals should also not have an unacceptable adverse impact on sites designated as internationally, nationally or locally important for nature conservation, including County Wildlife Sites and Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. This includes both direct and indirect impacts to these sites and areas. the Oxfordshire Conservation Target Areas and the setting of those areas."</p> <p>Mineral working and waste management development should will not damage or destroy irreplaceable habitats or biodiversity, including ancient woodland, and species rich grassland and species.</p> |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
|                                    | <p>The County Council will seek the enhancement of Conservation Target Areas to implement Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets within and close to areas of mineral working. Mineral extraction will not be permitted unless the long term maintenance of BAP Priority Habitats and appropriate contributions to Oxfordshire BAP targets through the Conservation Target Area approach have been secured.</p> <p>Nationally and regionally important geological features including geological Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites should be protected from harmful development and retained in situ unless there are exceptional reasons justifying their removal and preservation, in which event their presence should be appropriately recorded.</p> <p>And we support Camilla Burrow's comments.</p>  |
| <p><b>POLICY C5: LANDSCAPE</b></p> |   |
| <p>W145<br/>CPRE</p>               | <p>Policy C5: Landscape</p> <p>We wholeheartedly endorse Policy C5, and OCC's commitment to ensure that proposals for minerals and waste development "should include appropriate provisions to protect and where possible enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape of the whole county."</p> <p>We agree that proposals for development "should demonstrate that they will not have a negative impact on views and settings associated with the Chilterns, Cotswolds and North Wessex Downs Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)."</p> <p>We agree that "major developments should only be permitted in these areas in exceptional circumstances." And that "Where development is proposed within or in proximity to an AONB, the assessment should be informed by the relevant AONB Management Plan."</p> <p>We also agree that "Development proposals should also take into account the landscape character areas, which are not statutory designations."</p> <p>We full commend OCC's commitment to demonstrate that any new waste development "will protect and where possible enhance the landscape quality of Oxfordshire and will take account of the landscape character areas identified in the Oxfordshire Wildlife</p> |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
|                        | <p>and Landscape study."</p> <p>We also agree that "Appropriate measures should be taken to mitigate potential adverse visual impacts through siting, design and landscaping."</p> <p>However, while we endorse the wording of Policy C5, we wonder about OCC's ability and/or commitment to adhere to these objectives when push comes to shove. The case of the Ardley incinerator suggests otherwise. We also have reservations about the proposed gasification plant at Finmere - we fear this may prove to be another example of OCC over-riding the policies outlined in Policy C5. However, without seeing the detail it is hard for CPRE to comment further at this stage.</p>           |
| W207<br>Frobisher      | <p>Policy C5: Landscape (part support, part object)</p> <p>The Wicklesham Quarry site is located within the North Vale Corallian Ridge landscape designation (Local Plan Policy NE10). Policy C5 relates to areas of landscape character and identifies that development should protect or enhance landscape quality. It is likely that a proposal for a waste recycling and energy centre will have some impact on its surrounding landscape given the scale and nature of such a use. That said, it is reasonable to expect these impacts to be kept to a minimum and/or mitigated where possible and it is accepted that measures should be taken to make enhancements if it is possible.</p> |
| W83<br>M367<br>Bampton | <p>Bampton Parish Council strongly supports:<br/>The whole of 5.27 Policy C5</p>   |
| W93<br>M405<br>BEWG    | <p>Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)strongly supports:<br/>The whole of 5.27 Policy C5</p>  |
| M1<br>NWCB             | <p>The North Wessex Downs AONB unit support the sensitive approach taken in the Oxfordshire Minerals Plan, to development within or within the setting of the AONBs. Although no specific minerals development is proposed within the North Wessex Downs AONB as part of this plan, making reference to the potential for harm from minerals development to the AONBs and their setting is relevant. Reference to the AONBs and their Management Plans is necessary to accord with statutory requirements of the CRoW Act 2000.</p>  |
| M22<br>NWCB            | <p>Policy C5 should be amended to include the supporting text actually within the Policy.</p>  |

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
|                 | <p>Policy C5 should refer specifically to the AONBs, the duty to conserve and enhance AONBs (Section 85 CRow Act 2000), and refer to the need to consider the potential impact of development outside but within the setting of the AONBs. The scale of development in AONBs(PPS 7) is again referred to in the supporting paragraph but should be brought into the Policy itself.</p> <p>Policy C5 should be more specific in respect of potential harm to AONB setting as the Cholsey sites SG 33, 57 and 60 all lie in a narrow gap between the North Wessex Downs AONB and Chilterns AONB. As stated in respect of the map that illustrates this within the Plan, the Cholsey sites are requested to be rejected by the North Wessex Downs AONB as they stand, based on likely setting impact on the AONBs. Alternatively these sites should not proceed any further in terms of consideration until detailed landscape and visual impact assessments have been prepared, as there is a substantial risk from these sites impacting negatively on two nationally protected landscapes.</p> <p>The North Wessex Downs AONB Position Statement on Setting is attached.</p> |
| M121            | <p>Policy C5 is commendable. I doubt however that in the flatlands of the Thames gravel terraces, extraction and subsequent restoration is likely to be a significant landscape issue, especially with the establishment of screening planting towards any higher ground (eg the Wittenham Clumps near Cholsey)</p>  |
| M685<br>RSPB    | <p>We support the commitment to protect 'the landscape quality of Oxfordshire' and feels that this strikes a good balance between preserving and enhancing the environment.</p>  |
| M722<br>Chil CB | <p>5. The Board notes that there are many references to the AONBs within the County. However, although Policy C5 (landscape) has a good supporting paragraph (5.26) the Board considers that it fails to include the correct terminology in connection with AONBs and their settings. The Board therefore considers that the following modifications are required to the first part of this policy in particular in order to ensure compliance with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement</p> <p>7: 'In particular proposals for minerals and waste development should ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the County's AONBs and their settings and should also demonstrate that the development will protect and where possible enhance the wider landscape quality of Oxfordshire'.</p>  |
| M743<br>NE      | <p>Policy C5 - Landscape.</p> <p>We suggest the addition of a mention of an intention to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB's, thus:</p>  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | 'Proposals in locations within, in conflict with the purposes of any of the AONBs, will be avoided.'  |
| M446<br>Nthants                        | Reference is made in C5 (Landscape) only to Oxfordshire's landscape character - there may be instances where impacts from development close to the boundary of neighbouring authorities affects landscape character outside of Oxfordshire. The policy should be amended as follows:<br>'Proposals for minerals and waste development should demonstrate that the development will protect and where possible enhance THE (delete) landscape quality OF OXFORDSHIRE (delete) and will take account of the identified landscape character areas IDENTIFIED (delete), including IN (delete) the OWLS study. Appropriate measures should be taken to mitigate potential adverse impacts through siting, landscape and design.'                     |
| M975                                   | Para 5.26. One paragraph on landscape seems totally inadequate and indicates the inability of the authors to see Oxfordshire's diverse landscape as more than a 'mineral resource'. This sub-section should be re-thought and re-written by someone with a proper and wide recognition of what landscape stands for. In this way perhaps some meaning could be breathed into following Policy C5.<br><br>The term 'landscape character areas' at the end of this paragraph is not defined in the text nor the glossary, but in comments on section 4, I have given detailed reasons why the minerals and waste strategy should take clear and explicit notice of the existing Vale DC policy governing development in the Corallian Ridge area. |
| <b>POLICY C6: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</b> |   |
| W146<br>CPRE                           | Policy C6: Historic environment and archaeology<br><br>We endorse Policy C6, and OCC's commitment to protecting and conserving Oxfordshire's historic assets and the setting of those assets, including Blenheim Palace, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, conservation areas, historic battlefields, and registered parks and gardens.  |
| W84<br>M368<br>Bampton                 | Bampton Parish Council strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.30 Policy C6  |
| W94<br>M406<br>BEWG                    | Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG) strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.30 Policy C6  |
| M122                                   | Policy C6 Historic Environment Proper evaluation of archaeology on fields where no cropmarks or surface finds have yet been   |

|               |  |
|---------------|--|
|               | <p>recorded can reveal important and unexpected evidence for historical use of the "ordinary landscape". All extraction operations should be required, regardless of the desk-top evaluation of known archaeology, to bring in archaeologists to record any sub-soil evidence after topsoil stripping. It would also be reasonable to encourage organised detectorists, under supervision</p>  |
| M172          | <p>This policy is objected to. The policy currently provides that, where archaeological remains are of national significance, they 'should' be preserved in situ. However, where remains are of 'only' regional or local importance, this is simply 'preferred'.</p> <p>Archaeological features are a finite resource which, once damaged or removed, cannot be replaced. The wording of the policy therefore needs to be amended to require that, where appropriate, all important archaeological remains are preserved in situ. The policy should also clarify that where features of sufficient importance to be preserved in situ exist in and around potential mineral extraction sites, these features may preclude extraction taking place.</p> |
| M266          | <p>5.30 Policy C6: Historic environment and archaeology</p> <p>The protection of heritage assets should be an essential part of any development proposed, but BaCHPoRT objects to the approach whereby the applicant is deemed the appropriate body to carry out a preliminary archaeological assessment (5.28) because of the possibility of conflict of interest. Any such assessment should be independent; ideally the Council to establish a panel of organisations/individuals with the necessary expertise; one of these could be selected by the Council to undertake a preliminary assessment, the cost to be met by the applicant.</p>   |
| M278<br>Cemex | <p>Policy C6; Historic Environment and archaeology</p> <p>Definition of Regional and Local importance,</p> <p>There is limited information attached to the core strategy which quantify the areas of significant archaeological importance and those areas that should be preservation in situ which warrants the exclusion of mineral safeguarding and extraction from the County.</p>  |
| M545<br>EH    | <p>With respect to the wording of s.28 to s.30 of the consultation draft, and in particular policy C6, it does appear that this is very much couched in the language of the former policy relating to archaeology, PPG 16, rather than the draft National Plan Policy Framework or PPS 5, and it might benefit from re-wording in the light of these documents.</p>  |
| M646<br>OGT   | <p>Oxfordshire Gardens Trust was established in 2002 as one of the 38 County Gardens Trusts in England. We are a Charity, and our aims are to promote the understanding, enjoyment and protection of parks and gardens in the county of Oxfordshire.</p>   |

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
|                      | <p>We have looked at the two documents of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework on Waste Planning Strategy and on Minerals Planning Strategy.</p> <p>We are somewhat concerned that there is no specific mention of English Heritage's Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, as such, although there are 58 such Registered sites in the county, any one of which might be near one of the proposed sites. The maps are on such a small scale that it is not possible to see what the impact on such sites might be, and so it is not possible to comment on these in more detail.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned with Policy C6 - 5.30 Historic environment and archaeology. (page 38 of Minerals document and page 49 on Waste document).</p> <p>Can we underline in particular the need to protect and conserve Oxfordshire's historic assets and the setting of those assets including ..... registered parks and gardens.</p> <p>And similarly at page 49 Policy C6 5.30.</p> <p>We note also that Historic Asset does not appear in either glossary. Perhaps it is not needed, but it would have been useful for those not working with these assets.</p> |
| M674 Hills           | <p>30. It is not appropriate to require archaeology of national importance to remain in situ. Often it is better to investigate the archaeological features and properly record them. The extraction of minerals provides a valuable, and probably unique, opportunity to evaluate archaeology that would never otherwise be available. Without mineral extraction large areas of England would not have been evaluated and much archaeological knowledge would still be left in the ground unknown. A blanket policy will prevent valuable archaeological knowledge becoming available. It is not appropriate and should not be proposed.</p>   |
| M447 Nthants         | <p>Policy C6 also only refers to impacts within Oxfordshire. As per policy C5, the policy should be amended to reflect that development may impact on areas outside of the county.</p>   |
| POLICY C7: TRANSPORT |  |
| W60                  | <p>Policy C7</p> <p>In terms of Transport paragraph 5.34 states that commuted lump sums may be required to cover ongoing road maintenance.</p>   |

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
|                       | <p>Surely, this is what mineral operators pay road taxes are for. The policy test for road traffic in C7 is also incorrect in requiring only neutral or positive benefits before permission can be granted; it should be that the test is that there are no significant adverse effects.</p>  |
| W75<br>M499<br>HW PC  | <p>Policy C7.</p> <p>This policy should be strengthened by adding " safe and " after ' where provision is made for' and before 'convenient access'.</p>   |
| W55<br>M324<br>Ewelme | <p>Policy C7 Transport - Minerals and Waste development will only be permitted (precis of policy):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ where it does not impact on residential development</li> <li>~ also facilities should have regard for he proximity principle</li> </ul> <p>Impact on Residential Areas: Representing the residents of Ewelme (Parish Councillor responding on behalf of the Ewelme PC), our concern is based on experience of the Hazells and Jeffrey's Eyres Lane recycling facility *</p> <p>The projections in the Strategy for Construction and Demolition Waste (CDW) show a considerable growth in this, and we believe that expansion on scale projected at existing sites should require new permission (even where a a site already has permission, but especially where the original CLUED licence has been far exceeded)</p> <p>The granting on any new permission should be in consultation with the local community, for the overall site and operation of the plant, but especially on lorry movements - numbers, routing and timing of operation.<br/>And that such routing should be acceptable to the local community and appropriate where it passes through residential areas.</p> <p>* The current processing at this site far exceeds the CLUED licence / permission with the result that lorry movements are a constant annoyance to parishioners of both Ewelme and Benson - and this has been raised with OCC to no effect.</p> <p>On the matter of Proximity principle, we question whether the Strategy takes into account the import of CDW materials from closely neighbouring counties (in our case (old) Berkshire and Buckinghamshire). Accepting that this is reasonable and inevitable up to a point, but we question whether there should be limitations on this where such imports add excessively to Oxon's processing requirements, and result in adverse impacts as described above</p> |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| 255<br>Eyn PC          | Eynsham Parish Council think that the effect of the consultation will have only minimal effects on the Parish, but do ask that the requirement for hauliers transporting waste to net their lorries and cargo is enforced.   |
| W147<br>CPRE           | <p>Policy C7: Transport</p> <p>We endorse Policy C7, and OCC's commitment to only permit minerals and waste development "where provision is made for convenient access to and along the primary road network in a way that maintains or improves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- the safety of all road users including pedestrians;</li> <li>-- the efficiency and quality of the road network;</li> <li>-- residential and environmental amenity."</li> </ul> <p>We also endorse OCC's commitment to ensure that wherever possible, it will transport minerals or waste by "rail, water, pipeline or conveyor, rather than by road"; and that as far as possible, it will "minimise the distance of mineral workings from locations of demand for aggregates, via roads suitable for lorries"; and that as far as possible, it will "minimise the distance of waste facilities from locations of waste production, via roads suitable for lorries."</p> <p>CPRE is particularly concerned that any new waste facility is accessible by suitable roads. We have been alarmed in the past by the use of narrow country lanes for the transport of waste and dismayed at how the lanes and surrounding countryside have been littered with wind-blown waste.</p> |
| M527<br>CPRE           | <p>Policy C7 Transport</p> <p>The policy of minimizing the distance over which minerals have to be transported is obviously a sound one. What is more difficult is how to achieve that when, as stated repeatedly, extraction can only take place where minerals occur and the market for those minerals may not be very local. It is disappointing from the West Oxfordshire perspective that there is no recognition of the particular constraints put on the transport of minerals by the lack of HGV routes across the Thames which necessitates the use of the already overloaded, single carriageway A40 to transport freight to the south and east of the county.</p>   |
| W163<br>M682<br>Alk PC | <p>Policy C7</p> <p>This proposes that mineral workings and waste facilities should be located where they can be served "via roads suitable for lorries". Suitability should be defined for selected lorry sizes, eg 20 t, so the requirements can be more clearly understood by all</p>   |

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
|                                   | <p>and applied when making planning decisions. For example, the Shenington Quarry ROMP proposal includes the movement of HGVs along lanes 3.8 m to 5.2 m in width whereas the Department for Transport "Manual for Streets" gives guidance that a minimum road width of 5.5 m is necessary for two HGVs to pass safely.</p> <p>The policy statement should include an explicit commitment by OCC to seek contributions to improvements before development starts and commuted sums towards ongoing maintenance. This is important to reduce potential costs to the taxpayer.</p> <p>OCC may not be aware that the nearest rail depot for aggregates is Banbury and that all transportation of minerals from Shenington with Alkerton would have to access the A422 and travel through Banbury. Also, OCC may not be aware that our villages are not suitable for HGVs as they are dangerous, narrow and in many cases the only access roads. We simply do not have a secondary road network or footpaths.</p> <p>Furthermore, the parish located north-west of Banbury on the county boundary is very remote from the county's planned growth areas: Bicester 42 km; Oxford 53 km; Wantage and Grove 75 km; Didcot 77 km.</p> <p>Thus, it is the opinion of the Parish Council that our location and infrastructure are unsuitable mineral and waste facilities.</p>          |
| <p>W167<br/>M610<br/>High Agy</p> | <p>Thank you for consulting the Highways Agency. I see you have Paul Robinson as your contact; he has changed jobs, so in order to avoid future difficulties when staff changes occur, please register <a href="mailto:PlanningSE@highways.gsi.gov.uk">PlanningSE@highways.gsi.gov.uk</a> (in cc of this email) or our postal address below as our contact point.</p> <p>We are responsible for the A34, M40, and A43 trunk roads in the county, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. We support policy C7: Transport. Except, please note that C7 could be read ("... where provision is made...") as permitting new access onto trunk roads for waste facilities. In fact the HA has its own policy for access, set out in DfT Circular 2/2007. This would tend to rule out the construction of new accesses purely for waste facilities. I suggest you change the first sentence to "minerals and Waste development will only be permitted where there is adequate and convenient access to and along the primary road network in a way that maintains or improves..."</p> <p>Douglas Rounthwaite, asset manager<br/> Highways Agency   Federated House   London Road   Dorking   RH4 1SZ<br/> Tel: +44 (0) 1306 878313   Mobile: + 44 (0) 7710 958485<br/> Web: <a href="http://www.highways.gov.uk">http://www.highways.gov.uk</a><br/> GTN: 3904 8313</p> |

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
|                           | <p>Safe roads, Reliable journeys, Informed travellers<br/>Highways Agency, an Executive Agency of the Department for Transport</p>  |
| <p>W219<br/>ConRec</p>    | <p>Policy C7</p> <p>34. Policy C7 states that minerals and waste development will only be permitted where provision is made for convenient access to and along the primary road network. The primary road network is not defined. However, if it consists of only the Motorway and "Primary 'A' roads" as shown on Figure 8 then there will be severe difficulty in finding sites that can comply with the policy and indeed most existing waste sites would not comply, as they do not have direct access on to the primary road network.</p> <p>35. As currently drafted there is an internal conflict between policies within the plan as many of the proposed locations for new waste management facilities envisaged within policy W5, for example at Wantage/Grove, Didcot, Carterton, Henley and Oxford could not have direct access to the primary road network and some are some distance away from it.</p> <p>36. If direct access to the Motorway and "Primary 'A' roads" is not actually meant by the policy, then this needs to be clarified and/or the "primary road network" defined to ensure there is no ambiguity in the policy and internal conflict in the plan (which is one of the tests of soundness).</p> |
| <p>W176<br/>Ox City</p>   | <p>The first bullet point of the policy omits to consider the safety of cyclists (who, along with pedestrians, may be particularly vulnerable to heavy vehicles used for transporting waste).</p> <p>Suggested change: Amend first bullet point to read: "- the safety of all road users including pedestrians and cyclists"</p>  |
| <p>W208<br/>Frobisher</p> | <p>Policy C7: Transport (support)</p> <p>Access to the Wicklesham Quarry site is provided by the A420 which is directly adjacent and to the north. Policy C7 seeks to ensure that convenient access is provided from a waste development site to the primary road network. This policy approach is supported. Part b) of the policy relates to minimising distances for transporting materials and this is intrinsic to the principles of decentralising the system and locating waste and recycling facilities close to the large and smaller towns in the area. The principle of this approach is considered acceptable although, as noted previously, the appropriate transportation distance should be determined having regard to the nature of the waste stream involved.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>W225<br/>Sheehan</p>                  | <p>Policy C7</p> <p>34. Policy C7 states that minerals and waste development will only be permitted where provision is made for convenient access to and along the primary road network. The primary road network is not defined. However, if it consists of only the Motorway and "Primary 'A' roads" as shown on Figure 8 then there will be severe difficulty in finding sites that can comply with the policy and indeed most existing waste sites would not comply, as they do not have direct access on to the primary road network.</p> <p>35. As currently drafted there is an internal conflict between policies within the plan as many of the proposed locations for new waste management facilities envisaged within policy W5, for example at Wantage/Grove, Didcot, Carterton, Henley and Oxford could not have direct access to the primary road network and some are some distance away from it.</p> <p>36. If direct access to the Motorway and "Primary 'A' roads" is not actually meant by the policy, then this needs to be clarified and/or the "primary road network" defined to ensure there is no ambiguity in the policy and internal conflict in the plan (which is one of the tests of soundness).</p> |
| <p>W85<br/>M369<br/>M371<br/>Bampton</p> | <p>Bampton Parish Council strongly supports:<br/>The whole of 5.35 Policy C7</p> <p>In addition to our comment in support of Policy C7, Bampton Parish Council would like to make the following observation in regard to supporting documentation "Minerals and Waste Core Strategy - Preferred Minerals Strategy - Annex 2: Preliminary Site Assessment". Page 1 shows an indication of the "Distance to main lorry network". The distances shown for the Clanfield/Bampton sites would appear to indicate access to the A420. The distances shown fail to take into consideration weight and other restrictions that apply to these access routes. The distances to the main lorry network are in fact far greater than those shown, adding more weight to the reasons given for the exclusion of these sites.</p>  |

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <p>W95<br/>08<br/>BEWG</p> | <p>Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)strongly supports:<br/>The whole of 5.35 Policy C7</p> <p>In addition we would like to make the following observation in regard to supporting documentation "Minerals and Waste Core Strategy - Preferred Minerals Strategy - Annex 2: Preliminary Site Assessment". Page 1 shows an indication of the "Distance to main lorry network". The distances shown for the Clanfield/Bampton sites would appear to indicate access to the A420. The distances shown fail to take into consideration weight and other restrictions that apply to these access routes. The distances to the main lorry network are in fact far greater than those shown, adding more weight to the reasons given for the exclusion of these sites.</p>   |
| <p>M4</p>                  | <p>In the recently endorsed Local Transport Plan 3 one of the requirements to be taken into consideration is:</p> <p>5. Minimise the distance minerals need to be transported by road and encourage where possible the movement of aggregates by conveyor, rail and on the River Thames in order to reduce the adverse impacts of mineral transportation on local communities and on the environment.</p> <p>To satisfy both of the above policies then more sites have to be identified in the South of the county, otherwise the County Council is contradicting itself, the whole Minerals &amp; Waste policy would be found unsound and could be challenged.</p> <p>The improvement to the A40 via Access to Oxford has been cancelled and the Highways Agency will object to a strategy that will add approx 700,000 HGV movements to the A40. This would have a negative impact on the local road network especially the A4095 &amp; A44.</p> <p>The Enterprise Zone will attract new government funding that will not be available to other areas, which can be added to the £6.5 million investment in the southern ring road by the County Council. This additional funding of infrastructure will mean that the Southern area will be best equipped to deal with the HGVs to satisfy policy 5 of LTP3 and policy C7 of this strategy.</p> |
| <p>M38<br/>Earthline</p>   | <p>Policy C7 (Transport)</p> <p>The objective of minimising the road distance between quarries and delivery locations is common sense and supported. However in practice at the application stage pressure can be brought to bear for lorry routeing or restrictions on certain routes (including A</p>   |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | <p>roads) that conflict with this approach. This can be a significant issue given the additional mileage that can be involved, and the ensuing additional environmental and financial costs. We suggest that somewhere in the supporting text - eg after 5.34 - something could be added along the lines that a balance needs to be struck between the use of routeing agreements and wider sustainability objectives.</p>  |
| M953<br>BWB      | <p>Policy C7</p> <p>British Waterways fully supports the use of waterways for the transport of low cost, high volume, non- time constrained goods where practical, economical and environmentally desirable. Minerals and waste are good examples of the types of material. As an example, the 'Waste by Water' waste transfer scheme on the Lee Navigation will remove 45,000 lorry movements per year.</p> <p>We note that figure 7 does not show the local waterways despite the fact that the policy aims to encourage transport by water if possible. We believe that the main rivers and canal, where freight transport could be a real possibility should be shown.</p> <p>The policy aims to protect other road users from the harmful impact of haul routes such as increased traffic, noise and wear. We ask that if transport by water is considered possible then similar studies are undertaken and mitigation put in place if necessary to protect the amenity of other waterway users.</p> |
| M201<br>E Hag PC | <p>East Hagbourne Parish Council strongly supports the Transport Policy C7. The policy details and criteria set out to obtain permission for mineral development must be firmly applied and the infrastructure must be in place before the site is opened. In addition, firm control and monitoring is needed to ensure that the policy and strategies are fully implemented and maintained throughout the working period of the site.</p>  |
| M267             | <p>5.35 Policy C7: Transport</p> <p>BaCHPoRT welcomes the adoption in the consultation draft of the proximity principle, for the reasons advanced in the draft.</p> <p>The barrier effectively presented by the River Thames, because of the dearth of crossings suitable for heavy lorry traffic, should be recognised. In the south of the county there are no bridges suitable for such traffic upstream of the A4130 crossing below Wallingford and below the Oxford Ring Road (excluding the A415 bridge at Abingdon, which would deliver heavy lorries into the already overcrowded roads of the town centre, creating even worse congestion than is currently experienced there). The Core Strategy should recognise that this restriction has major implications for the location of any new developments, which until the</p>  |

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | road infrastructure has been reinforced should either be located on the same side of the River Thames as the markets they are intended to serve, or within easy reach of a suitable crossing.   |
| M279<br>Cemex    | Policy C7; Transport<br><br>In general agreement<br>Does this also include distance of importation?   |
| M336             | 5.0 COMMON CORE POLICIES FOR MINERALS AND WASTE<br><br>5.1 It is accepted that distances for the transportation of minerals needs to be reduced where possible. However, national guidance states that minerals can only be extracted where they naturally occur.<br><br>5.2 Further, it is evident from paragraph 2.9 that there is significant development proposed throughout Oxfordshire, some of which is not immediately accessible to the primary road network.<br><br>5.3 Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged that access to the primary road network needs to be considered, there needs to be sufficient flexibility within this policy, in accordance with Planning Policy 12 (PPS12): Local Spatial Planning, for the policy to be considered sound.<br><br>5.4 The current drafting which states that 'Minerals and waste development will only be permitted where provision is made for convenient access to and along the primary road network.....' is too absolute and this therefore needs to be diluted so that there is more flexibility available within the application of the policy, which will assist not minerals operators but also Officers and Members when assessing proposals for minerals and waste development. |
| M358<br>P Bennie | Policy C7<br>In terms of Transport paragraph 5.34 states that commuted lump sums may be required to cover ongoing road maintenance. Surely, this is what mineral operators pay road taxes are for. The policy test for road traffic in C7 is also incorrect in requiring only neutral or positive benefits before permission can be granted; it should be that the test is that there are no significant adverse effects.   |
| M407<br>Grundon  | Policy C7 In terms of Transport paragraph 5.34 states that commuted lump sums may be required to cover ongoing road maintenance, this is not acceptable, other developers do not have to pay such contributions despite far higher traffic levels. The  |

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
|                | <p>increasing use of weight limits especially at river crossings leads to greater road mileages that would seem to run counter to policy C7 and their increasing use needs to be questioned.</p> <p>The policy test for road traffic in C7 is also incorrect in requiring only neutral or positive benefits before permission can be granted, the test should be that there are no significant adverse effects.</p>  |
| M312           | Policy C7: Whilst this policy direction is supported, it should be recognised that proposals for transporting mineral by means other than the public highway should be afforded reasonable leniency in the context of Common Core Policies C3, C4, C5, C6 and C8.  |
| M675<br>Hills  | <p>31. It is accepted that provision for a convenient access to the primary road network can be gained but the requirement for a convenient road access "along the primary road network" is unclear. It suggests responsibilities beyond the remit of any mineral operator. Roads are the responsibility of the County Council or Department of Transport. HQPL in general with the mineral industry, pays exorbitant sums of road and fuel duties which ought to pay for a suitable road network. Therefore the making of additional monetary payments for ongoing road maintenance is not supported and, in fact, cannot be legally upheld.</p> <p>32. Similarly, the requirement that the mineral industry should provide a neutral or positive benefit before permission is granted is also wrong. The test should be that there are no significant adverse effects.</p> |
| M705<br>MPA    | The MPA supports the intention of ensuring adequate provision for indigenous minerals close to markets to help 'minimise the distance of mineral workings from locations of demand for aggregates'. The first clause of the policy, referring to permission only being granted where it 'maintains and improves' safety, efficiency and amenity is potentially overly prescriptive. We recommend it is re-worded to the effect that permission will be granted if there are 'no significant adverse effects'...In addition, the reference to 'commuted sums toward on-going maintenance' of roads is not acceptable.   |
| M716<br>OMPG   | The MPA supports the intention of ensuring adequate provision for indigenous minerals close to markets to help 'minimise the distance of mineral workings from locations of demand for aggregates'. The first clause of the policy, referring to permission only being granted where it 'maintains and improves' safety, efficiency and amenity is potentially overly prescriptive. We recommend it is re-worded to the effect that permission will be granted if there are 'no significant adverse effects'...In addition, the reference to 'commuted sums toward on-going maintenance' of roads is not acceptable.   |
| M734<br>Smiths | 10.1 The objective to reduce the distances minerals need to be transported is welcomed as is the recognition that most quarries in the County are unable to use alternative methods of transport and therefore have to rely upon the road network for the delivery of aggregates to their customers. Although this hierarchy of transportation methods is understood, if the alternatives to roads are not practical it is unclear what Policy C7a is seeking to achieve.  |

|      |  |
|------|--|
|      | <p>10.2 We object in principle to the proposed requirement for commuted sums for highway maintenance as pro rata standard quarry trucks already pay a higher level of road tax (£1200p.a.) for the wear and tear caused by them on the roads. With the Policy C7 requirement for quarries to have access to and along the primary road network it is unreasonable to seek financial gain specifically from locally based mineral operators. Provision for the maintenance of the primary road network should be the responsibility of the County Council.</p> <p>10.3 The Background Paper 6 appears to group the local transport of aggregates from quarry to customer with those of freight movements through the county. Local quarries by and large supply local markets. However, contrary to the statement at Para 5.4, the results of AM2009 confirm that Oxfordshire is now a net importer of minerals (see comments on M2). The consequence of this is an increase in the number of road miles per tonne of material supplied to customers in the county.</p> <p>10.4 The policy states that the distance between quarries and the customers should be minimised. This is commendable but in light of the proposals set out under Policy M3 the location of future mineral working is already defined so it is not clear what policy C7b is endeavouring to achieve.</p> <p>10.5 The policy conflict between lorry routeing, weight restrictions and increased road miles and carbon emissions is acknowledged at Para 5.34. The use of weight restrictions on certain roads within the county can have the effect of significantly increasing road miles for customer deliveries and for increasing congestion at known pinch points on the strategic network. The vision for Oxfordshire's minerals planning strategy is to minimise the distance that aggregates are transported by road. We do not believe that there is at present sufficient weight in favour of this objective in the Policy C7.</p> |
| M750 | <p>This policy is concerned to ensure sustainable transport arrangements. In this context additional soft sand extraction at Pusey Lodge Farm it as at least as available as other soft sand extraction in this immediate area, an area that has been identified as suitable for this purpose. This particular site benefits from excellent and direct access to the A420 that will have no impact upon any dwellings.</p>   |
| M382 | <p>Policy C7 - Comment:<br/>The encouragement to use alternative transport to road is noted but in practice this generally can only be achieved for the bulk movement of minerals. It would be helpful if the policy could identify this.</p>  |
| M976 | <p>Para 5.34 and Policy C7. As written, policy C7 is acceptable, but experience points to the inability of the Council to implement</p>  |

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
|                          | these. For example routeing agreements are only as useful as they can be enforced. Exoerience, eg in the Northmoor area, shows that the inability of OCC to enforce these agreements shows that they become voluntary and ineffective in practice.  |
| M423<br>Hanson           | Hanson objects to the proposal of a commuted sum for highways maintenance since this is already reflected in the level of road fund licence payable. Responsibility for highway maintenance rests with the highways authorities   |
| POLICY C8: RIGHTS OF WAY |   |
| W148<br>CPRE             | <p>Policy C8: Rights of way</p> <p>We endorse Policy C7, and OCC's commitment to maintain "The integrity of the rights of way network" and where possible to retain rights of way "in situ in safe and useable condition". We agree that: "Diversion should be safe, attractive and convenient and, if temporary, should be reinstated as soon as possible. If permanent diversions are required, these should seek to enhance and improve the public rights of way network. Improvements and enhancements to the rights of way network will be encouraged and public access will be sought to restored mineral workings, especially if this can be linked to wider provision of green infrastructure."</p> |
| M574<br>CPRE             | Equally, CPRE approves the aims set out in Policy C8 and especially the intention that improvements to public access should be encouraged.  |
| W86<br>M370<br>Bampton   | Bampton Parish Council strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.39 Policy C8  |
| W96<br>M409<br>BEWG      | Bampton Environmental Watch Group (BEWG)strongly supports:<br>The whole of 5.39 Policy C8   |
| M123                     | <p>Policy C8 is important and must address local sensitivities over access routes which may be "accustomed" rather than formal rights of way. Because of the length of time extraction and mitigation operations may take, careful consideration of phasing, and provision of way-marked temporary alternatives should be planned within all applications, in consultation with local residents.</p> <p>In general, I would like to see all mineral extractions sites becoming full public access areas after rehabilitation, and that the management fund should include provision for signage and interpretation as well as land management.</p>  |
| M313                     | Policy C8: Whilst this policy direction is supported in principle, assumed rights of public access should be afforded and limited to restoration schemes featuring designated public open space.  |

M563  
OCAR

On behalf of Oxfordshire's local access forum, OCAF, I am sending you our response to the consultation on the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF), with particular reference to countryside access. OCAF's interests lie in encouraging countryside access, in particular walking, cycling and horse riding, as healthy and sustainable activities, whether for work, transport or leisure.

The forum is an advisory body set up under the CROW Act 2000 that brings together landowners and land managers with representatives of users of the countryside and rights of way and other people with an interest in countryside access. The forum's members bring different perspectives and priorities to our discussions, so the forum's advice will often reflect a balance of views. Our response has been formulated following our last meeting, on 4th October in Oxford, with all members having the opportunity to contribute their views, which I have summarised in the following letter.

We were pleased to note that rights of way had been mentioned and considered in the proposals. In particular, we fully support the idea that existing rights of way should be maintained in situ during mineral workings wherever possible, or a suitable alternative found. However we felt it was important to highlight, on this point, that the needs of our equestrian users are often not fully understood, and therefore not fully met, on bridleways and/or other horse routes that run through mineral workings. Whilst a sufficient width and an appropriate surface are usually provided to comply with statutory requirements, it often seems to be forgotten that horses are flight animals and easily spooked by unusual sights, sounds or movements. Our members cited a couple of examples where bridleways/horse routes had become almost unusable to riders during and after mineral workings due to the presence of noisy, frightening objects or machinery in too close proximity to the bridleways. For example in one case a conveyor was placed alongside a bridleway, its unfamiliar noise and movement making the route unusable to all but the quietest horses. In another case horse riders were expected to share the haulage road with the heavy stone lorries and other traffic, even though there would have been sufficient width to create a safe off road route for them alongside. We would ask that this point be taken into account when approving works adjacent to or diversions to existing bridleways, and that the British Horse Society or local riding group be consulted on any such matters to ensure that all routes are safe for horses as well as just being passable.

Our second point relates to paragraph 5.37 of the Oxfordshire Minerals Planning Strategy Consultation Draft which states "Proposals to enhance, promote and improve the rights of way network ... should be encouraged". We obviously agree with this but would prefer a more proactive wording along the lines of "We will actively seek and implement proposals from local residents to enhance and improve the rights of way network". The current wording places little requirement on the mineral companies to take any action towards implementing this, as reflected by the fact that "Table 1: Minerals Strategy Implementation and

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>Monitoring Framework" contains no targets for enhancement of the rights of way network. The only target listed for rights of way requires simply that existing routes are safeguarded. In an ideal world we would like to see a target for the creation of "x" new public access areas/routes for all users (walkers, cyclists, horse riders, disabled users, etc).</p> <p>In summary, we thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on these proposals. We are grateful that rights of way are being considered, and we hope you will be able to take on board our suggestions in order to give rights of way the recognition and support that they deserve for the vital role that they play in our society.</p> |
| M676 Hills                                  | 33. It is accepted that public access will be sought for restored mineral workings and it is understood that where footpaths can be linked into a footpath or bridleway network this would be beneficial. However, it is not clear what the provision of "green infrastructure" is. The policy should, instead, refer to the "rights of way network".  |
| M686 RSPB                                   | We support the commitment to maintain and improve the 'integrity of the rights of way network'. However, to ensure that access is appropriate, and does not comprise the outcome of sites being restored to certain habitat types, for example, heath land and grassland, we would suggest including wording to the effect that 'where this [public access] does not compromise primary restoration/biodiversity end use/purpose'.   |
| M735 Smiths                                 | 11.1 We broadly support the aspirations of this policy and the provision of improved access opportunities as part of mineral restoration and after use proposals. It is however disappointing to note that landowners will not only be required to designate new rights of way across their land but will also be obliged to fund the management of the paths for an extended period. We believe this weighs far too heavily against the landowner and may be counterproductive to the creation of new rights of way.  |
| INTERNAL COMMENTS (OCC RESPONSIBLE OFFICER) |  |
| Katie Barrett                               | I think the Minerals Planning Strategy consultation draft reads really well and I've only a few minor comments and suggested changes relating mainly to the transport section  |
| Transport Policy C7                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Para 5.32: delete first sentence</li> <li>- Para 5.32, third sentence: delete 'An objective of this plan' and insert 'This will be taken into account when seeking'. This gives a clearer link between minimising distances travelled but balancing this with protecting the environment.</li> <li>- Para 5.34, fourth sentence: delete 'onto the primary road network by the most appropriate route available' and insert ' to and along the advisory lorry routes (shown on Figure 9)'</li> <li>- Policy C7, second line: delete 'the primary road network' and insert 'advisory lorry routes'</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Figure 9: replace with the attached plan ‘Advisory Lorry Routes’ and add underneath the plan words to the effect that ‘The plan is shown for illustrative purposes and may change in the future; an up to date copy will be available on the Council’s web site.’ (It was to have been agreed by Rodney Rose on Monday but he cancelled due to a medical appointment and won’t be around till January.)</li> <li>- The structure plan and SE Plan had an overarching policy about achieving infrastructure. Do you have anything about development funding necessary mitigation measures? This could be useful. LTP3 has a policy SD2 about securing contributions, but something covering all mitigation works would perhaps be better and being part of the development plan would carry more weight.</li> </ul> <p>These are officer views and have not been agreed by the Cabinet Member for Transport.</p> <p>Am happy to discuss my response.</p>  |
| <p>Camilla Burrow</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Policies C1 C3 C4 C5</p> | <p><b><i>Flooding &amp; policy C1</i></b></p> <p>Reference could be made to the ‘ecosystem services’ that restorations of mineral sites can provide, such as flood alleviation or flood storage, which can be delivered alongside nature conservation. For example, where sites are in areas liable to flooding, restorations to wetland habitat, such as reedbed or wet grassland, should be promoted which can provide flood alleviation or storage.</p> <p><b><i>Water environment &amp; policy C2</i></b></p> <p><b>5.15</b> Support considering buffer zone distances on a case by case basis. The restorations of mineral sites present an opportunity to protect existing sites of biodiversity importance through buffering and extension provided that restorations are close enough to existing habitat to provide this protection, and yet not damage the existing site. This approach will also enable integration of wetland habitats with rivers, increasing the sustainability of the restoration, and the role of such restorations in, for example, flood alleviation.</p> <p><b>5.16</b> consider using ‘landscape character’ rather than ‘landscape setting’ – again, there are specific tools such as Landscape Character Assessment which help us to define what we mean here in a more objective way.</p> |

### ***Biodiversity and geodiversity***

Broadly support the principles in this section and strongly support paragraph 5.23 that minerals development should seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity, but have suggested amendments to wording for clarity. 'Local Biodiversity Action Plan' should be replaced with 'priority' to ensure delivery of national priority habitats and species targets as Oxfordshire targets are met through the Conservation Target Areas. Reference to woodland should be removed as it is a priority habitat so is already covered.

**5.21** *The County Council will encourage tree planting ~~with native species~~ for screening and landscaping and as a productive land use on restored mineral workings ~~where appropriate~~. ~~Planting should be of native species and characteristic to the local area.~~*

**5.22** *Proposals must address the need to maintain and/or enhance the following features of local and regional importance: Conservation Target Areas, ~~Local Biodiversity Action Plan~~ priority habitats and species, ~~woodlands~~, Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves.*

### **5.25 Policy C4: Biodiversity and geodiversity**

There should be a separate policy paragraph for the protection of European sites to ensure compliance with the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010. Section 21 of the Habs Regs states that if proposals are '*likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either individually or in combination with other plans or projects)...must make an appropriate assessment of the implication for that site*'. Therefore, in order to highlight the different levels of protection for SACs and SSSIs, the paragraph should be split into two, covering internationally and nationally/locally protected sites separately. Reference to CTAs within the first part of C4 should be omitted, as these areas are not development constraints, rather they are areas identified as where targeted conservation work would provide the greatest benefit.

Policy C4 should be strengthened to protect biodiversity and geodiversity as follows:

*Proposals for minerals and waste developments ~~will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated~~ ~~demonstrate~~ that the development will ~~have no significant effect on internationally designated sites~~. ~~Proposals should not have an unacceptable adverse~~ ~~direct or indirect~~ impact on sites designated as ~~internationally~~, nationally or locally important for nature conservation, ~~including the Oxfordshire Conservation Target Areas and the setting of those areas.~~*

*If adverse effects are likely, the development would not normally be permitted unless the developer can demonstrate that they have*

*sought to avoid the impact, adequately mitigated for the impact and adequately compensated for any residual impact. All developments should seek to conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.*

Suggest amendments to 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph for clarification:

*Mineral working and waste management development should not damage or destroy irreplaceable habitats ~~or species or~~ ~~biodiversity~~, including ancient woodland and species rich grassland.*

Strongly support 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph but suggest removing the reference to *Oxfordshire* BAP targets as follows to ensure priority habitats and species can be identified and conserved, even if BAPs are no longer in place.

*Mineral extraction will not be permitted unless the long term maintenance of ~~BAP~~ Priority Habitat and appropriate contributions to ~~Oxfordshire BAP targets through~~ the Conservation Target Areas approach have been secured.*

Re-word 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph to include preservation of geological sites and updated nomenclature for RIGS.

*Nationally and regionally important geological features including geological Sites of Special Scientific Interest and ~~Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological~~ Local Geological Sites should be protected from harmful development and retained in situ unless there are exceptional reasons justifying their removal ~~and preservation~~; in which event their presence should be appropriately recorded.*

## **5.26 Landscape**

Strongly support signposts to OCC's landscape character assessment (Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study). The archaeology service is starting to undertake an historic landscape assessment which will improve our evidence base. As well as protected landscapes, I would hope that all M&W developments would be able to demonstrate no significant harm to any landscape. As well as our own character assessment there are methods available which can be used to assess all landscapes for sensitivity and capacity to development, as well as visual sensitivity – e.g. see <http://www.dorsetforyou.com/media.jsp?mediaid=142231&filetype=pdf>

Suggest amending the language to set out our expectations on this – e.g. that *we would expect all developments to undertake a landscape assessment which demonstrates no significant harm to landscape character or visual amenity.*

Suggest amending wording below as well, as it is not so much the areas which are important in OWLs (e.g. lines on the map), but using

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>the descriptions of what is important in each landscape and the strategies and recommendations made in OWLs to help demonstrate no significant harm.</p> <p><i>Where development is proposed within or in proximity to an AONB, the assessment should be informed by the relevant AONB Management Plan. Development proposals should also take into account <del>the landscape character, sensitivity and visual amenity areas, which are not statutory designations.</del></i></p> <p>Support Policy C5.</p> <p><i>Proposals for minerals and waste development should demonstrate that the development will protect and where possible enhance the landscape quality of Oxfordshire and will take account of <del>the landscape character areas identified set out in the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape study</del> <b>and other relevant character assessments.</b> Appropriate measures should be taken to mitigate potential adverse visual impacts through siting, design and landscaping</i></p>   |
| <p>Paul Harris</p> <p>Rights of Way</p> <p>Policy C8</p> | <p>3) para 5.36 'rights of way' I think the first sentence is a little incorrect and may cause uncertainties in the future as it suggests that the RoWIP isn't its own document any more, So, instead of saying that the oxfordshire rights of way improvement plan has been incorporated into the local transport plan etc.... could this paragraph please be reworded to: <b>The Oxfordshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan set out the County Council's intention to protect and maintain public rights of way and natural areas so that all users are able to understand and enjoy their rights in a responsible way. The plans also note that the County Council will seek opportunities for network improvements and initiatives to better meet the needs of walkers, cyclists, and horse riders, including people with disabilities, for local journeys, recreation, and health.</b></p> <p>4) para 5.37 could we strengthen the text here and say " Proposals to enhance, promote and improve the rights of way network and to increase access to the countryside <b>are expected to be provided</b> as part of restoration plans for mineral workings <b>where appropriate.</b> Operators and landowners will be expected to contribute to an extended period of aftercare and management of rights of way."</p> <p>5) para 5.59 Policy C8. Again, could this be strengthened by a small change to "..... <b>Improvements and enhancements to the rights of way network will be provided where appropriate and public access will be sought to restored mineral workings,</b></p> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <b>especially if this can be linked to wider provision of green infrastructure.</b> |
|  |   |
|  |   |