

Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

MINERALS AND WASTE CORE STRATEGY

PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION February 2007

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES



CONTENTS

Section	Title	Page
	Introduction	3
1	Context and History	3
2	The Consultation Process	4
3	Purpose of this Report	4
4	Structure of the Report	4
	Summary of Responses	6
5	Comments on matters raised in the Introduction	6
6	Comments on matters raised in the section on Background and Context	6
7	Comments on the Plan's Aims and Objectives	7
8	Comments on the Plan's approach to Preferred Options	8
9	Comments on Issue 1 – The Plan Period	9
10	Comments on Issue 2 – Mineral Supply	10
	Issue 2a – Minerals Provision	10
	Issue 2b – Provision for Sharp Sand and Gravel and Soft Sand	11
11	Comments on Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings	12
12	Comments on Issue 4 – Strategy for Location of Crushed Rock (Limestone and/or Ironstone) Workings	14
13	Comments on Issue 5 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	15
	Issue 5a – Provision for Supply of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	15
	Issue 5b – Where Aggregates Recycling Facilities should be located	15

14	Comments on Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots	17
15	Comments on Issue 7 – Methodology for Identification of Areas or Sites for Mineral Working	17
16	Comments on Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Working	19
17	Comments on Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Mineral Working and Supply	20
18	Comments on Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals	21
19	Comments on Issue 11 – Waste Management Facilities	22
	Issue 11a – How the Plan makes Provision for Waste Management Facilities	22
	Issue 11b – Where Waste Management Facilities should be located	23
20	Comments on Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy	25
21	Comments on Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management	26
22	Comments on Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities	26
23	Comments on Issue 15 – Landfill	28
24	Comments on Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management	29
Annex	Numerical analysis of responses	30

INTRODUCTION

1. Context and History

- 1.1 Oxfordshire County Council is reviewing the planning policies covering minerals working and waste management in Oxfordshire. This will result in a new policy framework for minerals and waste development in the County – the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (the Plan).
- 1.2 The preparation of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) is a key document in the framework. It is currently proposed to be supported by two other main documents:
- the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies Development Plan Document (the Minerals Sites Document); and
 - the Waste Site Proposals and Policies Development Plan Document (the Waste Sites Document).
- 1.3 The role of the Core Strategy is to set out the County Council's vision, objectives and overall spatial development strategy for minerals and waste matters in Oxfordshire. It will guide the way in which sites that may be appropriate for mineral working and waste management are identified and allocated. The Core Strategy is likely to cover the period up to 2026.
- 1.4 Preparation of the Core Strategy commenced in March 2005 and has been informed by an independently chaired Stakeholder Group comprising representatives of various organisations, including mineral and waste operators and amenity groups. An Issues and Options Consultation Paper was published in late Spring 2006 and this was the subject of a six week consultation exercise.
- 1.5 The results of the consultation helped to inform the preparation of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Paper (the Consultation Paper) which was published in February 2007. The purpose of the Consultation Paper was:
- to report on the responses that had been received to the Issues and Options Consultation Paper;
 - to set out what the County Council saw as the preferred approach to the key issues that had been identified in the Issues and Options Consultation Paper;
 - to seek views on the extent to which the approach (the preferred options) might be considered appropriate;
 - to advise on the outcome of the interim sustainability appraisal work that had been undertaken to inform the selected approach to each issue.

2. The Consultation Process

- 2.1 The Consultation Paper was published in February 2007 and responses were sought by 23 March 2007. It was sent to all the District, Parish and Town Councils in Oxfordshire, appropriate statutory bodies and relevant local and national interest groups. All of the individuals listed on our consultation data base also received a notification letter about the consultation and how to find out more information if desired.
- 2.2 The Consultation Paper was made available for viewing at all of Oxfordshire's Libraries, District Council Offices, County Hall and our Speedwell Street Offices. A downloadable copy was also made available on the County Council web site along with other relevant information. The Consultation Paper is available for viewing at:
http://portal.oxfordshire.gov.uk/content/publicnet/council/services/environment_planning/planning/planning_policy/minerals_waste_policy/development_framework/cspo/CS-Preferred-Options.pdf.

3. Purpose of this Report

- 3.1 This report summarises the views expressed by the 115 respondents who made comment on the Consultation Paper. The comments that were made will help to inform the next stage of preparation of the Core Strategy.
- 3.2 A numerical analysis of the responses by section of the consultation paper and by individual preferred option is set out in the Annex to this report. The report text refers to numbers of responses in the annex.
- 3.3 In this report we summarise the comments that respondents have made to the preferred options that we put forward to deal with the issues that need to be addressed in the Core Strategy. No analysis of these comments or assessment of the accuracy of the comments has been undertaken.
- 3.4 Separate consultations took place in the Spring of 2007 on Issues and Options for the Minerals Sites Document and the Waste Sites Document. Reports on the responses made to both of those consultation papers are available on the County Council website.

4. Structure of the Report

- 4.1 The Consultation Paper discussed a number of matters under the heading of 'Issues' and, for each, put forward the Council's preferred approach – the 'Preferred Option(s)'. Some respondents commented on the matters discussed under each issue, some commented directly on the preferred option(s) and some commented on both. Many respondents made comment on more than one issue, and often made more than one comment on the range of matters covered.

4.2 This Report follows the order in which matters were presented in the Consultation Paper. At the start of each sub-section there is a numerical breakdown of the number of comments that were made on the subject; these have been categorised to give an idea of the level of support or opposition to the Council's suggested approach, as follows:

- Support;
- Conditional Support;
- Objection;
- Observation;
- Other Comment.

A summary of the main points then follows.

4.3 The table in the Annex allows a ready comparison to be made of the level of interest expressed in each issue and the level of support or objection to the Council's preferred approach. Reference to the table will show, for example, that there was some support for the way in which the Council proposed to deal with the siting of Aggregates Recycling Facilities (topic 5b), but that overall there was a higher level of concern about the suggested approach.

4.4 There appears to have been more interest in the Minerals Planning issues than there was in the Waste Planning issues, with interest being particularly focussed on:

- the location of aggregate recycling facilities;
- the location of appropriate locations for mineral working;
- the restoration requirements for mineral sites; and
- the extent to which sensitive receptors are protected from the harmful impacts of mineral working.

4.5 It should be remembered that a summary report can appear to be selective in its reporting. It is clearly not possible to mention all of the comments that have been made in response to the Consultation Paper. Wherever possible the report attempts to reflect the tenor of the majority response to an issue, but it cannot faithfully reflect any one of the individual comments that make up the whole. If there has been an opposite view to the majority, an attempt is also made to reflect this. Occasionally, reference to an individual comment might be made where this appears to be particularly poignant.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

5. Comments on matters raised in the Introduction

- 5.1 This section of the Consultation Paper explained how the Core Strategy fits into the Plan, the process to be followed in its preparation and the steps likely to be followed after its publication.
- 5.2 There were no comments raised specifically on this section. However, a number of responses included general comments that could not be clearly related to any one of the sections of the Consultation Paper. There were 15 responses that fell into this category, including one from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE).
- 5.3 GOSE made a number of general comments in addition to various comments on specific sections of the Consultation Paper. Several of these comments have been registered as objections. There was general concern at the overall approach being taken in the Core Strategy; in particular that it was not sufficiently spatial in its approach and not suitably reflective of the approach to be taken under the new Planning Act (2004). GOSE has warned that, unless the approach is changed significantly – particularly in the way the Core Strategy approaches the provision of Waste Management facilities – the Document may be found to be unsound.
- 5.4 Some of the other general comments raised by respondents included that:
- there were no maps in the Consultation Paper;
 - the term ‘sustainability’ should be defined;
 - the Core Strategy should avoid encouraging sand and gravel workings in the Wallingford area;
 - the relationship to the Milton Keynes sub-regional area should be addressed;
 - further growth at Didcot will require nearby resources of sand and gravel if the ‘costs’ associated with transportation from source to market are to be kept to a minimum; the Culham/ Appleford/ Long Wittenham area appears to have that potential.

6. Comments on matters raised in the section on Background and Context

- 6.1 This section of the Consultation Paper explained how the Plan, and the Core Strategy in particular, relate to other local and regional planning policy documents, and also to Government planning policy.

6.2 There were 36 responses to the matters raised as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
0	2	32	0	2

6.3 Most of the responses addressed the interim sustainability appraisal that supports the Consultation Paper. All of the responses were worded in the same way; they considered that assessment of the traffic and transport impacts of development proposals should be more comprehensive and undertaken at an earlier stage than presently envisaged; also that more regard should be had to plans and policies (e.g. County Council policies on transport) other than those listed in Table 3.1 of the Appraisal. The respondents also challenge the assertion that the long term effect of mineral working can increase bio-diversity, suggesting that this takes no account of the possibility of any new species not being characteristic to the area and that this could lead to a net reduction of native species.

6.4 Other comments were made about the desirability of Oxfordshire's Biodiversity Action Plan Targets being used to inform site options appraisal; also that the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study could be used to help identify suitable strategic mineral extraction areas. A further comment was that Appropriate Assessment (under the Habitats Directive) should extend to other European sites that may be affected by the Plan even if they are outside the County's administrative area.

7. Comments on the Plan's Aims and Objectives

7.1 This section of the Consultation Paper set out proposed minerals and waste aims and objectives that could provide the basis for the Plan's development of strategy, policies and proposals (including the Core Strategy).

7.2 There were 35 responses to the matters raised as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
18	13	2	0	2

7.3 The proposed Minerals Aims and Objectives were broadly supported, some respondents welcoming the fact that objectives for environmental enhancement and sustainable transport had been added since the previous consultation. There were some concerns that the objectives are still too general and not specific to the characteristics of Oxfordshire e.g. that it might be considered desirable for mineral working to set out to enhance Oxfordshire's biodiversity and natural environment. A number of comments were made to the effect that it would be desirable to add 'agriculture and forestry' to the objectives which seek to secure the effective restoration of minerals/landfill sites.

7.4 With regard to the aims and objectives for minerals, there was general support for objectives M2 (safeguarding), M3 (substitutes for primary products) and M4 (minimise travel distances)); less so for M5 (environmental safeguards) and M6 (restoration), which some felt did not adequately recognise and promote the role of minerals planning in contributing to biodiversity and landscape enhancement. There was a further suggestion that the objectives should address the protection of the historic environment. One respondent suggested that objective M3 be placed above M2 to emphasise the importance of using recycled material over primary aggregate wherever possible.

7.5 On the matter of the aims and objectives for waste, a number of respondents welcomed the recognition that waste management should not only protect but also enhance the natural environment, and the greater emphasis now given to sustainable development. Several respondents also mentioned that specific reference might usefully be given in objective W1 (capacity) to the need for Oxfordshire to accept some of London’s waste, with one respondent suggesting that it would be useful to include reference to the specific amounts of waste that Oxfordshire needs to deal with.

7.6 There was strong support for objectives W2 (waste reduction/recycling), W3 (waste facilities in new developments), W4 (minimise travel distances), W5 (environmental safeguards) and W6 (landfill restoration) although some responses expressed a wish that objective W2 be expanded to better reflect the Government’s commitment to Biodiversity and Geological Conservation in PPS9. There was particularly strong support for objective W3, which most felt reflected best practice and national guidance. Various respondents felt that a new (or expanded) objective should be adopted to provide protection to existing and newly allocated waste management sites from encroachment by uses that may be adversely affected by their proximity to such a use. It was also suggested that this point could usefully be reflected in amendments to preferred options 11a and 15.

8. Comments on the Plan’s approach to Preferred Options

8.1 This section of the Consultation Paper introduced the general way in which it was anticipated that the minerals and waste preferred options be approached.

8.2 There was only one comment on the way in which the Consultation Paper proposed to approach the preferred options:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
0	0	1	0	0

- 8.3 The objector felt that the Consultation Paper should have set out to develop the actual policies which will set the framework for making decisions on mineral extraction proposals, rather than consider the approach that might be taken to policy development; the point being that this appears to limit the opportunity for engaging in actual policy development until the later stages of the process, which was thought to be too late.

9. Comments on Issue 1 – The Plan Period

- 9.1 This section considered the period that should be covered by the Plan, and proposed that the preferred approach (as set out in preferred options 1a and 1b) be as follows:

- 1a The Core Strategy should cover the period to 2026.
- 1b The Minerals Sites and Waste Sites Documents should cover the period to 2026 and include identified locations for minerals and waste developments for the period to at least 2019.

- 9.2 There were 37 responses to this issue as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
17	4	11	3	2

- 9.3 Opinions were divided on the approach to be taken to site identification through the Minerals Sites Document and Waste Sites Document, especially on the desirability of maintaining a 7 year land bank in the supply of minerals. Some felt this was more likely to be achieved if mineral site allocations were made for the whole of the plan period i.e. to 2026. One response actually suggested that this period be extended further if no revision of the Minerals Sites and Waste Sites Documents is likely to take place during the lifetime of the Plan. Others felt that any desire to maintain an element of “flexibility” was a good thing, and that the objective should be to ensure that sufficient mineral resource should be released at the right time with a view to maintaining the land bank to at least the minimum requirement.

- 9.4 Of the 16 comments made in response to the proposal that the Core Strategy cover the period to 2026, 11 were by way of support. They pointed out that this would be in line with the emerging South East Plan; some also felt that this may allow for a more strategic approach to habitat creation. Most felt that a long term view to mineral production is needed, particularly concerning crushed rock, and that careful phasing and regular monitoring could be used to control the rate at which resources are released. Those who felt that the Core Strategy should not identify sites for future development beyond the period to 2019 felt that this better respected the fact that it is difficult to provide the necessary degree of certainty beyond a 10 year period, particularly where growth is concerned.

9.5 One respondent made the point that the desirability of aligning the life time of the Plan's Development Plan Documents to the lifespan of the various Local Development Framework Documents being prepared by the District Councils should be considered.

10. Comments on Issue 2 – Mineral Supply

Issue 2a – Minerals Provision

10.1 This section considered the level of provision to be made in the supply of minerals and how this should be best achieved.

10.2 The preferred approach was set out in preferred options 2a(i), 2a(ii) and 2a(iii), and proposed that the Minerals Site Document should:

- 2a(i) Identify specific sites for mineral working, unless there is insufficient geological or other information in which case identify areas of search.
- 2a(ii) Identify extensions to existing quarries to meet short term requirements where this is possible and acceptable and identify sites for new quarries for the longer term.
- 2a(iii) Identify specific sites for mineral working for the period to at least 2019 supported by criteria policy.

10.3 There were 55 responses to the matters raised in this section as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
20	16	9	0	10

10.4 There was a variety of general comments; many raised questions of interpretation of terms and a need to better understand some of the issues. Some respondents, for example, failed to understand the suggestion that there may be “significant environmental advantages in extensions”, and questioned what definition was being given to the term “extension”. One respondent acknowledged that there may be short term benefits in securing future supplies from extensions to existing pits but suggested that these were likely to be small scale and unlikely to provide sufficient resources to avoid the need for new ‘stand alone’ workings – particularly for the supply of soft sand.

10.5 One respondent felt there was a need for a more detailed justification for further mineral extraction in West Oxfordshire, and more work required in assessing the impact of such working on local communities. This respondent also felt that in its present form the Core Strategy was not sufficiently spatial in its approach.

10.6 Some respondents queried whether sufficient account had been taken of the Government's intention to increase the supply of secondary and recycled materials, and whether the levels of primary aggregates required to be

produced in Oxfordshire were realistic. One respondent felt that it was inappropriate for the Core Strategy to make no mention of Oxfordshire's present position in the availability of permitted sand and gravel reserves and the fact that this was below the required 7 year land bank.

- 10.7 Some respondents asked that more emphasis be placed on the opportunities offered by mineral workings to increase biodiversity, and that biodiversity target areas be included within the strategic criteria for site selection. One respondent commented that it was not clear why an environmental appraisal should not be required for each site.
- 10.8 Notwithstanding the individual comments made on some matters, overall there was support for identifying specific sites for mineral working in the Minerals Sites Document - preferred option 2a(1) – there being only one objection from the nine responses that specifically addressed this question.
- 10.9 There was also overall support for looking to extensions to existing quarries to meet short term needs, and identifying new quarries to meet longer term needs – preferred option 2a(ii). Of the eleven responses to this issue there were only two objections. It seems to be generally recognised that extensions to existing quarries are likely to deliver new reserves and are more likely to avoid extensive “Greenfield” development – being based on existing infrastructure and having a shorter lead time than is usually the case when establishing brand new workings.
- 10.10 At least one respondent made the point that preferred option 2a(iii) – identify specific sites for mineral working for the period to at least 2019 – could be amalgamated with preferred option 2a(i). Notwithstanding this, there was again overall support for the approach being recommended in the preferred option, although in this case there were five objections amongst the seventeen who made comment on this point. The objectors felt that it would be preferable to identify sites up to 2026 (especially for crushed rock) since this would give better certainty. It was felt that if sites were only identified up to 2019, then the options for provision beyond this period should at least be clearly defined now.

Issue 2b – Provision for Sharp Sand and Gravel and Soft Sand

- 10.11 This section considered the proportions of the sand and gravel apportionment that should be met by soft sand and by sharp sand and gravel. The preferred approach to this issue was set out in preferred option 2b as follows:
- 2b Plan on the basis of a subdivision of the sand and gravel supply requirement (apportionment) of 17% soft sand and 83% sharp sand and gravel.

10.12 There were 52 responses to the matters raised on this issue as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
40	6	3	0	3

10.13 Some comment was made that there should be flexibility in any subdivision between sharp sand/gravel and soft sand, since this would be more responsive to dynamic market forces. Some felt that, whatever subdivision was chosen, the policy should include a clear commitment to meet the 1.82 mtpa provision for sharp sand and gravel and the maintenance of a 7 year landbank throughout the plan period. It was also pointed out that separate land bank calculations may, in any event, need to be undertaken in line with policy M3 of the Draft South East Plan. Another respondent felt that production rates for both products be raised to cater for higher levels of house building.

10.14 Notwithstanding these individual comments, there was a fairly strong level of support for the preferred approach. Of those who made specific comment on the preferred option (47) there were only three objections, whereas 39 responses expressed full support. Those offering conditional support (4) made the point that the preferred subdivision may need to be reviewed prior to Submission of the Document to the Secretary of State to take account of the current regional apportionment review.

11. Comments on Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings

11.1 This section of the Consultation Paper identified that there would be a considerable need for new sand and gravel workings during the Plan period. Also, that the level of need was such that there would almost certainly be a requirement for the identification of new areas of working outside of the areas that are currently meeting the demand for the resource. It suggested that there was therefore a need for a strategy for the location of sand and gravel workings in Oxfordshire to guide the way in which the Minerals Site Document should identify appropriate sites.

11.2 Work on the identification of appropriate sand and gravel sites has been undertaken through the Minerals Sites Document and on the basis of that work the Consultation Paper identified the preferred approach to site identification in preferred options 3(i) and 3 (ii) as follows:

3(i) For sharp sand and gravel, subject to the results of further work on site assessment, to continue identifying locations for extensions to existing workings and new working areas within the sharp sand and gravel resource areas of West Oxfordshire and to identify new working area(s) within the sharp sand and gravel resource area of southern Oxfordshire outside the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).

- 3(ii) For soft sand, subject to the results of further work on site assessment, to identify locations for extensions to existing workings and new working areas in the main soft sand resource area between Faringdon, Oxford and Abingdon.

11.3 There were 31 comments to the matters raised under this issue as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
11	10	8	1	1

11.4 Much comment was made on the criteria that might be used in the first stage of the proposed site assessment process. There were uncertainties amongst the respondents as to what may be termed “key” constraints and the fact that these have yet to be defined. A particular point was made that there are many environmental constraints in West Oxfordshire, and that these should be carefully considered: others requested that criteria relating to the historic environment and biodiversity be included amongst the criteria to be used.

11.5 Notwithstanding this, there was a reasonable level of support for the strategy of seeking new sites in the West Oxfordshire and southern Oxfordshire resource areas – preferred option 3(i). Of the 18 comments made specifically on this issue, 12 gave support or conditional support to this as a means of providing a secure source of sand and gravel. There was widespread support for recognising a need to avoid mineral working in the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

11.6 The main reason given for supporting the continuation of working in the West Oxfordshire area was that it could build on existing infrastructure and the knowledge that already exists on the market dynamics of the area. However, there is some feeling that there should be no new workings in the Windrush or Evenlode Valleys until at least a comprehensive restoration strategy has been prepared. Some respondents queried why the preferred option did not refer to the potential for extending existing sites in southern Oxfordshire (as opposed to only searching for new workings in that area). One respondent suggested identifying workings within the Central Oxfordshire area to minimise transport distances to key development sites in that area.

11.7 Of the 10 responses made on the issue of locations for soft sand, only 2 failed to offer support for the preferred approach of seeking sites in the Oxford/Faringdon/Abingdon resource area – preferred option 3(ii). It was recognised that geology largely pre-determines the location of sites, one respondent seeking confirmation that extensions to existing workings could usefully be made for reserves in the north of the area that provide soft sand for needs local to that area – thus reducing transportation distances.

12. Comments on Issue 4 – Strategy for Location of Crushed Rock (Limestone and/or Ironstone) Workings

12.1 This section of the Consultation Paper addressed the approach that should be taken in the Minerals Site Document to the location of crushed rock (limestone and/or ironstone) workings to meet the resource needs throughout the Plan period.

12.2 The preferred approach was set out in preferred option 4 as follows:

- 4 For crushed rock, subject to the results of further work on site assessment, to identify locations for working crushed rock in the main limestone resource areas outside the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:
- (i) in the Witney – Burford area (south of the A40); and
 - (ii) in the area east / north-east of Woodstock / Chipping Norton (including the Oxford – Bicester area).

12.3 There were 20 responses to the matters raised on this issue as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
3	2	5	4	6

12.4 There are mixed views on the various matters raised by this issue. Some respondents felt that there should be a greater level of provision for crushed rock – one respondent commented that it should be favoured as a substitute for sand and gravel. Those who favour a higher level of provision for crushed rock suggest that a new policy should be built into the Development Framework to confirm the Council’s commitment to an agreed level of provision.

12.5 More respondents (4) were opposed to the preferred option of seeking locations for new crushed rock workings in the specified areas than those who supported the strategy (3). One respondent suggested that further provision for crushed rock should be made through extensions to existing quarries as the benefits to this approach (use of existing infrastructure, lesser environmental damage etc) outweigh any disadvantages. One respondent was particularly concerned to avoid further crushed rock quarries in West Oxfordshire unless a full environmental assessment had established that this was feasible. Another respondent felt that the approach that had been set out for site identification was insufficiently spatial.

13. Comments on Issue 5 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

Issue 5a – Provision for Supply of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates

13.1 This section of the Consultation Paper examined the level of provision that should be made for secondary and recycled aggregates and how this should be achieved.

13.2 The preferred approach to these issues was set out in preferred options 5a(i) and 5a(ii) as follows:

5a(i) Identify permanent facilities for aggregate recycling where possible supported by temporary facilities at minerals and waste sites.

5a(ii) Maximise the provision for aggregate recycling through a positive policy approach.

13.3 There were 15 responses to the matters raised under this issue as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
5	8	2	0	0

13.4 There was overall support for the preferred approach to the identification of opportunities for the provision of recycled aggregate – preferred option 5a(i). Some respondents suggested that this could be improved with additional policy support being given to the provision of temporary facilities. Those who had concerns about showing a positive commitment to the provision of permanent facilities pointed to the difficulties in finding sites in appropriate locations that were unlikely to generate noise and dust problems to sensitive receptors such as residential property.

13.5 On the question of the level of provision that should be made for recycled aggregates – preferred option 5a(ii) – there was again general support for the suggested approach, with only one of the seven respondents raising a positive objection. The main point made was that the Plan should be clear in setting out to demonstrate how Oxfordshire is achieving its apportionment for secondary and recycled aggregates as required by policy M2 of the Draft South East Plan.

Issue 5b – Where Aggregates Recycling Facilities should be located

13.6 This section of the Consultation Paper explored where the most appropriate locations for the siting of aggregate recycling facilities should be, and how the Plan could best approach the selection of suitable sites.

13.7 The preferred approach to site identification was set out in preferred option 5b as follows:

- 5 Locate aggregate recycling facilities using the following sequential approach:

- urban areas; close to urban areas; rural areas.

Within these areas take the following sequential approach to site identification:

- previously developed land; temporary minerals and waste sites; greenfield sites.

This sequential approach includes locations in the Green Belt, which should be considered against national and regional policy.

- 13.8 There were 67 responses to the issues raised in this section of the Consultation Paper as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
4	10	51	1	1

- 13.9 A commonly expressed view related to the environmental problems (noise, dust, heavy traffic etc) that can be generated by recycling aggregate uses, and that these should be given due recognition in any locational strategy. It was pointed out that a strategy which allowed aggregate recycling facilities to be located near to urban areas was likely to consume a disproportionate level of resources in responding to the environmental problems commonly generated by such facilities. There was some support for the view that environmental designations should be taken into account when considering a sequential approach to site selection. Some respondents pointed out the advantages of locating such facilities in active quarries where advantage could be taken of the washing facilities installed for treating the primary aggregates being quarried.

- 13.10 Of the 54 responses that specifically addressed the preferred approach – preferred option 5b – 42 raised an outright objection. A common reason for objection concerned the need to avoid siting recycling aggregate facilities in the Green Belt, which most felt was not specifically precluded by the recommended approach. Although some respondents felt that the preferred approach could adequately prevent unnecessary use of Green Belt land for the accommodation of aggregate recycling facilities, many felt there should be a strengthening of the sequential approach to prevent aggregate recycling sites developing in the Green Belt. Some also suggested that more suitable locations for such facilities may be alongside active quarrying sites and locations that are genuinely temporary in nature; however, a strongly held view was that the Green Belt should only be considered as a final option in any sequential test. Some suggested that reference to urban areas in the sequential test should be removed due to the fact that current housing policy favours the use of brownfield land. One respondent felt that temporary sites should be moved further up any sequential list.

14. Comments on Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots

14.1 This section of the Consultation Paper examined the need for imported aggregate (of a type that cannot be sourced within the County area) and the means by which such resources are brought to Oxfordshire.

14.2 The preferred approach to the matters raised under this issue is set out in preferred options 6a and 6b as follows:

6a Continue local supply of aggregates at levels in line with regional policy plus imports to meet demands that cannot be met from this local supply.

6b Include a policy for new rail aggregate depots and, where possible, identify sites for rail aggregate depots.

14.3 There were 6 responses to the matters raised as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
2	3	0	0	1

14.4 The view was expressed that any additional rail depots should be developed on the basis of their being able to demonstrate an acceptable environmental impact, rather than having to demonstrate that any new facility was needed. A further respondent expressed the view that for developments of this type there should be strict adherence to the terms of any planning permission issued.

14.5 There was general support for the preferred approach; however, there was a suggestion that this could be strengthened by including a statement that committed the County Council to ensuring that it met its sub-regional apportionment for aggregates from local sources.

15. Issue 7 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Areas or Sites for Mineral working

15.1 This section of the Consultation Paper examined the criteria that should be used in the identification of sites for future mineral working and how these could be best applied to the site options that are being developed.

15.2 The preferred approach – preferred option 7 – was set out in the following way:

7 Include a policy for the identification of appropriate locations for mineral working based on Structure Plan Policy M2:
In identifying appropriate locations, the County Council will take account of the distribution of mineral resources; the existing pattern of supply and distribution of workings; proximity to main market areas; accessibility to the main transport routes; risk of birdstrike;

restoration and after use potential; and development plan policies, in particular which seek to safeguard:

- important archaeological remains, historic buildings and areas;
- areas and sites of nature conservation importance, especially Special Areas of Conservation and Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- features of landscape importance, especially Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- best and most versatile agricultural land;
- the water environment;
- land uses which are sensitive to nuisance; and
- the safety and convenience of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

15.3 There were a total of 114 comments made on the issues raised in this section of the Consultation Paper as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
12	21	42	34	5

15.4 There was a wide variety of views expressed, many tending to address the degree of weight that should be afforded to one or more of the criteria that had been identified as appropriate for site selection. There was no widespread view that the criteria that had been identified were inadequate. This was typified by comments from those with a general interest in nature and wildlife conservation, who suggested that opportunities for enhancing biodiversity should be at least equal to the weight to be afforded to the potential for restoring a mineral site to full agricultural use. A particular plea was made for giving more recognition to the need to safeguard archaeological remains and landscapes. Generally speaking, however, there was considerable support for the view that a greater emphasis should be given to the opportunities for restoration when identifying sites suitable for mineral working.

15.5 Overall, the approach to site selection advocated by preferred option 7 was not popular. Of the 85 individual comments made, about half (41) registered an objection. Many thought that more clarity was required and that this could generally be addressed by giving a better idea of the weighting to be given to the various criteria that had been identified. That said, there was an equal level of opposition to any attempt to devise a systematic approach to weighting, and it was recognised that a level of flexibility will often be required to reflect individual site circumstances.

15.6 Some respondents felt that there was a need for some explanation to be given as to the reasons that often cause delay in determining minerals applications. Many respondents welcomed the recognition given in the selection criteria to the potentially adverse environmental impacts of mineral workings – particularly in terms of heavy traffic movements and

congestion. Some made a particular point that there is an over-emphasis on the potentially adverse effect caused by birdstrike. Many felt that there should be greater emphasis placed on the desirability of avoiding mineral workings in the Green Belt.

- 15.7 One particular comment was that the proposed methodology intended to rely on a former Structure Plan Policy and that it was not considered appropriate to replicate or repeat former development plan policies in the new plan making system.
- 15.8 Notwithstanding these comments the former policy approach was also supported (in some cases conditionally) by 33 favourable comments, many of which indicated that the preferred approach should lead to effective restoration and after-use of mineral workings.

16. Comments on Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings

16.1 This section of the Consultation Paper addressed the way in which the Core Strategy should deal with the need to ensure effective and appropriate after uses for mineral workings – recognising that there were often a number of options to be considered.

16.2 The preferred approach in addressing this issue – preferred option 8 – was set out in the following way:

8 Promote and require progressive working and restoration of mineral sites within reasonable timescales to acceptable uses that are appropriate to the location whilst maximising appropriate opportunities for restoration to agricultural land, habitat creation, recreation and public access.

16.3 There were a total of 84 comments made in response to the issues raised on this topic in the Consultation Paper as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
25	47	2	6	4

16.4 Many respondents made the point that long-term management agreements were vital in ensuring successful restoration opportunities. Others made the point that there may be cases where an Area Action Plan may be beneficial in bringing about effective restoration over a broader area to bring potential social, economic and environmental benefits. As highlighted in comments made in response to issue 7 (above), many respondents felt that the selection of sites for mineral working should be based primarily on those areas where there is greatest opportunity for constructive restoration. In recognition of the fact that the amount of inert waste available for restoration is becoming increasingly restricted (through more effective recycling schemes), those with an interest in habitat and

wildlife conversation point to the fact that available quantities of inert fill should be targeted as far as possible to enhancing the biodiversity conservation target areas; and that this should be a recognised consideration in the selection of sites for future mineral working. One of the more original responses suggested that consideration could be given to the use of water bodies created from mineral workings as a means of supplying local communities with water resources in an energy efficient manner.

- 16.5 Despite the wealth and variety of comments made, overall there was a healthy level of support for the preferred approach to restoration – preferred option 8 – with only two outright objections from the 57 comments that were specifically made on the preferred option. Many of the supporters suggested minor amendments with a view to making the approach more robust, and made the point that much can be learned from assessing the successes and failures of previous attempts to secure restoration at former mineral workings. The emphasis on the progressive restoration of sites and restoration to acceptable local uses was welcomed by many respondents, albeit there were also many who would like to see a move away from water-based restoration schemes wherever possible. Despite this, there were several respondents who considered that too much emphasis is given to the effect of birdstrike from water based restoration schemes.

17. Comments on Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Mineral Working and Supply

- 17.1 This section of the Consultation Paper looked at the need for measures to be put in place to minimise the impact of mineral working where it took place close to a sensitive receptor, and the best ways of achieving such protection. In particular the most appropriate means of applying buffer zones around mineral workings was considered.

- 17.2 The preferred approach to this issue was set out in preferred option 9 as follows:

- 9 Provide protection for environmental interests and for local residents and others against unacceptable impacts from mineral working by:
- (a) establishing the need for buffer zones around mineral workings and other mitigation measures on a case by case basis, at the planning application stage; and
 - (b) specifying any buffer zones required and requiring any other necessary mitigation measures when planning permission is granted.

- 17.3 There were 54 comments made in response to the issues raised in the Consultation Paper as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
9	38	2	3	2

- 17.4 Most of the views expressed were on the issue of buffer zones, although there were some responses which addressed other issues - primarily how to find suitable ways of mitigating the effects of disturbance caused by heavy lorry traffic from mineral workings. One respondent in particular, whilst generally supportive of transport management measures to mitigate the adverse traffic effects that may be caused by minerals workings, also suggested that some emphasis should also be placed on opportunities for the water based transportation of minerals wherever possible. There were also some respondents who queried what was intended by the Council's stated intention to develop a general policy for the protection of local residents and others, and environmental and other areas from the unacceptable impacts of mineral working.
- 17.5 There was strong support for the preferred approach to the establishment of buffer zones – preferred option 9; however, of the 44 comments made in support, 38 were conditional. Many felt that rather than leaving the setting of a buffer zone to be set entirely at the planning application stage, the Council could usefully establish parameters and guidelines in the Development Framework in a way which could provide for some degree of certainty without compromising overall flexibility. At least one respondent felt that this should be taken further, and that the Plan should make more specific provision for a buffer zone distance in the manner of the current Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996).

18. Comments on Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals

- 18.1 This section of the Consultation Paper considered the approach that should be taken to the safeguarding of known mineral resources from development that may render the resource unusable for future generations.
- 18.2 The preferred approach was expressed in the following terms through preferred option 10:
- 10 Safeguard mineral resources of potential economic importance for possible future use, in particular sand and gravel, limestone, ironstone and fullers earth.
- 18.3 There was only one response made to the issues raised by this section of the Consultation Paper as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
0	1	0	0	0

- 18.4 Whilst supportive of the approach put forward in preferred option 10, the respondent suggested there was also a need to safeguard any resources of natural stone that may be suitable for the maintenance of historic buildings and monuments.

19. Comments on Issue 11 – Waste Management Facilities

- 19.1 This section of the Consultation Paper introduced the amount of waste that will need to be managed and advised of the need to decide what types and sizes of facilities will be required over the Plan period and where they should be located.
- 19.2 Two responses were made on this and both pointed out that the Plan did not address the question of hazardous waste and that provision for this should be made within the Core Strategy.

Comments on Issue 11a – How the Plan makes Provision for Waste Management Facilities

- 19.3 This section of the Consultation Paper considered whether the need for new waste management facilities might best be met by a range of smaller specialised facilities, by larger scale facilities catering for a number of waste needs or by a combination of both; also whether the Plan should make provision for specific sites or be more general in its approach and identify broader areas within which such facilities might be found more acceptable than others.
- 19.4 The preferred approach was set out in preferred options 11a(i), 11a(ii) and 11a(iii) in the following way:
- 11a(i) Identify specific sites in the Waste Sites Document, particularly for strategic facilities; and indicate broad areas where more local facilities will be needed to serve communities or where specific sites cannot be identified. Support identified sites and areas with locational criteria policies.
 - 11a(ii) Identify locations that are generally suitable for a range of facilities, to provide flexibility and allow for evolving waste management technology; but where there are sound planning reasons for doing so, restrict locations to specified types of facility.
 - 11a(iii) Provide for a mix of sites for both large and small scale facilities. For large-scale facilities, identify specific sites in the Waste Sites Document; and for smaller-scale facilities, for which identification of sites is likely to be more difficult, include locational criteria policies.
- 19.5 There were 26 comments on the issues raised in the Consultation Paper on this section as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
16	5	0	4	1

- 19.6 All but 1 of the responses made comment on one or more of the preferred options, and generally speaking there was support for the approach taken in the Consultation Paper.
- 19.7 The strategy of identifying specific sites for strategic waste management facilities and broader areas for more local facilities – preferred option 11a(i) – was supported in the case of five of the six responses received on the subject. Most respondents expressed the view that it was important to make best use of existing waste transport infrastructure wherever possible. The point was also made that it is now important for the Plan to recognise the need for a range of waste management facilities and not just landfill void. One respondent considered that sites for waste management facilities should be safeguarded against their possible use by non-waste related development. Another expressed the view waste should be viewed as a resource and utilised for the provision of combined heat and power for domestic and industrial consumption.
- 19.8 The approach to restricting specified types of facility on a site only where there were sound planning reasons for doing so – preferred option 11a(ii) – was also supported in the case of five of the six responses received on the subject.
- 19.9 There was again majority support for the approach to providing for a mix of large and small sites – preferred option 11a(iii). There were 9 responses on this matter of which none were expressions of outright objection. The suggestion was made that the approach could be strengthened further if greater emphasis were to be placed on the reduction of waste. But overall the approach set out was considered to provide a necessarily flexible and reasonable approach to waste management.

Comments on Issue 11b – Where Waste Management Facilities should be Located.

- 19.10 This section of the Consultation Paper looked at the locations that could best be utilised for the siting of waste management facilities; in particular whether they should be within (or close to) urban areas or in rural areas, the type of land that should be used; and the approach that should be taken in relation to Green Belt land.
- 19.11 The preferred approach was set out in preferred option 11b as follows:
- 11b Locate waste treatment facilities within or close to urban areas, subject to the availability of suitable land.
In view of the difficulty of finding sites for waste facilities, locate waste facilities using the following sequential approach:

- urban areas; close to urban areas; rural areas.

Within these areas take the following sequential approach to site identification:

- previously developed land; temporary waste sites; greenfield sites.

This sequential approach includes locations in the Green Belt, which will be considered against national and regional policy.

- 19.12 There were 26 comments made on the issues raised in the Consultation Paper on this section as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
3	8	13	2	0

- 19.13 Although there was some limited support for the suggested approach, the majority of responses were not supportive.

- 19.14 Some respondents felt that the sequential approach would lead to an unnecessary use of resources to monitor the management of facilities (particularly aggregate recycling facilities) that will be allowed to locate in places that are not conducive to sensitive receptors. Others thought that the sequential approach, as presently defined, does not recognise that proximity to the source of waste arising and/or market for the product are equally suitable site assessment criteria to those set out. Another response pointed out that there appears to be no intention to take account of environmental designations such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

- 19.15 Many raised concern about the approach suggested to the Green Belt, and most felt that this should be excluded from the sequential approach altogether – in recognition of the fact that waste uses should not be sited in the Green Belt. Although a few respondents acknowledged that Green Belt locations might be considered suitable for such development if all other options had been explored and found wanting, many were not clear as to exactly how it was being suggested the sequential approach should be applied – particularly in the case of Green Belt.

- 19.16 One response suggested that the sequential approach could be acceptable and noted that it was little different to the approach suggested in preferred option 5b (which had also usefully included temporary minerals sites in the suggested approach). Other supporters of the approach pointed out that it should prevent unnecessary use of greenfield land. Other supporters took the view that there was no reason why Green Belt land should not be considered – one interpretation of Government policy being that it already attempts to make some provision for this.

- 19.17 However, overall the level of support for the approach was limited, particularly in so far as most of the favourable responses were, in any event, conditional.

20. Comments on Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy

20.1 This section of the Consultation Paper addressed ways to encourage the movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy, in line with national and regional policy.

20.2 The preferred approach to the issues raised were set out in preferred options 12a(i), 12a(ii) and 12a(iii) as follows:

12a(i) Encourage and enable the movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy and ensure there is adequate provision of a range of waste management facilities to meet needs, including suitable facilities for local communities.

12a(ii) Limit landfill provision in line with national and regional policy and landfill targets, whilst recognising there will be a continued need for some landfill.

12a(iii) Make provision for at least the minimum capacity to meet national and regional policy targets for recycling, recovery and diversion from landfill, through positive policies and identification of sites. Provide a positive policy framework to enable advantage to be taken of any appropriate opportunities that may arise to increase capacity. The regional targets should be used as a guide to the minimum level of provision that is required.

20.3 There were 17 comments made on these issues as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
13	3	0	0	1

20.4 Some of the respondents felt that it was not being made sufficiently clear how Oxfordshire will demonstrate that it is complying with the delivery of national and regional waste targets – a particular concern being in the areas of recycling and composting. At least one of the respondents commented that of the various options available for the treatment of residual waste, energy from waste was the most preferable.

20.5 Although there is overall support for the approach advocated in the Consultation Paper – there were 5 comments by way of support for each of the preferred options – the number of respondents was not large. With regard to preferred option 12a(ii) one respondent made the point that the commitment to still provide for necessary landfill space could be strengthened by the deletion of ‘some’ from the text.

21. Comments on Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management

21.1 This section of the Consultation Paper examined the extent to which Oxfordshire should be self sufficient in meeting its own waste needs and what provision should be made for waste from elsewhere. It also addressed the level of provision for waste management facilities relative to regional targets.

21.2 The preferred approach in addressing these issues was set out in preferred options 13(i), 13(ii) and 13(iii) as follows:

- 13(i) Provide for net self sufficiency in waste management capacity plus capacity for Oxfordshire’s share of waste from London as set in regional policy. Imported waste should normally be limited to residues from treatment processes that can only be disposed to landfill. Import of waste for treatment at facilities in Oxfordshire could be appropriate where this would be a sustainable option of there would be overall benefits.
- 13(ii) Ensure there is enough capacity to meet the targets in regional policy for recycling, composting, other treatment and landfill; but with only the minimum provision necessary being made for landfill.
- 13(iii) Plan for the capacity requirements in regional policy, unless monitoring of local information and other circumstances indicates otherwise.

21.3 There were 12 comments made on these issues as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
7	4	0	1	0

21.4 The comments generally support the approach suggested in the preferred options, although concerns were expressed about the impact of waste management facilities on Oxfordshire’s roads which points to a desire to limit the number of facilities to that necessary to manage the County’s waste needs only. The view was expressed that this applied particularly to any waste being imported into the County for treatment.

22. Comments on Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities

22.1 This section considered the criteria that should be used to inform decisions on the siting of the new waste management facilities that will be required during the Plan period. The preferred approach was set out in preferred option 14 as follows:

- 14 Include a policy for identification of appropriate locations for waste management facilities based on principles similar to those included in Structure Plan Policy M2:
 In identifying appropriate locations, account will be taken of the existing pattern of waste management facilities; proximity to main sources of waste and destinations for outputs from waste treatment processes; accessibility to the main transport routes; risk of birdstrike (for landfill); restoration and afteruse potential (for landfill); and development plan policies, in particular which seek to safeguard:
- important archaeological remains, historic buildings and areas;
 - areas and sites of nature conservation importance, especially Special Areas of conservation and Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
 - features of landscape importance, especially Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
 - best and most versatile agricultural land;
 - the water environment;
 - land uses which are sensitive to nuisance; and
 - the safety and convenience of all road users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

22.2 There were 18 comments on these issues as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
6	8	4	0	0

22.3 Although there was overall support for the approach set out in the preferred option, a number of comments made by supporters addressed the level of weight that should be given to different factors. Some felt that priority should be given to the safeguarding of features of landscape importance such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, others felt that emphasis should be placed on the need to keep traffic to a minimum – again with a view to safeguarding the character of rural Oxfordshire. A number of comments were made about the fact that there was no mention made of the significance of Oxford’s Green Belt, and some felt that greater emphasis should be placed on the impact of waste management facilities on local communities.

22.4 There were four outright objections to the preferred approach, and some commented that this would have significant and unacceptable impact on local communities and the environment generally. It was suggested that by including more positive guidance on the potential adverse effects of waste management facilities on local communities, the strategy could be made more acceptable. The need to be clear about the policy that should apply to the provision of waste management facilities in the Green Belt was also cited as a cause of concern. Other comments of concern included a need for greater clarity on what was meant by the term “main

transport routes”; it was also felt that more needed to be said on what the Council meant by the term “after-use potential” and its relevance to recreation activities, particularly those that were water based.

23. Comments on Issue 15 – Landfill

23.1 This section examined the need for future landfill facilities and how they should be provided.

23.2 The preferred approach to these issues was set out in preferred options 15(i), 15(ii) and 15(iii) as follows:

15(i) Make provision for landfill in line with national and regional policy targets; over time this should increasingly limit landfill to waste that has been subject to treatment, whilst recognising the continued need for some landfill capacity.

15(ii) Give priority to use of inert waste for restoration of mineral workings. No provision should be made for other types of inert waste landfill and policy for new landfill should include a strong test of need for use of inert waste other than for restoring mineral workings.

15(iii) Generally safeguard existing landfill void for future use.

23.3 There were 20 comments on these issues as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
12	7	0	0	1

23.4 The responses to the approach advocated by the preferred options was positive, although one respondent felt that some aspects of the approach needed to be given greater clarity. Several of the comments were particularly supportive of the approach being taken on inert waste, stating that this should ensure that this valuable resource should be directed to sites where there is a genuine need for restoration work to be undertaken, thereby contributing to more sustainable methods of mineral extraction. It was felt it important that the Core Strategy seek to retain Oxfordshire’s inert wastes for restoration purposes in Oxfordshire; also that sites suitable for landfill should not be restricted to the tipping of inert wastes if it was geologically suitable for landfilling other wastes. One respondent felt that the preferred option should be broadened in some way to take account of the requirement that all non-hazardous waste going to landfill after October 2007 be treated prior to its final disposal.

23.5 Two comments were made specifically on the subject of hazardous waste. There was a feeling that it is important for Oxfordshire to make provision within the Plan for sufficient facilities to handle hazardous waste. The point was made that this would be beneficial to the South East generally,

which is a region producing a significant amount of hazardous waste with few locations designated as being suitable for its disposal after 2009.

24. Comments on Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management

24.1 This section of the Consultation Paper considered the need for the potential adverse effects of waste management facilities to be addressed in some way through the Core Strategy.

24.2 The preferred approach to these issues was set out in preferred option 16 as follows:

- 16 Provide protection for environmental interests and for local residents and other against unacceptable impacts from waste management facilities by:
- (a) establishing the need for mitigation measures on a case by case basis, at the planning application stage; and
 - (b) requiring any necessary mitigation measures when planning permission is granted.

24.3 There were 8 comments on these issues as follows:

Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment
5	3	0	0	0

24.4 There were no objections to the approach suggested in the preferred option, which was generally supported. In recognising that the safeguarding of environmental interests and those of local residents were best considered on a case by case basis, comment was nevertheless made that this should only be found acceptable if the means by which mitigation could be secured was legally enforceable.

ANNEX

**Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework.
Minerals and Waste Core Strategy
Preferred Options Consultation February 2007
Numerical analysis of responses**

Section / Issue	Preferred Option	Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment	Total
Introduction	General Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0
Background and Context	General Comments	0	2	32	0	2	36
Aims and Objectives of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework	General Comments	18	13	2	0	2	35
Preferred Options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework	General Comments	0	0	1	0	0	1
Issue 1 - Minerals and Waste Development Framework (Plan) Period	General Comments	2	0	2	1	1	6
	Preferred Option 1a	9	2	3	2	0	16
	Preferred Option 1b	6	2	6	0	1	15
Issue 2 - Minerals Supply							
Issue 2a - Provision for Mineral Supply	General Comments	3	7	1	0	7	18
	Preferred Option 2a(i)	6	2	1	0	0	9
	Preferred Option 2a(ii)	5	4	2	0	0	11
	Preferred Option 2a(iii)	6	3	5	0	3	17
Issue 2b - Provision for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand	General Comments	1	2	1	0	1	5
	Preferred Option 2b	39	4	2	0	2	47
Issue 3 - Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings	General Comments	0	1	2	0	0	3
	Preferred Option 3(i)	7	5	5	1	0	18
	Preferred Option 3(ii)	4	4	1	0	1	10
Issue 4 - Strategy for Location of Crushed Rock (Limestone and/or Ironstone) Workings	General Comments	1	1	1	0	5	8
	Preferred Option 4	2	1	4	4	1	12
Issue 5 - Recycled and Secondary Aggregates							
Issue 5a - Provision for Supply of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	General Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Preferred Option 5a(i)	2	5	1	0	0	8
	Preferred Option 5a(ii)	3	3	1	0	0	7
Issue 5b - Where Aggregates Recycling Facilities should be located	General Comments	1	2	9	1	0	13
	Preferred Option 5b	3	8	42	0	1	54
Issue 6 - Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots	General Comments	2	1	0	0	0	3
	Preferred Option 6a	0	2	0	0	1	3
	Preferred Option 6b	0	0	0	0	0	0

Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste Core Strategy: Preferred Options 2007

Section / Issue	Preferred Option	Support	Conditional Support	Objection	Observation	Other Comment	Total
Issue 7 - Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Areas or Sites for Mineral Working	General Comments	9	11	1	3	5	29
	Preferred Option 7	3	10	41	31	0	85
Issue 8 - Restoration of Mineral Workings	General Comments	16	8	0	2	1	27
	Preferred Option 8	9	39	2	4	3	57
Issue 9 - Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Mineral Working and Supply	General Comments	3	0	0	0	2	5
	Preferred Option 9	6	38	2	3	0	49
Issue 10 - Safeguarding of Minerals	General Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Preferred Option 10	0	1	0	0	0	1
Issue 11 - Waste Management Facilities	General Comments	0	2	0	0	0	2
Issue 11a - How the Plan makes Provision for Waste Management Facilities	General Comments	3	1	0	1	0	5
	Preferred Option 11a(i)	4	1	0	1	0	6
	Preferred Option 11a(ii)	4	1	0	1	0	6
	Preferred Option 11a(iii)	5	2	0	1	1	9
Issue 11b - Where Waste Management Facilities should be Located	General Comments	0	1	2	0	0	3
	Preferred Option 11b	3	7	11	2	0	23
Issue 12 - Moving up the Waste Hierarchy	General Comments	1	0	0	0	1	2
	Preferred Option 12a(i)	4	1	0	0	0	5
	Preferred Option 12a(ii)	4	1	0	0	0	5
	Preferred Option 12a(iii)	4	1	0	0	0	5
Issue 13 - Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management	General Comments	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Preferred Option 13(i)	1	1	0	1	0	3
	Preferred Option 13(ii)	3	2	0	0	0	5
	Preferred Option 13(iii)	3	1	0	0	0	4
Issue 14 - Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities	General Comments	2	0	0	0	0	2
	Preferred Option 14	4	8	4	0	0	16
Issue 15 - Landfill	General Comments	1	1	0	0	0	2
	Preferred Option 15(i)	3	2	0	0	1	6
	Preferred Option 15(ii)	6	2	0	0	0	8
	Preferred Option 15(iii)	2	2	0	0	0	4
Issue 16 - Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management	General Comments	3	1	0	0	0	4
	Preferred Option 16	2	2	0	0	0	4
Overall Total							737