

PROPOSED SITE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT

Analysis of Responses to Initial Informal Consultation
January/February 2018

August 2018



Proposed Site Assessment Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

Initial Consultation

The Proposed Site Assessment Methodology and draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report were published on 8th January 2018 for a six week consultation.

They were published on Oxfordshire County Council's website, with an invitation to comment. Relevant stakeholders were directly informed, including local community groups, parish and district councils, adjoining county/unitary councils, the minerals and waste industry and statutory bodies.

Responses to the consultation

- 32 respondents made comments on the consultation
- 21 respondents made comments on the proposed Site Assessment Methodology.
- 7 respondents also made comments on the Sustainability Appraisal
- 5 respondents made no comment
- 6 respondents made comments on specific sites. These comments will be considered as part of the individual Site Assessment.

This document is a summary of those comments received and how they have been addressed within the revised Proposed Site Assessment Methodology and draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The full responses have been considered when assessing the responses.

Copies of the full responses are available on request. Please contact the Minerals and Waste Policy Team.

Email: mineralsandwasteplanconsultation@oxfordshire.gov.uk

Minerals and Waste Policy Team
Strategic Infrastructure and Planning
Planning and Place
Oxfordshire County Council
County Hall, New Road
Oxford
OX1 1ND

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
001	Hanborough Parish Council		Previous response from earlier Core strategy consultation (20/03/2017). Proposed modification of policy M3 with the removal of Lower Evenlode Valley (SG-08) from list of strategic resource areas.	Site specific and Core Strategy policy comments. None required at this stage	Will review comments at site appraisal stage.	No amendments required at this stage
002	Bicester Town Council		No comment	None Required	Not applicable	No amendments required
003	Doncaster Council		No comment	None Required	Not applicable	No amendments required
004	Richard Betteridge		Comments on specific site only. Elmwood Farm site should be removed from the existing waste site map, as it is not a waste site	Waste site inclusion Remove site from existing waste site map	Site Specific Comments Will review comments at site appraisal stage. Waste site inclusion Elmwood Farm is a safeguarded waste site for Recycle/Transfer within Policy W11.	Waste site inclusion No amendments required at this stage
005	Brian Fearneyhough		Comments on specific sites only. Concerns regarding the viability of Sites SG-09 and SG-59 (Drayton St. Leonard and Stadhampton) due to frequent flooding of nearby roads.	Site specific comments No action required at this stage.	Will review comments at site appraisal stage	No amendments required at this stage

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
006	Watlington Parish Council	SAM	No sites to put forward. Transport Request to assess transport routes around Watlington as itself is not an appropriate route for Heavy Vehicles as it is an AQMA with 7.5 Tonne Limit.	Transport Assess transport routes in relation to a particular site,	Transport Transport routes are considered under the transport section of the initial screening and Criterion T1 – T4 of the Detailed Technical Assessment. Local traffic impacts of each site will be assessed against these criteria. A transport assessment or transport statement, as appropriate, will also be prepared for the Site Allocations Plan.	Transport No amendments required at this stage
007	Surrey County Council		No comment	No action required	Not applicable	No amendments required
008	Sue Cooper	SAM	Two points to consider as part of site allocations policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of water transport • After use of sites 		Both issues will be considered when it comes to the assessment of each site. These issues are included within the Policies already adopted in the Core Strategy	

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Sue Cooper		<p>Use of alternative transport Consideration for using water transport to transfer minerals & waste to reduce pollution & noise caused by HGVs.</p> <p>After use of sites Increased housing will see increased demand on water supplies. Having a number of</p>	<p>Use of alternative transport Requests that consideration be given for sites within a reasonable distance to the Thames to provide a water connection so can be exported from sites via water.</p> <p>After use of sites Would like the creation of a</p>	<p>(C10 and M10) and all sites are assessed against the adopted Core Strategy, within the initial screening and through various criterion of the Detailed Technical Assessment</p> <p>Use of alternative transport Alternative transport modes are a consideration within the initial screening and Criterion T4 of the Detailed Technical Assessment.</p> <p>After use of site Water resources are a consideration within the initial screening. The after use of</p>	<p>Use of alternative transport No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>After use of site of site No amendments required at this stage</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Sue Cooper		smaller reservoirs would be more secure than having one reservoir. Use some of the “holes of mineral extraction” as such reservoirs. These would provide good leisure facilities for an increasing population.	number of smaller reservoirs from the quarries. Use these for water supply and leisure facilities.	sites is then considered under the following criterion as part of the Detailed Technical Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B4 Biodiversity Accounting • B1 Potential to Impact source protection zones. • HA 1 Proximity to residential development /sensitive receptors and potential to impact on health and amenity. • R1 - Restoration 	
009	Anti Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)	SAM	Supports the Traffic light scoring system. There are four important subjects that should be included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water resources • Transport • Health and Amenity • Tourist Trade 	Support None required	Support Support for the Traffic Light scoring acknowledged Four subjects to be included overview These are all issues that are considered by the Policies contained within the adopted Core Strategy. All sites are	

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Anti Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)		<p>Water Resources New or extended quarries can have a major effect on local water tables, below ground water flows and the quality of water for a considerable distance. WODC has seen historical usage of wells. A recent figure for the number of active wells in WODC was 260. These could be seriously affected and should be included in the judgement criteria.</p>	<p>Water Resources Need to include water table reference and impact on wells in relation to new or extended quarries.</p>	<p>assessed against the adopted Core Strategy within the initial screening and through various criterion of the Detailed Technical Assessment</p> <p>Water Resources The Environment Agency have defined Source Protection Zones (SPZs) for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes, and springs used for drinking water supply, to ensure that they are looked after and water is safe to drink. The effect/impact on SPZ's and other water resources are a criterion within the initial screening methodology against which sites are assessed. They are then included within the Detailed Technical assessment under Criterion W1 and W2 As such we believe there is no requirement to specifically mention wells.</p>	<p>Water Resources No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Anti Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)		<p>Transport There is no mention of schools positioned on the roadside. During term times schools generate fleets of parents' cars delivering and collecting children. Where this occurs the addition of 20-40 ton lorries would produce blockages and create mayhem thus considerably increasing the danger to the children. In our area this problem is exacerbated by the poor country road system. There are 6 schools on the roadside in the area.</p> <p>Health and Amenity (or 13 Airport Safeguarding zones) The airport traffic from Brize Norton easily exceeds that of any other airport in the County. Increasing flow of aircraft traffic and there is a low-level training exercise at 1,500ft over the AGGROW area. This increases the existing air pollution and the</p>	<p>Transport Need to include proximity to schools and road safety</p> <p>Health and amenity Need to consider pollution levels combined with Air traffic pollution, and bird strike implications</p>	<p>Transport "Local traffic impacts increased traffic on local routes – potential to increase congestion or road safety risk, risk to health and amenity" is a criterion in the initial screening methodology. Road safety is also an aspect of Criterion T2 and T3 of the Detailed Technical Assessment.</p> <p>A transport assessment or transport statement, as appropriate, will also be prepared for the Site Allocations Plan.</p> <p>Health and Amenity Air Quality, Transport, Health and Amenity and Airport Safeguarding zones are all criterion within the Initial Screening and they are also taken into account within the Detailed Technical Assessment.</p>	<p>Transport No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Health and Amenity No amendments required at this stage</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Anti Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)		<p>danger from bird strike. It should be taken into account when considering increased lorry traffic and the extra pollution that would bring.</p> <p>Tourism We are uncertain in which strategy this would be included. In 2010 WODC estimated the Tourist Trade in their area</p>	<p>Tourism Need to consider impact on tourism as gateway to Cotswolds</p>	<p>As well as the transport criteria discussed above, the following criteria assess for these issues A1 – Potential to impact of Air Quality Management areas A2 – Potential to impact air quality in general. HA1 Proximity to residential development/sensitive receptors and potential to impact on health and amenity. AS1 – Nature of proposed development and potential to impact Airport Safeguarding Zone.</p> <p>The MOD will also be actively engaged with the preparation of the Site Allocations plan in relation to bird strike and traffic.</p> <p>Tourism Many of the initial screening criterion from Landscape/Visual impact through to Transport, Air</p>	<p>Tourism No amendments required at this stage</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Anti Gravel Group of Residents in Oxfordshire West (AGGROW)		amounted to £232m and supported 4,000 jobs. These figures will have increased since then. The AGGROW area will be playing a major role in this employment as it is so close to the Cotswolds. It is an ideal location from which to explore this major tourist attraction and the many other interesting places in the WODC area. Sand and gravel quarries would destroy this valuable trade. Who would wish to stay in an Inn or Hotel close to a gravel pit or follow gravel lorries on their way to 'lorry routes'?		<p>Quality and Public Rights of Way and the subsequent criterion within the Detailed Technical Assessment cover areas that could affect potential site impact on local economy and consequently tourism.</p> <p>Policy C5 of the Core Strategy protects Tourism as part of the requirement for sites to not have an "unacceptable adverse impact on the local economy"</p> <p>One of the Oxfordshire County Councils Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) priorities is to ensure the high quality of our built environment is maintained. We have regard to the priorities of the SEP and its supporting documents as part of the plan preparation.</p>	
010	Office of Road & Rail		No Comment	No action required	Not applicable	No amendments required

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
011	Longworth Parish Council		<p>Comments on specific site only. Parish and Council and some of the residents are concerned and object to the inclusion of the Hanson-owned land located next to Pinewoods Road (erroneously tagged as Kingston Bagpuize in your documents) as a potential site for Soft Sand extraction. The Village went through a protracted and painful experience of fighting this site when it was applied for several years ago and were relieved that the OCC objected to the application. We would like to suggest that, as before, extensions of existing quarry sites in the county should suffice to maintain the sandbank quota and respectfully request that this site be removed from the list and not included for a soft sand quarry.</p>	<p>Site specific comments</p> <p>No action required at this stage.</p>	<p>Site specific comments</p> <p>Will review comments at site appraisal stage</p> <p>Policy M4 of the adopted Core Strategy gives the factors for site allocation and one of these is the priority for the extension of existing quarries, where environmentally acceptable (including taking into consideration criteria c) to l), before working new sites.</p> <p>The County Council have a duty to maintain landbanks of minerals to meet National Policy.</p> <p>These requirements for the plan period have been set out within the adopted Core Strategy and will be reviewed as part of the Core Strategy review (intended every 5 years unless the Annual Monitoring report requires otherwise).</p>	<p>Site specific comments</p> <p>Review naming of sites.</p> <p>No further amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Longworth Parish Council				The Councils Annual Monitoring Report reviews the production, sales and reserves of minerals and at this time we do not consider that there is an oversupply.	
012	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council	SAM	<p>Sand and Gravel requirements Before any sites are assessed a review of mineral requirement should be undertaken. The County has planned for an oversupply of mineral, which, without review will lead to a continual oversupply of sites during the plan to the detriment of Oxfordshire residents.</p> <p>Common Dataset A common dataset should be used to compare sites equally at Stage 1 and 2. Weight should not be given to site specific</p>	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirements Need to consider whether we need to review our mineral requirement.</p> <p>Common Dataset Need to consider reliance on</p>	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirements. These requirements for the plan period have been set out within the adopted Core Strategy and will be reviewed as part of the Core Strategy review (intended every 5 years unless the Annual Monitoring report requires otherwise). The Councils Annual Monitoring Report reviews the production, sales and reserves of minerals and at this time we do not consider that there is an oversupply.</p> <p>Common Dataset We will look to use as much information as is available to us to try and ensure</p>	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirements No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Common Dataset Include question in Issues and Options consultation on</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council		information from site promoters and their agents. If two sites show the same proportions of BMV land grade under the regional classification system they should be treated equally by the classification. Any additional information from the promoters soil analysis can be noted but not relied on.	information from site promoters.	<p>deliverable sites are put forward for the Plan Period. We have included site promoters as an information source as we feel they are relevant.</p> <p>As part of their site nomination form, we have asked for certain information to be included. These forms can be seen within the methodology.</p> <p>We will consult on this in accordance with our SCI. However, it must be noted that site promoters are just one of the information sources that we will utilise in the Plan Preparation.</p> <p>The Issues and Options consultation will include a question asking "Whether we should only consider sites that have been put forward by owners/operators or should other sites be considered?"</p>	<p>whether other sites should be identified.</p> <p>No further amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council		<p>Sequential Test for Flooding. The NPPF Sequential Test for flooding is a requirement for allocating development sites. The current proposal applies the sequential test only for sites that pass an initial subjective screening against other considerations. We suggest a 'matrix' of flood risk (low/high) and quantity of BMV land (low/high) should be used as a first step to categorise the long list of sites into four groups before any other 'traffic light' criteria are applied.</p> <p>Site Comparison The Site assessment methodology does not indicate how it will compare large site resources with smaller ones. Blanket criteria could inadvertently</p>	<p>Sequential Test for Flooding Need to consider an initial matrix of flood risk to quantity of BMV land to categorise all sites, before other traffic lights. Low & low goes forward, high and high considered last.</p> <p>Site Comparison The methodology should better compare large and smaller sites.</p>	<p>Sequential Test for Flooding We are undertaking the sequential testing as part of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment at the Detailed Technical Assessment stage of the site allocation plan preparation. This will mean that those sites that are wholly unsuitable due to flood risk will not be carried through in the first place.</p> <p>This process for the sequential test was approved within the Core Strategy (2.58) This will be undertaken alongside the site assessment.</p> <p>Site Comparison Each site is assessed on its own merits to determine whether it would be suitable for development.</p>	<p>Sequential Test for Flooding No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Site Comparison No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council		<p>favour a site when both are equally suitable</p> <p>Reliance on promoters information OCC should be able to conduct their assessments without reference to the promoter during the screening stage process.</p>	<p>Reliance on promoters information Need to consider using promoter's material at initial screening time</p>	<p>Reliance on promoters information As discussed above, we will look to use as much information as is available to us to try and ensure deliverable sites are put forward for the Plan Period. We have included site promoters as an information source as we feel they are relevant. As part of their site nomination form, we have asked for certain information to be included. These forms can be seen within the methodology. We will consult on this in accordance with our SCI. However, it must be noted that site promoters are just one of the information sources that we will utilise in the Plan Preparation.</p>	<p>Reliance on promoters information Include question in Issues and Options consultation on whether other sites should be identified.</p> <p>No further amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council		<p>Parish councils Parish councils are credible sources of information for many of the qualitative criteria used in the assessment, but these bodies are not proposed as an information source e.g. the impact on sensitive receptors, public rights of way, important tree, hedgerow and landscape elements etc. These local views are an important source of information to counterbalance claims made by promoters.</p> <p>Mineral Quality The quality of mineral resource could be better defined in Stage 2. For example, the mineral volume per hectare and the proportion/variety of mineral within a site could be used as a proxy guide to the quality of a site</p>	<p>Parish Councils Include Parish Councils as an information source.</p> <p>Mineral Quality Need to define the quality of the mineral resource better in Stage 2</p>	<p>Parish Councils The Council do recognise the importance of consulting the Parish Councils as they have a wealth of local knowledge and are committed to doing so throughout the plan making process as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)</p> <p>Mineral Quality In stage 2 Criterion 4 it considers the resource quality as well as the quantity and depth.</p> <p>This quality of resource would be assessed using the information sources available to us and through using the data received from the promoter. Currently the Methodology states that we will only consider mineral</p>	<p>Parish Councils Add Parish councils to the list of information sources.</p> <p>Mineral Quality No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council		<p>Hedgerows The Biodiversity and Geodiversity screening criteria do not consider 'important' or 'ancient' hedgerows which are protected from development, are often essential landscape elements, and provide essential habitat in agricultural areas. Suggest an assessment of a site's workable resource by OCC should assume the stated deposit is reduced by the proportion of existing mature landcover in trees and hedgerow to encourage best practice by operators and discourage the loss of mature habitats for commercial gain.</p> <p>Green Belt Suggest a mineral site in the Green Belt which requires plant, buildings or visible screening elements should have an amber</p>	<p>Hedgerows Need to consider 'important' or 'ancient' hedgerows. We should assume a deposit is reduced by the proportion of existing mature landcover in trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Green Belt Need to consider additional scoring criteria for Green Belt as consider it</p>	<p>sites that have been submitted by the Operator due to deliverability.</p> <p>Hedgerows Ancient hedgerows are protected within Policy W7 of the adopted Core strategy. This Policy will be adhered to as we assess the sites. It will be for the promotor to prove that they have protected the ancient hedgerow and how they have come to the reserve calculation whilst considering the existence of the hedgerow.</p> <p>Green Belt The NPPF states that mineral extraction is not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided it preserves its openness and</p>	<p>Hedgerows Add the phrase 'ancient' hedgerows in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity screening criteria and in criterion B1</p> <p>Green Belt Amend Appendix 1 Initial Screening scoring matrix so that mineral sites in the</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council	SASR	<p>or red-amber rating as these are clear constraints to taking the site forward to planning</p> <p>Oxford Flood Alleviation scheme We welcome the potential benefit on the supply of minerals from the new Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme noted in paragraph 3.71. This is a welcome consideration and the potential contribution should be fully explored before any new sites are allocated.</p> <p>Agricultural land value The description in paragraph 3.104 is incorrect comparing the distribution of mineral vs Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Fig 25 shows no Grade 1 land in west</p>	<p>inadequate and misinterprets wider Green Belt policies of NPPF</p> <p>Oxford Flood Alleviation scheme Need to consider the potential contribution before any new sites are allocated</p> <p>Agricultural Land Value Need to amend the paragraph as incorrect.</p>	<p>does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This can only be established when full details of a proposed mineral working development are known. In view of this element of uncertainty, mineral sites in the Green Belt should be scored amber-green rather than green.</p> <p>Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme The application for the scheme has recently been submitted to the County Council and its potential contribution will be explored during the plan preparation and will be taken into account with our provision.</p> <p>Agricultural land value Check the report and amend the paragraph if necessary.</p>	<p>Green Belt will be scored amber-green.</p> <p>Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme Amend text to acknowledge the application has been submitted.</p> <p>Agricultural land value Amend to: "Much of the main sand and gravel resource to the north</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document	Main Point / Comments	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Clifton Hampden & Burcot Parish Council	Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	(These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)			
			Oxfordshire - it is only shown occurring in South and East Oxfordshire - and there is no readily discernible difference in the proportion of Grade 2 land overlying mineral deposits in south Oxfordshire in comparison to west Oxfordshire. The paragraph requires amending.			of the River Thames in the west of Oxfordshire underlies Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, as does some of the sand and gravel deposit in Southern Oxfordshire. This can be seen in Figures 25 and 26”
013	Central Bedfordshire Council		Do not have any comments on the Site Allocations process.	None required	Not applicable	No amendments required at this stage
014	Oxfordshire County Council – Rights of Way	SAM	<p>Public Rights and Users I wish to acknowledge the inclusion of public rights and users as an integral part of your draft site assessment methodology. The inclusion of external stakeholders such as user groups and the Oxfordshire Countryside Access Forum (OCAF), as well as desk based assessments, are welcomed.</p> <p>We may need to work on a</p>	<p>Public Rights and Users Need to investigate best approach to involve OCAF</p>	<p>Public Rights and Users We need to work closely with the Countryside Access Strategy and Development Officer to try and ensure that OCAF group have time to respond to the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations Plan</p>	<p>Public Rights and Users Work with the Countryside Access Team</p> <p>OCAF are an information source listed within the screenings and therefore they will be approached for</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
			mechanism to better involve OCAF given that the main group meets only two or three times a year.			information during the plan preparation.
015	Anglian Water	SAM	<p>Sources of Flooding Flood risk is criteria within the proposed methodology to be used to determine which M&W sites should be included in the local plan. Reference is made to the risk of flooding from fluvial sources but not other sources of flooding. It is considered that the risk of flooding should be considered from all sources including sewer flooding (where relevant)</p> <p>Existing facilities In addition, there is a need to consider the location of existing utilities in the context of site selection.</p>	<p>Sources of Flooding Need to consider all sources of flooding not just fluvial.</p> <p>Existing Facilities Need to consider the location of existing utilities</p>	<p>Sources of Flooding It is acknowledged that there are flood risk from other sources and that this is included within the Sensitivity scores in that the “Site is likely to exacerbate local flood risk and Levels of mitigation will be required.”</p> <p>As set out in 4.7 of the SFRA, as updated Level 1 SFRA will accompany the Allocations Plan and will consider flooding from other sources</p> <p>Existing Facilities & Water Recycling Assets We would consider existing utilities to be ‘sensitive receptors’ under the Health</p>	<p>Sources of Flooding Include Water companies as an Information source Ensure other sources of flooding are included within the SFRA for the Site Allocations Plan.</p> <p>Existing Facilities & Water Recycling Assets Take into account any response from</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Anglian Water		<p>Water recycling assets We would ask that consideration is given to the location of existing water recycling assets in Anglian Water's ownership as part of the site selection process. For example, we would wish to ensure that mineral extraction sites do not include existing sewers within the proposed working area or that sewers are diverted where necessary.</p>	<p>when considering sites.</p> <p>Water recycling assets Need to consider the location of existing water recycling assets.</p>	<p>and Amenity criteria as distance could impact amenity and health etc. Upon assessing sites we would also expect Anglian Water to keep us informed if a site could have the potential to damage their site as part of the consultations.</p>	<p>Anglian Water in relation to the site allocations and potential negative impact on their utilities and water recycling assets. Ensure, if necessary, suitable mitigation measures are included.</p>
016	Highways England	SAM	<p>Infrastructure, Manage and Reduce & Mitigation measures Highways England has been appointed by the traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). In Oxfordshire the SRN relates to the M40, A34 and A404.</p> <p>We would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as a result of planned growth without careful</p>	<p>Infrastructure Need to consider the appropriate infrastructure is in place before development takes place</p> <p>Manage and Reduce Need to consider those proposals that manage down demand</p>	<p>Infrastructure, Manage and Reduce & Mitigation measures The Council recognises that the transport network should be operated in a way that balances the protection of the local environment with efficient and effective access for freight and distribution.</p> <p>Policy C10 in the adopted Core Strategy sets out the Councils approach to</p>	<p>Infrastructure, Manage and Reduce & Mitigation measures No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Highways England		<p>consideration of mitigation measures.</p> <p>It is important that the Minerals and Waste Plan provides the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure in place. When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible; in general, we will support proposals that consider sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduce the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts The transportation of waste and minerals has the potential to generate a significant number of heavy goods vehicle (HGV) trips, a large proportion of which are</p>	<p>and reduce need to travel</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Need to consider mitigation measures if material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts Need to consider cumulative impact of</p>	<p>Transport and which the sites within the Site Allocation plan must follow. Within the Core Strategy we refer to the Strategic Lorry Route Map</p> <p>Transport is considered within Transport (including access) in the initial screening and in T1 – T4 of the Detailed Technical Assessment and will be explored thoroughly to address all of these issues as part of the site allocations plan preparation. A transport assessment or transport statement, as appropriate, will also be prepared for the Site Allocations Plan</p> <p>Cumulative impacts This is criteria within the initial screening which considers the Cumulative Impact of development. Criterion C1 also assesses sites against</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts & Road Safety No amendments are required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Highways England		<p>likely use the SRN. Although individual sites might not have a significant impact, cumulatively, developments could still have the potential to impact on the SRN, particularly to road safety. Concerned with an increase in slow moving HGVs accessing the SRN and the resulting potential impact to the safe and efficient SRN.</p> <p>Alternatives to road We would support proposals that promote alternatives to road based transport, such as transportation of minerals and waste via rail and water. In addition to further minimise potential impacts to the SRN we would look to site operators to identify opportunities to reduce trips during peak periods, this might be through construction and operational management plans</p>	<p>developments on the SRN</p> <p>Road Safety Need to consider impacts on road safety.</p> <p>Alternatives to road Would support alternatives to road based travel.</p>	<p>the proximity to other existing operations and potential for cumulative impacts. This would include cumulative impact upon the SRN Road Safety is assessed within the Transport Criterion of the initial screening and T1 – T4 of the Detailed Technical Screening.</p> <p>Alternatives to road Criterion T4 assesses sites in contributing to more sustainable transport methods.</p>	<p>Alternative to road No amendments are required at this stage.</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
017	Dr Judith Webb		<p>Comments on specific sites only. Has comments on 8 specific sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SS-11 Great Park Farm, Besselsleigh - SS-10 South of Cothill - SS-09 Buckland Warren, Gainsfield - SS-01 Tubworth Barn, Tubney - SS-13 Upwood Park, Besselsleigh - SG -05 Land east of Cassington Quarry - SG-20a Land at Wharf Farm, Cassington - SG-31, Sutton Farm Stanton Harcourt 	<p>Site specific comments No action required at this stage.</p>	<p>Site specific comments Will review comments at site appraisal stage</p>	<p>Site specific comments No amendments required at this stage.</p>
018	Environment Agency (EA)	SAM	<p>Water Resources Criteria The Water Resources criteria is listed as: "Proximity to/ potential to impact source protection zones (SPZs), or major/minor aquifers". Should be reworded to use primary & secondary. Ideally it should also reference other existing abstractions.</p>	<p>Water Resources Criteria Need to consider changing wording to as suggested.</p>	<p>Water Resources Criteria These requests for text change are for the initial screening. Within the Detailed Technical Assessment these are covered by the Water Resource section and Criterion W1 – W3</p> <p>Suggested change</p>	<p>Water Resources Criteria Change the initial screening criteria to wording suggested by EA.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>Sensitivity Score The sensitivity score should really be widened a bit to include groundwater status under the Water Framework Directive and abstractions</p>	<p>Sensitivity Score Need to consider changing wording to as suggested.</p>	<p>“Proximity/potential to impact source protection zones (SPZs), other existing abstractions or principal/secondary aquifer</p> <p>Sensitivity Score Have suggested two amended sentences: Option A “Site likely to have a very substantial detrimental effect on the Water Framework Directive status of a surface or groundwater body due to the nature of development and/or proximity/hydrological connectivity to the surface or groundwater body. Mitigation is not likely to be possible or effective.</p> <p>Option B “Site likely to have a very substantial detrimental effect on the existing abstractions and/or groundwater receptor due to the nature of development and/or proximity/hydrological</p>	<p>Sensitivity Score Change to Option A.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)	SASR	<p>Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report</p> <p>Box 1 We are very pleased to see that one of the key assessment criteria is: Box 1: Key messages/sustainability objectives emerging from Stage We would whole heartily support this</p> <p>Biodiversity Bullets We recommend that the following biodiversity bullets are grouped together (as 2,3 & 4). 2 – 10 - 11.</p> <p>SPZ's We are also pleased to see that the Sustainability Appraisal and indicators (Table 15 point 4) include: "To maintain and improve ground and surface water quality.</p>	<p>Box 1 Support Acknowledged</p> <p>Biodiversity Bullets Need to consider grouping the biodiversity bullets differently.</p> <p>SPZ's Need to consider including list SPZ1 as there can be some mineral and</p>	<p>connectivity to the surface or groundwater body. Mitigation is not likely to be possible or effective."</p> <p>Box 1 Not Applicable</p> <p>Biodiversity Bullets The Biodiversity bullets are currently set out to follow the cycle of development, therefore we do not feel an amendment is due at this stage.</p> <p>SPZ's Acknowledge that SPZ1 should be included.</p>	<p>Box 1 No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Biodiversity Bullets No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>SPZ's Include reference to SPZ1 in Table 15 Point 4.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>However, we are not sure why only SPZ2 and 3 are listed in the possible indicators. There can be some minerals and waste activities in SPZ1 (though these are tightly restricted). We recommend that the list should therefore include SPZ1</p> <p>Water Resources Slight change in the wording of 3.59 to remove impression of reservoirs underwater</p> <p>Groundwater resources 3.61 Slight change in the wording to offer wider protection to groundwater resources.</p>	<p>waste activities in SPZ1</p> <p>Water Resources Need to consider changing the wordings to as those suggested in the EA response</p> <p>Groundwater resources Need to consider changing the wordings to as those suggested in the EA response</p>	<p>Water Resources Agree to suggested change: 3.59 "Groundwater is stored underground in areas of saturated bedrock called aquifers. The Environment Agency has divided these into principal and secondary aquifers."</p> <p>Groundwater resources Agree to suggested change: 3.61 "Minerals and waste activities need to be monitored and regulated to ensure that they do not have a detrimental impact upon groundwater resources, in particular those areas</p>	<p>Water Resources Amend 3.59 as suggested by the EA.</p> <p>Groundwater resources Amend 3.61 as suggested by the EA.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>Farmoor 3.64 – Farmoor is nearer to Oxford</p> <p>Flood Alleviation scheme 3.71 reworded to provide greater detail on the Oxford Flood Alleviation scheme.</p>	<p>Farmoor Need to consider removing reference to Abingdon</p> <p>Flood Alleviation scheme Need to consider changing the wording to as suggested in EA response.</p>	<p>covered by Source Protection Zones (SPZs). SPZs show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in an area, the closer the activity, the greater the risk”</p> <p>Farmoor Farmoor is closer to Oxford.</p> <p>Flood Alleviation scheme “The Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme aims to reduce flood risk to over 1,200 homes and businesses and key infrastructure routes in Oxford. The scheme will be approximately 5km long, it will run north of Botley Road, down to south of the A423 southern by-pass where it re-joins the River Thames. It will include lowering parts of floodplain to create a two-</p>	<p>Farmoor Amend: remove reference to Abingdon and replace with near Oxford.</p> <p>Flood Alleviation scheme Add the further detail about the proposed site within 3.71; but this will need further updating as the planning application has now been submitted.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>Waste 3.113 “Current (2016) forecasts for the principal waste streams are set out in Table 9. - Growth in MSW related to population growth seems fair, however, for any increase in house building or commercial development, we should expect to see a proportionate increase in CDEW. If you increase population, we</p>	<p>Waste & Table 8 Need to consider whether CDEW and C&I waste would increase with population growth.</p>	<p>stage channel, and working on some of the existing rivers and streams that run through it, to make more space for water and reduce flood risk in the city. Current plans are to submit a planning application for the scheme in Spring 2018. 62 Materials excavated from the scheme would be considered mineral extraction and if not reused on site for the scheme could contribute to some of the requirement for sharp sand and gravel in the county.” Waste Our waste projections for the plan period have been adopted within our Core Strategy and will be monitored as part of our Annual Monitoring Report and reviewed if necessary. The Governments Planning Practice Guidance for Waste</p>	<p>Waste No amendments are requirement at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>would anticipate an increase in housing (and infrastructure need).</p> <p>Table 8 Looking at Table 8 we would also question if C& I waste wouldn't increase more.</p>		<p>(2015) (Para 033) states that when forecasting further arisings for this CDEW, waste planning authorities should start from the basis that net arisings will remain constant over time as there is likely to be a reduced evidence base on which forward projections can be based. Following this guidance, it can be taken that a minimum of 1.033mtpa of CDE waste will require management in Oxfordshire throughout the plan period to 2031.</p> <p>Table 8 The C&I forecast takes account of economic growth forecasts for Oxfordshire and Defra national forecasts. A moderate growth rate has been used (see the Supplement to the Waste Needs Assessment for more information) and adopted within the Core Strategy in Policy W1</p>	<p>Table 8 No amendment required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>Agricultural Waste 3.114 – Agricultural waste can have problematic elements – we question if there has been any evidence of illegal disposal etc.</p> <p>Table 9 Hazardous Waste What provisions/DtC has been made undertaken in disposal of hazardous waste?</p>	<p>Agricultural Waste 3.114 Need to consider if there have been any issues from agricultural waste. We need to consider whether there has been any evidence of problems with illegal disposal.</p> <p>Table 9 Hazardous Waste Need to clarify what provisions/DtC have been undertaken in disposal of hazardous waste?</p>	<p>Agricultural Waste Para 3.114 “much of it in ways that are outside normal planning control” may be misleading and lead the reader to believe illegal operations take place.</p> <p>Table 9 Hazardous Waste Policy W7 sets out the Councils position on the Management and Disposal of Hazardous Waste. We have a duty to co-operate and will consult with neighbouring authorities and those with the potential to be affected by our Minerals and Waste Plan, as set out in our SCI. This will include any authorities that import into or receive any</p>	<p>Agricultural Waste Delete: “much of it in ways that are outside normal planning control”</p> <p>Table 9 Hazardous Waste No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>HS2 Impact We need to consider impact of HS2 and the requirement for inert landfill void.</p> <p>We need to consider if DtC has been undertaken with MK in relation to capacity at the north of the County</p> <p>HWRC Facilities They are pleased to see that there is a commitment to maintain public (HWRC) facilities and that this is allied to reducing travel times.</p> <p>Waste Hierarchy It would be nice to have some sort of projection for how much of the main waste streams will be moved</p>	<p>HS2 Impact Need to consider impact of HS2 and the requirement for inert landfill void.</p> <p>Need to consider if DtC has been undertaken with MK in relation to capacity at the north of the County</p> <p>HWRC Facilities No changes required</p> <p>Waste Hierarchy Need to consider if we can provide projections of</p>	<p>hazardous waste from Oxfordshire.</p> <p>HS2 Impact We have a duty to co-operate and will consult with neighbouring authorities and those with the potential to be affected by our Minerals and Waste Plan, as set out in our SCI including Milton Keynes. We are also a member of South East Waste Planning Advisory Group.</p> <p>HWRC Facilities Noted</p> <p>Waste Hierarchy Policy W2 sets out the projections for waste streams over the Plan Period.</p>	<p>HS2 Impact No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>HWRC Facilities No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Waste Hierarchy No amendment required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		<p>up the waste hierarchy and to what level. This might be determined partly from Table 9.</p> <p>Secondary Aggregates In terms of secondary aggregates, it would be nice to see a link between the production of secondary aggregates and the promotion of green procurement to encourage their use in local construction projects.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Indicators Table 15 We note that the proposal is to use a simple percentage metric. This could result in a lot of schemes delivering tiny gains and the overall assessment would be a high percentage, looking like a great success. We suggest the</p>	<p>waste streams movements up the waste hierarchy are possible.</p> <p>Secondary Aggregates Need to consider whether to include a link between secondary aggregates and the promotion of green procurement.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Indicators Need to consider using a quantifiable metric system instead.</p>	<p>Secondary Aggregates It is felt that this not an area that could be covered by a Local Plan as it is not a land use issue.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Indicators Data on percentage of applications is more readily available than it is on actual areas of habitat improved, created, enhanced, etc, but the latter would provide more meaningful information.</p>	<p>Secondary Aggregates No amendment required at this stage.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Indicators Amend Possible Indicators for SA Objective 1 in Table 15 to include areas of habitat improved, created, enhanced,</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Environment Agency (EA)		use of a metric that is quantifiable in spatial terms of target area instead. For example, the amount in hectares of habitat that is improved, created, enhanced, etc. Targets could be aligned to targets in Oxfordshire BAP and CTA objectives.	Need to consider using targets in Oxfordshire BAP and CTA objectives		etc., in addition to number / percentage of permitted applications.
019	M&M Skip Hire Ltd	SAM	<p>Green Belt Object strongly to the means by which sites are proposed to be assessed. Consider it contrary to the vision, objectives and policy parameters of the Core Strategy and does not comply with National Policy.</p> <p>The Appendix 1 Table in relation to Green Belt does not reflect national policy in the NPPF and NPPW. It does not acknowledge that other considerations may exist which provide very special circumstances for outweighing any harm caused by inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Green Belt Request changes to Appendix 1 to address concerns by inclusion of scoring criteria for amber-green, amber and red-amber, rather than only scoring sites green or red. Detailed changes put forward, which are available to view in the original response.</p>	<p>Green Belt The NPPF lists a number of exceptions to development being inappropriate in Green Belt and also provides for inappropriate development to take place where very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Although it may be possible to establish this only when full details of a proposed development are known, it would nevertheless seem appropriate to extend the sensitivity scoring for Green Belt in Appendix 1 to include scoring criteria for amber-green, amber and red-</p>	<p>Green Belt Amend Appendix 1 Initial Screening scoring matrix to include scoring criteria for amber-green, amber and red-amber, rather than only scoring sites green or red, taking into account the respondent's suggested wording.</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	M&M Skip Hire Ltd		<p>The first column and the commentary would result in the automatic exclusion of any site nomination for a waste management activity whilst a mineral development would qualify, even though the NPPF exemption of mineral extraction does not extend to some of the development associated with it.</p> <p>Consideration of Green Belt is not a simple red/green exercise. The degree of harm to the Green Belt is a consideration in itself to be taken into account in determining whether very special circumstances exist.</p> <p>The methodology appears to be attempting to impose an absolute ban on waste management sites in Green Belt, contrary to the waste spatial strategy in the adopted Core Strategy.</p>		amber, rather than just limiting the scoring of sites to either green or red.	

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	M&M Skip Hire Ltd		<p>Cumulative Impacts The Appendix 1 Table section on Cumulative Impacts appears to be focussed only on negative impacts from the proximity of operations to each other. However, with waste management operations positive outcomes can arise from the co-location of facilities.</p> <p>Active Identification of Waste Sites by the County Council If OCC need to undertake active identification of sites then a procedure for doing so needs to be in place and either set out in the Site Assessment Methodology or elsewhere and to be subject to</p>	<p>Cumulative Impacts Request changes to Cumulative Impacts entry in Table 1 to include references to co-location of waste facilities. Detailed changes put forward, which are available to view in the original response.</p> <p>Active Identification of Waste Sites Consider need for a procedure for active identification of waste sites, in</p>	<p>Cumulative Impacts This is a different type of impact from that which the Table 1 section Cumulative Impacts seeks to score; it would not be appropriate to include it here. If this factor is to be included it would be more appropriate as a factor in the Detailed Technical Assessment rather than the Initial Screening. I would seem best to fit here under Criterion A2 – Potential to impact air quality in general, given that one of the main benefits of co-location would be reduction in lorry movements and consequently in emissions.</p> <p>Active Identification of Waste Sites If it proves to be the case that additional sites need to be actively identified by the Council, we would need to review the process by which sites are identified, assessed</p>	<p>Cumulative Impacts Amend Appendix 2 to include references to benefits of co-location of waste management facilities under Criterion A2 – Potential to impact air quality in general.</p> <p>Active Identification of Waste Sites Amend paragraph 3.27 of the Site Assessment Methodology to provide expanded explanation of how a</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	M&M Skip Hire Ltd		consultation, to ensure site identification accords with the nPPG.	the event that there are insufficient nominated sites.	and consulted on; and this will need to be consistent with the process for nominated sites and with the nPPG.	shortfall in nominated sites and consequent need to actively identify additional sites would be addressed.
020	McKenna Environmental Ltd	SAM	As 019 above	As 019 above	As 019 above	As 019 above
021	Sheehan Haulage & Plant Hire Ltd	SAM	As 019 above	As 019 above	As 019 above	As 019 above
022	Historic England	SAM	<p>Welcome and supports the inclusion of the historic environment as a category.</p> <p>Weighting protection Is any weighting of the categories proposed for historic environment i.e. to give greater weight to those categories that reflect statutory protection and/or protection afforded by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Weighting protection Need to consider whether we need to give weighting to sites.</p>	<p>Weighting Protection Policy M4 and C9 of the Adopted Core Strategy says that great weight will be given to the conservation of designated Heritage Assets, and non-designated archaeological assets which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument; and the setting of those assets.</p>	<p>Weighting Protection. No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>Evidence Base It is essential to have an adequate, relevant and up to date evidence base for the historic environment and to use that evidence to assess the</p>	<p>Evidence Base Need to ensure we have a full historic evidence base when</p>	<p>This is recognised in the traffic light system which will be applied to Criterion H1, H2 and L4.</p> <p>Once we have undertaken the technical assessment stage, the preferred options that are considered to best meet the identified requirements for mineral provision and waste management in the Core Strategy will be identified. Detailed reasoning explaining the rationale for including/not including the sites for progression and how we came to that decision as preferred options will be given.</p> <p>Evidence Base We always use the most recent and up to date evidence that is available to us during the Plan preparation.</p>	<p>Evidence Base We will always try and ensure we have an adequate and up to date evidence base.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>significance of heritage assets and the potential impacts of minerals or waste development on that significance. Have included important components of what we must consider.</p> <p>Further assessments of future sites Further detailed assessments may be required of individual areas or potential sites in order to assess the extent, nature and significance of archaeological remains.</p> <p>County archaeologist The advice of your archaeological advisors will also be very important.</p>	<p>assessing the sites.</p> <p>Further assessments of future sites We may need to require further assessments of future sites.</p> <p>County archaeologist We should seek advice of our archaeological advisors.</p>	<p>Further assessments of future sites In the Core Strategy Policy C9 sets out the Councils approach to minerals and waste development in historic areas. We acknowledge that further detailed assessment is require. Applicants are required to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected and any contribution made by the setting.</p> <p>County archaeologist We consult Oxfordshire County Councils Archaeologist in regards all consultations on the Plan Preparation in accordance</p>	<p>Further assessments of future sites As part of the Detailed Technical Assessment each site will be looked at in terms of impact on historical impact.</p> <p>County archaeologist Add County archaeologist to the information sources in the Detailed</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>Weighting Support the use of the criteria of Policies M4 and C9 for the stage 3 detailed technical assessments and categories L4, H1 and H2. Is any weighting proposed?</p>	<p>Weighting Need to consider whether we need to give weighting to sites.</p>	<p>with the SCI. We will also seek their assistance as and when we have a specific query they will be able to assist with.</p> <p>Weighting The traffic light system which will be applied to Criterion H1, H2 and L4 will assess the impact of each site on the historic environment. Once we have undertaken the technical assessment stage, the preferred options that are considered to best meet the identified requirements for mineral provision and waste management in the Core Strategy will be identified. Detailed reasoning explaining the rationale for including/not including the sites for progression and how we came to that decision as preferred options will be given.</p>	<p>Technical assessment.</p> <p>Weighting No amendment required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>RAG Scorings We welcome the recognition in paragraph 3.17 that RAG scorings for a criterion may alter from the initial screening as further technical work reveals or clarifies the impacts of a site.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Although we accept that impacts on historic landscape character would be considered as part of the stage 3 detailed technical assessment, we would like to see these included in the Initial Screening – Traffic Light scoring Criteria either under Landscape/ Visual Impact or Historic Environment. For the Historic Environment, thought will need to be given to how to distinguish between “less than substantial” and “moderate” harm for the Red/Amber and Amber ratings.</p> <p>Historic Battlefields The section on designated heritage assets should clarify that it refers to Registered Historic</p>	<p>RAG Scorings None required</p> <p>Historic Landscape Consider whether inclusion of impacts on historic landscape character in initial screening, not just at detailed technical assessment stage.</p> <p>Historic Battlefields Need to consider whether to</p>	<p>RAG Scorings Support acknowledged</p> <p>Historic Landscape Data is available that would enable impacts on historic landscape character to be considered at the initial screening stage. It would seem most appropriate to include this under Historic Environment.</p> <p>Historic Battlefields We have used the wording ‘historic battlefield’ in both the Initial screening and the</p>	<p>RAG Scorings Acknowledged.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Include impacts on historic landscape character under Historic Environment in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Historic Battlefields Change the wording ‘historic battlefields’ to Registered Historic</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		Battlefields. Effects on the significance of the World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Historic Battlefields can be caused through development within their setting, which needs to be taken into account	include Registered Historic Battlefields.	Detailed Technical Assessment. This needs amending.	Battlefields within both the initial screening and the Detailed Technical Assessment (H1)
022a	Historic England	SASR	<p>General advice is set out in Historic England’s Advice Note 8 “Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment”</p> <p>Must consider Note 8 when preparing the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Box 1 In Box 1, we believe that the key message/sustainability objective for the historic environment should be “Conserve and enhance all aspects of the historic environment.....”. Paragraph 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>Box 1 Need to consider whether to amend to read “Conserve and enhance all aspects of the historic</p>	<p>Box 1 C9 within the Core Strategy sets out the Policy for the Historic Environment and Archaeology. It recognises the its importance and sets out what proposals for minerals and waste developments must meet. It</p>	<p>Box 1 Add “Conserve and, where possible, enhance all aspects of the historic environment” to Box 1</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>states; “Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment”, and paragraph 157 requires local plans to “contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic Environment”. It is therefore clear that enhancing the historic environment is a key message from the Framework and this should be recognised in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Designated Heritage sites If it is considered necessary to list designated wildlife sites, designated heritage assets could also be listed i.e. World Heritage Site, listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and Registered Historic Battlefields.</p>	<p>environment...” as requested</p> <p>Designated Heritage sites Need to consider whether to list designated Heritage sites.</p>	<p>asks that developments, wherever possible, demonstrate how the development will make an appropriate contribution to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Acknowledge that our SA must recognise this.</p> <p>Designated Heritage Sites There are over 13,000 designated historic sites within Oxfordshire which are recognised within the Scoping Report. To list each one as requested would make the document exceedingly large. When preparing the Site Allocation plan, we will consider them all.</p>	<p>Designated Heritage Sites No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>Baseline Consider the baseline is comprehensive and welcome the references to the Historic Environment Record and the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register and Table 5 is particularly helpful.</p> <p>Potential Loss We agree with the Key Sustainability Issue relating to the historic environment, although there should also be mention of the potential loss of historic landscape character and features from minerals and waste development</p> <p>Sustainability Objective 3 We welcome Sustainability Objective 3, although it should really refer to the significance of heritage assets, and we also welcome both the Appraisal Criteria/Sub-objectives for this</p>	<p>Baseline No action required.</p> <p>Potential Loss Need to consider including the potential loss of historic landscape character and features from minerals and waste development.</p> <p>Sustainability Objective 3 Need to consider whether to amend Sustainability Objective 3 to</p>	<p>Baseline Not applicable</p> <p>Potential Loss</p> <p>Sustainability Objective 3 Historic England have clarified that wish to see this objective amended to: "To conserve the historic environment, significance of</p>	<p>Baseline Acknowledged</p> <p>Potential Loss Add "Will the plan lead to the potential loss of historic landscape character and features?" Indicator: No. of planning applications refused/amended due to historic impact.</p> <p>Sustainability Objective 3 Amend the objective as requested by Historic England.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Historic England		<p>Objective and the possible indicators.</p> <p>Heritage Counts We consider that it is not appropriate to include our annual publication “Heritage Counts” in Appendix 2: Review of Relevant Policies, Plans and Programmes. Heritage Counts is a statistical report on the state of the historic environment, not a plan or strategy.</p>	<p>refer to the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>Heritage Counts Need to consider removing their annual publication “Heritage Counts” from Appendix</p>	<p>heritage assets and their settings”. This wording would accord with the NPPF.</p> <p>Heritage Counts Acknowledge that it is not a plan or strategy so will remove</p>	<p>Heritage Counts Remove “Heritage Counts” from Appendix 2</p>
023	Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities	SAM	<p>Impacts on other authorities The impacts of these potential sites on other authorities need to be considered both within the site allocation process and during the preferred options consultation, which should include the input of adjacent Authorities of Central and Eastern Berkshire. Such impacts could be proximity based or based upon the tangible effects that these sites would have upon the minerals and waste picture</p>	<p>Impacts on other authorities Need to consider the impact of adjacent authorities when considering sites.</p>	<p>Impacts on other authorities We consult all adjacent authorities and those we believe would be affected by the Plan, in accordance with our SCI and under “Duty to Co-operate”. Consider the impact of adjacent authorities during site assessment. These are also considered as part of the</p>	<p>Impacts on other authorities No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities		<p>within Central and Eastern Berkshire.</p> <p>Mineral and Waste movements As a result of the above point, the Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities would like to highlight the strategic nature of mineral movements originating from Berkshire in 2014 (source AM 2014). Specifically, around 8-77k tonnes of sand and gravel (around 1-10% of Oxfordshire’s total SaG consumption – 765k tonnes) originated from Windsor and Maidenhead.</p> <p>We would also like to draw attention to the fact that Oxfordshire is a net importer of non-hazardous waste from Central and Eastern Berkshire, demonstrated to be 2.8 million tonnes according to WDI data 2016.</p> <p>We would like the movements of non-hazardous waste from the Re3 sites into Oxfordshire to be</p>	<p>Mineral & Waste movements Need to be aware of strategic movements of minerals and the importation of non-hazardous waste from Central and East Berkshire.</p>	<p>preparation of the supporting documents.</p> <p>Mineral & Waste movements Sources of Minerals and Waste are monitored through the County’s Annual Monitoring Report. We are also work with other Minerals and Waste Planning Authorities as part of the South East Aggregates Working Party and the South East Waste Planning Advisory Group. For Waste we will also use the Environment Agency’s Waste Data Interrogator, which allows for monitoring of the amounts of waste coming into and being exported from Oxfordshire for management or disposal.</p>	<p>Minerals and Waste movements Continue working with other Authorities to ensure that the most accurate data is used for our evidence base.</p> <p>No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Central & Eastern Berkshire Authorities		<p>taken into account when allocating sites.</p> <p>Furthermore, 887 thousand tonnes of non-hazardous waste was imported to Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities according to 2016 WDI data. These movements originate from sites including R Collard Limited in Reading, which lies close to the Oxfordshire border.</p> <p>Support for Methodology The Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities support the Methodology proposed by Oxfordshire County Council for site allocations.</p>	<p>Support for Methodology None Required</p>	<p>Support for Methodology Acknowledge support</p>	<p>Support for Methodology None required</p>

024	South Oxfordshire District Council	SAM	<p>Need for Aggregate Minerals & Waste Management Capacity Whilst in paragraphs 1.9 & 1.10 in respect of facilities for recycled & secondary aggregates and re-use, recycling, composting or food waste treatment for non-hazardous and inert waste, the level of additional capacity required is expressed as a minimum, the approach to be used to determine how far above this level is appropriate to plan for is unclear. This should be a clearly justified, evidence-based approach.</p> <p>Renewed Call for Site Nominations Paragraph 2.8 says that if there are insufficient sites nominated for recycled & secondary aggregate or waste management facilities, OCC may need to actively identify additional sites, but no information on methodology for this is given. This should be made available, with opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Initial Screening Process:</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Strategies In Appendix 1, under compliance with both Minerals and Waste Strategies, consideration should</p>	<p>Need for Capacity Need to consider how any level of provision above the minimum is to be determined sites for these facilities. This should be clearly justified and evidence-based.</p> <p>Renewed Call for Sites Need to consider how OCC would identify sites if insufficient sites are nominated. A methodology for this should be made available and consulted on.</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Strategies</p>	<p>Need for Capacity The Core Strategy does not set an upper limit on provision to be made for capacity in respect of these types of facilities and therefore if sites come forward that are assessed as suitable for allocation, they should be allocated, irrespective of need. The question of whether the Sites Plan should allocate a particular level of provision above the minimum is one to be addressed in the preparation of the plan itself rather than in the site assessment methodology.</p> <p>Renewed Call for Sites If it proves to be the case that additional sites need to be actively identified by the Council, we would need to review the process by which sites are identified, assessed and consulted on; and this will need to be consistent with the process for nominated sites and with the nPPG.</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Strategies The inclusion of whether a site has been allocated for</p>	<p>Need for Capacity No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Renewed Call for Sites Amend paragraph 3.27 of the Site Assessment Methodology to provide expanded explanation of how a shortfall in nominated sites and consequent need to actively identify additional sites would be addressed.</p> <p>Minerals & Waste Strategies No amendments required at this stage</p>
-----	---	-----	---	--	---	--

	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>		<p>also be given to whether sites are proposed for allocation or safeguarded for future development in an emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>Need to consider those sites that are proposed or safeguarded for development in emerging local plans.</p>	<p>development in an adopted local or neighbourhood plan is based on the inclusion of this factor in the minerals and waste safeguarding policies in the Core Strategy (policies M8, M9 and W11). Sites proposed or safeguarded for development in emerging local plans are not recognised in policy in the Core Strategy; and it is difficult to see how this factor could be consistently applied. Also, there could be situations where the County Council has objected to a site being proposed in an emerging local plan on grounds of mineral sterilisation or conflict with waste management provision. The district councils will be consulted at all stages in the preparation of the Sites Plan and the County Council will engage with them under the duty to cooperate, and they will have full opportunity to raise any concerns over site options that may conflict with emerging local plans and to seek to resolve these.</p>	
--	---	--	--	---	---	--

	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>		<p>Access Arrangements The suitability of access arrangements appears to be double counted under the categories compliance with waste strategy and transport. Need to consider it once as applicable to both Minerals and Waste.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity Under the biodiversity and geodiversity category, the impact on important ecological networks in Oxfordshire (Conservation Target Areas) should also be considered.</p> <p>Landscape/Visual Impact. Under the landscape/visual impact category, it is proposed to consider the potential impacts on designated landscapes. However, it will not be possible to properly assess this using on desk based information. Consideration should also be given to landscape impacts more broadly, not only designated landscapes.</p>	<p>Access Arrangements Need to consider access once, under the transport (Including access) category.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity Need to consider including impact on ecological networks CTA's</p> <p>Landscape/Visual Impact Need to consider including consideration to broader landscapes not just those designated.</p>	<p>Access Arrangements Comment noted</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity The Biodiversity and Geodiversity criteria considers designations. Conservation Target Areas are not designations and therefore not included</p> <p>Landscape/Visual Impact The Core Strategy highlights the NPPF's recognition of the importance of the countryside. It sets out that proposals for minerals and waste development should be designed to minimise visual impact and where possible enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape. Policy C8. We consider all landscapes not just designated. We will consult in accordance with our SCI on our desk based study after the initial site screening and responses will feed into the next stage, where we will undertake more</p>	<p>Access Arrangements To remove duplication, remove this from W1.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity. No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Landscape/Visual Impact No amendments required in terms at this stage.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---	---

	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>		<p>Health and Amenity Under the health and amenity category, proximity to residential development is considered. This should take into account developments, adopted and emerging Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan allocations and planning permissions for major residential developments on non -allocated sites. This is important to protect the health and amenity of the future occupiers of these developments.</p> <p>Green Belt Category Assessment For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that mineral extraction is not inappropriate development in Green Belt (in accordance with paragraph 90 of the NPPF) and that waste management activities are inappropriate development in Green Belt. This interpretation of paragraph 90 of the NPPF is oversimplified. The impact of development on the purposes of the Green Belt need to be</p>	<p>Health and Amenity Need to include consideration to residential developments both allocated in emerging and adopted plans and those permitted on non allocated sites.</p> <p>Green Belt Category Assessment Need to consider how we assess mineral sites in relation to the Green Belt and the traffic light system.</p>	<p>detailed technical assessment</p> <p>Health and Amenity We consult all adjacent authorities and those we believe would be affected by the Plan, in accordance with our SCI and under “Duty to Co-operate”.</p> <p>We will consider the impact of minerals and waste development on allocated sites within Local and Neighbourhood Plans, during both initial and detailed technical screening. These are also considered as part of the preparation of all the supporting documents.</p> <p>Green Belt Category Assessment The NPPF states that mineral extraction is not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided it preserves its openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This can only be established when full details of a proposed mineral working development are known. In view of this element of uncertainty, mineral sites in the Green</p>	<p>Health and Amenity Add “(Those permitted and allocated as sites within Local Plans)</p> <p>Green Belt Category Assessment Amend Appendix 1 Initial Screening scoring matrix so that mineral sites in the Green Belt will be scored amber-green.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---	--

	<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>		<p>properly assessed. It is suggested that Green Belt sites proposed for mineral extraction should be given an amber rating pending a full assessment of Green Belt impacts at Stage 3.</p> <p>Trees The presence of trees, particularly trees that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders, is not currently considered. This should be added to the Stage 2 site assessment framework.</p> <p>Archaeology The potential for archaeological remains is not currently considered. This should be added to the Stage 2 site assessment framework.</p>	<p>Trees Need to consider including the presence of trees as part of the methodology.</p> <p>Archaeology Need to consider including the potential for archaeological remains as part of the methodology.</p>	<p>Belt should be scored amber-green rather than green.</p> <p>Trees Tree Preservation Orders are not referred to within the Adopted Core Strategy, instead, protection is given to ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees within Policy C7 of the Core Strategy and within Criterion B1 of the Detailed Technical Assessment. However TPOs are a designation and should be a consideration when assessing sites</p> <p>Archaeology The potential for archaeology is recognised within the Core Strategy in Policy C9 against which sites are assessed within the initial screening. The potential for archaeological remains is then considered further within under Criterion H2 of the Detailed Technical Site Assessment.</p>	<p>Trees Add Tree Preservation Orders to Criterion B3 – Impact on local sites</p> <p>Archaeology No amendments required at this stage.</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	--

<p>South Oxfordshire District Council</p>			<p>Proposed Methodology Stage 3: Detailed Technical Assessment Red sensitivity Score should not be removed at stage 3 as some technical assessment may only discover issues at Stage 3 that were not picked up at Stage 2. For example. It will not be possible to properly assess landscape and visual impacts until Stage 3 when landscape and visual impact assessments will be undertaken.</p> <p>Green Belt The Green Belt is not mentioned in the detailed technical information pro forma. It is suggested that an assessment of the potential impacts of development on the purposes of the Green Belt should be undertaken at this stage in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>Stage 4: Identification and Consultation on Preferred Options. It is unclear how assessment taken at Stage 2 & 3 feed into the process of identifying preferred and non-preferred sites. Whether this site assessment criteria will be equally weighted.</p>	<p>Proposed Methodology Stage 3: Detailed Technical Assessment Need to consider retaining the Red Score in case further information comes forward during Stage 3.</p> <p>Green Belt Need to consider undertaking assessments of impacts of development on Green Belt at this stage.</p> <p>Stage 4: Identification and Consultation on Preferred Options Need to set out how we identify the preferred and non-preferred sites at Stage 2 & 3</p>	<p>Proposed Methodology Stage 3: Detailed Technical Assessment Those with any red score should have been removed at the initial screening. We have all the relevant information and evidence available to us to be able to identify the sites that should be assessed as red.</p> <p>Green Belt Amendment of the Appendix 1 Initial Screening scoring matrix to include amber-green, amber and red-amber scorings for sites, rather than only scoring sites either green or red, will necessitate further assessment at the Detailed Technical Assessment stage.</p> <p>Stage 4: Identification and Consultation on Preferred Options Once we have undertaken the technical assessment stage, the preferred options that are considered to best meet the identified requirements for mineral provision and waste management in the Core Strategy will be identified. Detailed reasoning explaining</p>	<p>Proposed Methodology Stage 3: Detailed Technical Assessment No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Green Belt Include Green Belt in Appendix 2 – Detailed Technical Assessment stage</p> <p>Stage 4: Identification and Consultation on Preferred Options No amendments are required at this stage.</p>
---	--	--	---	--	---	--

	South Oxfordshire District Council		<p>Demand for further sites If insufficient sites are identified, it may be necessary to reconsider non-preferred site, to undertake pro-active site searches and/or to review the assessment methodology. Should this be necessary, the County Council should share and consult on the proposed approach.</p>	<p>Will criteria be equally weighted</p> <p>Demand for further sites Need to consider setting out how we will identify sites if insufficient sites are put forward</p>	<p>the rationale for including/not including the preferred sites for progression and how we came to that decision will be given.</p> <p>Demand for further sites If it proves to be the case that additional sites need to be actively identified by the Council, we would need to review the process by which sites are identified, assessed and consulted on; and this will need to be consistent with the process for nominated sites and with the nPPG</p>	<p>Demand for further sites. Amend paragraph 3.27 of the Site Assessment Methodology to provide expanded explanation of how a shortfall in nominated sites and consequent need to actively identify additional sites would be addressed.</p>
024	South Oxfordshire District Council	SASR	<p>Stage A1. Paragraph 2.4 states current policy framework is dynamic and new plans & programmes may</p>	<p>Stage A1. Need to consider the South Oxfordshire Local</p>	<p>Stage A1. The SA acknowledges that the current policy framework is dynamic and relevant plans</p>	<p>Stage A1. Update Appendices with Local policy</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	South Oxfordshire District Council		<p>emerge. The SO local plan 2033 expected in 2018 should be taken into consideration in the production of the site allocations document.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Development Plans There are seven Neighbourhood Development Plans covering areas of South Oxfordshire. They are recognised in the SA Scoping report and this is welcomed. Other Neighbourhood Plans are currently being progressed in South Oxfordshire some of which may be made during the time of the Site Allocations being produced.</p> <p>Stage A2 GIS Images Lack of GIS images under water resources section and this information is readily available on Environment agency website. It would be useful to provide spatial imaging of groundwater protection zones across Oxfordshire.</p>	<p>Plan and its preparation as we prepare the SA report.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Development Plans Need to consider emerging Neighbourhood Plans as we prepare the SA report</p> <p>GIS Images Need to consider whether we can include GIS images under the water resources section</p>	<p>will be added to the list in Appendices 1 and 2, when applicable, and any relevant message added to Box 1</p> <p>Neighbourhood Development Plans We will consider emerging Neighbourhood Plans for Oxfordshire and surrounding areas as we prepare the Sustainability Appraisal. We will also ensure that the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plans is considered throughout Neighbourhood Plan preparation.</p> <p>GIS Images The Environment Agency host an easily accessible, thorough and interactive map on their website, which we use in the plans preparation. It is felt this is sufficient.</p>	<p>updates as and when required.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Development Plans Update Appendices with Local policy updates as and when required.</p> <p>GIS Images Add a reference link into the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	South Oxfordshire District Council		<p>Aquifers Aquifers in South Oxfordshire support strategically important drinking water supply abstractions and this should be recognised in 3.57 – 3.61.</p> <p>Stage A3. Core Strategy Reference Paragraph 4.1 refers to the preparation of the Core Strategy. Should this reference be to the preparation of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations?</p>	<p>Aquifers Need to consider recognising aquifers importance to supply strategically important public drinking water supply abstractions for South Oxfordshire.</p> <p>Core Strategy Reference Need to determine if this reference is correct?</p>	<p>Aquifers We do recognise how important the aquifers are across the County.</p> <p>Core Strategy Reference This is an administrative error and needs correcting</p>	<p>Aquifers Include the line “Within Oxfordshire aquifers support important water supply abstractions.” After “get through our taps”</p> <p>Core Strategy Reference Amend 4.1 to Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations not Core Strategy</p>
025	FCC Environment	SAM	FCC will separately nominate sites for consideration for the Site Allocations Plan, but wish to make one point in respect of the Proposed Site Assessment Methodology Paper.			

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	FCC Environment		<p>Capacity Cap Paragraph 1.10 of the Proposed Site Assessment Methodology Paper states that: "Whilst no capacity cap is set on the provision for residual waste treatment, no sites are intended to be allocated for residual waste treatment as no need has been identified."</p> <p>The Adopted Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy forecasts a small capacity surplus in waste treatment capacity in 2031. However, it also acknowledges that smaller scale residual waste treatment facilities may be acceptable, if designed to serve a local need, are linked to local provision of heat and power, help to divert waste from landfill and if it can be demonstrated that they would not impede the achievement of recycling and composting targets.</p>	<p>Capacity Cap Need to consider if we need to provide specific provision for residual waste treatment facilities within the Site Allocations.</p>	<p>Capacity Cap At the moment we have a capacity 300,000tpa for non-hazardous residual waste treatment, and this is sufficient for the requirements of the Plan period and why no sites are required to be allocated within the Site Allocations plan. We would require there to be a need for a facility for residual waste and proof that the waste could not be dealt with further up the waste hierarchy, if a site was to come forward at a future date. It would also need to adhere to the policies within the adopted Plan.</p>	<p>Capacity Cap No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	FCC Environment		FCC consider that specific provision for residual waste treatment facilities must be provided in the Site Allocations Plan. This will ensure the most sustainable waste management solution can be achieved over the Plan period.			
026	BBOWT	SAM	<p>Accordance with the Core Strategy</p> <p>No principle issues with the proposed site selection methodology but expect site selection to be in accordance with policies C7 (Biodiversity & Geodiversity) and M10 (Restoration of Mineral workings) of the Mineral & Waste Plan Core Strategy as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This requires development to avoid significant adverse ecological impacts on designated sites and habitats in line with the mitigation hierarchy.</p>	<p>Accordance with the Core Strategy</p> <p>The Sites for inclusion within the Site Allocations Plan must be in accordance with Policies C7, M10 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the NPPF.</p>	<p>Accordance with the Core Strategy</p> <p>The BBOWT's comments are noted. All sites are assessed against and must be in accordance with the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the NPPF.</p>	<p>Accordance with the Core Strategy</p> <p>No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	BBOWT		<p>Where sites are found to be acceptable (subject to further assessments) consideration should also be given to the restoration of mineral working sites for biodiversity in line with Policy M10 at the early stages of the process. Opportunities for large scale habitat restoration should be maximised to create continuous, more resilient ecological networks.</p> <p>Comments on waste site nominations: Site 007: Greenhill Farm Quarry Site 009: Worton Rectory Farm Site 020A: Wicklesham Quarry (extension) Site 030: Shipton on Cherwell Quarry Site 117: City Farm, Witney Site 118: Tubney Wood Quarry Site 247: Upwood Park</p> <p>Comments on mineral site nominations:</p>			

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	BBOWT		SG-05: Land to the East of Cassington Quarry Site SG-08: Land at Lower Road, Church Hanborough Site SG-09: Land North of Drayton St Leonard and Berinsfield Site SG-20a: Wharf Farm Site SG-20b: Land at Eynsham Site SG-23: Windrush North, Gill Site SG-31: Sutton Farm, Stanton Harcourt Site SG-37: Land at Grandpont and South Hinksey Site SG-62: Appleford Site SS-01 Tubworth Barn, Tubney Site CR-13: Dewars Farm Quarry Site CR-18: Shipton-on-Cherwell Quarry			
027	MOD	SAM	Air Strike Zones Principle concern is the creation of open water bodies. The MOD is mainly concerned with how the site will be restored after use by the Mineral operator. The use of water bodies within this area leads to an increased amount of bird activity which conflicts with	Air Strike Zones Need to consider that sites could create the potential to attract large and or flocking bird species	Air Strike Zones Airport safeguarding zones are considered within the initial screening and AS1 of the Detailed Technical Assessment and these include MOD airports. We will note comments made to the sites and will consult	Air Strike Zones No amendments required at this stage

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	MOD		<p>the RAF operations in the Country.</p> <p>The MOD reviews all the developments which have the potential to infringe/inhibit aerodrome operations, as well as developments which have the potential to attract large, and/or flocking species hazardous to aircraft safety</p> <p>The response then lists than 40 sites which are split into varying categories which fall within specific statutory safeguarding zones within the County.</p>	hazardous to aircraft safety	the MOD during the Plan Preparation in accordance with the SCI.	
028	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd	SAM	<p>Evidence Base The Site Allocations Plan must take account of and accommodate the ever-shifting evidence base. It must recognise the long gap in time between submission of a planning application and the point at which the quarry opens.</p>	<p>Evidence Base We must consider the evidence base and the impact on provision requirements.</p>	<p>Evidence Base We will consider all the information we have available to us during the plan preparation. Deliverability will be a consideration and we will work with site promoters for more detail on this. We recognise the timescales between submission of planning application and opening of operation.</p>	<p>Evidence Base No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Smith & Sons (Bletchington) Ltd		<p>Site Nomination Para 2.2 states is inviting mineral and waste operators, landowners and agents to nominate potential. However, at para 2.7 it is said that only those sites nominated by operators will be considered. Presumably this should also include landowners and agents.</p> <p>Site Publication Are publishing the nominated sites before the screening process or only after the initial screening process has removed those that are not deliverable because of overriding constraints.</p> <p>Assessment of sites Concerned about the subjectivity of the statement in 3.9 “If there are many categories with a red-amber sensitivity score for a site, then consideration will need to be given as to whether this would present too many limitations in progressing the site, and may lead to an overall ‘red’ assessment.” It is not clear on</p>	<p>Site Nomination We must clarify the situation.</p> <p>Site Publication We must clarify the situation.</p> <p>Assessment of sites We must clarify the situation.</p>	<p>Site Nomination Para 2.2 is referring to both Minerals and Waste. However, 2.7 clarifies that Minerals Sites that have been promoted by operations will be considered as deliverability is uncertain</p> <p>Site Publication All sites that have been submitted will be published along with the reasons that have been removed if they have.</p> <p>Assessment of sites The preferred options will be published for consultation in early 2019 and this will also set out how decisions have been made. These preferred options will then be available for public consultation and promoters will be given the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Site Nomination Include clarification in the revised draft Site Assessment Methodology.</p> <p>Site Publication No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Assessment of sites No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd		<p>what basis this decision will be taken rather than returning to the site promotor to request additional specific information to determine the category in a transparent manner.</p> <p>Geological Evidence Para 3.11 We are concerned that the council should also have sufficient comfort that the sites being screened have sound geological evidence to support the nomination of the resource. It is important for the Council to know how the potential reserve, expressed as a saleable tonnage is calculate.</p> <p>Traffic light Scoring APPENDIX 1: Initial Screening – Traffic Light Scoring Criteria scores the site on the “Quality of Mineral Resource”. This requires very clear definition to provide certainty because resource quality is subjective.</p>	<p>Geological Evidence We must clarify how we identify the reserve.</p> <p>Traffic light Scoring We must determine if and how we are going to deal with this issue of subjectivity</p>	<p>If during the site review, more information is required, we will contact the site promotor.</p> <p>Geological Evidence At the initial screening, it is felt that a desk top exercise using the information from the operator on the site submission form is sufficient. Once we get to the Detailed Technical Assessment we would expect the operators to provide any further information required for us to know the potential reserve.</p> <p>Traffic light Scoring At this stage, we do not intend to use the level of detail suggested. We will utilise the BGS data available, alongside the information that the site promotors have submitted. There will then be the</p>	<p>Geological Evidence No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Traffic light Scoring No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd		<p>Is the Council proposing to establish a minimum size for a new quarry development? Does the sand and gravel have to meet the specifications for high strength concrete? What determines the difference between a poor/moderate/fair resource. The SA does not make reference to this issue</p> <p>Subjectivity Para3.13 states that “the main focus of the initial screening is to filter out unsuitable sites”. This objective is supported so long as subjectivity is ruled out. It would be better for marginal sites to be assessed with additional evidence at the technical assessment rather than ruled out prematurely.</p> <p>Identifying sites The relationship at 3.21.and 3.22 between preferred and non-preferred options is unclear. If preferred options are those “that are considered to best meet the</p>	<p>Need to determine whether to include it within the SA.</p> <p>Subjectivity Need to clarify whether subjectivity will be ruled out</p> <p>Identifying sites Need to clarify what other reasons will be used to clarify the rationale.</p>	<p>opportunity to submit information in response to our findings at the Preferred Options stage.</p> <p>Subjectivity The initial screening and the filtering out of unsuitable sites will be based on the information and evidence we have before us. There will be consultation on our findings and the chance to comment on these at the Preferred Options stage</p> <p>Identifying sites To provide clarity we will set out how a preferred site is considered the best to meet the minerals and waste requirements for the Plan</p>	<p>Subjectivity No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Identifying sites No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd		<p>identified requirements for minerals provision and waste management in the Core Strategy” then what other reasons will be used to explain the rationale (para 3.22)?</p> <p>Nature after Minerals In Appendix 1 regarding biodiversity we believe that the expertise available through the Nature After Minerals Programme (RSPB/NE) should be cited as a formal source of information. However, we do recognise that this has been noted at para 3.32 of the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.</p> <p>Air Quality In Appendix 1 it would be helpful to clarify that the Air Quality sensitivity score is wholly separate from any nuisance dust issues which are dealt with under Health and Amenity. However, Air Quality is a Health and Wellbeing issue so it may be that these categories need revisiting.</p>	<p>Nature after Minerals Include Nature after Minerals as a formal source of information.</p> <p>Air Quality Need to determine which category Air Quality should be considered under.</p>	<p>Period and how those non-preferred sites do not. These will be subject to consultation as part of the preferred options consultation</p> <p>Nature after Minerals We consider all relevant plans and publications as part of our evidence base.</p> <p>Air Quality The difference between AQMA and nuisance dust on Health and Amenity is recognised by having two categories within the Screening. It is felt that by having it in the specific AQMA criteria and the Health and</p>	<p>Nature after Minerals Include Nature After Minerals as an Information Source under Biodiversity and Geodiversity screening sections.</p> <p>Air Quality No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd		<p>Soil Resources In Appendix 1 Soil Resources, the reference to the area of BMV land must be the result of a site specific ALC survey. It is not possible to determine this without this level of detailed information that should be requested from the site promotor</p> <p>Site Restoration It is not clear whether the council is, in these circumstances, supportive of mineral restoration to agricultural use as opposed to biodiversity gains.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact. In Appendix 1 Cumulative Impact it is not clear whether this only</p>	<p>Soil Resources Need to clarify how we will determine Land Values</p> <p>Site Restoration Need to clarify restoration to agricultural land rather than biodiversity gains.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact</p>	<p>Amenity criteria, the impacts are fully assessed.</p> <p>Soil Resources For the initial screening we will use the evidence we have available, including information from our GIS Data, Natural England, site promoters and Agricultural Land Classification Reports.</p> <p>Site Restoration The Council supports the most appropriate restoration for each individual site. Policy M10 in the Core Strategy states that all restoration should deliver a net gain in biodiversity. Decisions will be based upon a site's individual merits and circumstances, following consideration of evidence and information received from consultees.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact The Core Strategy considers cumulative impact within</p>	<p>Soil Resources No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Site Restoration No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact Add reference</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd		relates to one or more <u>active</u> mineral or waste activities operating in close proximity or whether the historical nature of an area as a source of sand and gravel for example is considered as well. There has been an argument for there being no further extraction within the Lower Windrush Valley. However, minerals can only be worked where they are found and a long history of mineral workings does not have the same impact as a concentration of active workings	Need to clarify what we consider cumulative workings.	Policy M4 k and the sites will be assessed against policies in the plan.	to Policy M4k to Appendix 1
028	Smith & Sons (Bletchingdon) Ltd	SASR	<p>Sustainability Appraisal No substantive comments on SA Scoping report</p> <p>Inert landfill and inert recovery The report does not differentiate between inert landfill and inert recovery. The SA could acknowledge the difference and simply define inert landfill as including inert recovery.</p>	<p>Inert landfill and inert recovery Acknowledge the difference between inert landfill and inert recovery the definition of inert landfill and inert recovery.</p>	<p>Inert landfill and inert recovery The Core Strategy Policy W6 covers the recovery and disposal of inert waste. It is unclear how the SA Scoping report needs to be altered.</p>	<p>Inert landfill and inert recovery No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
029	Bampton Parish Council		Comments on specific sites only. Objection to Sites SG15, SG58 and SG58a	None Required	Comments will be considered at the site assessment stage	None required at this stage.
030	Tarmac	SAM	<p>We note in Section 3 of the SSM that the Council has a four-stage approach to site selection with Traffic Light Scoring to consider the proposed sites. This high-level approach is supported by Tarmac.</p> <p>Comments on Stage Process with Appendix 1</p> <p>Compliance with Waste Strategy</p> <p>Scoring criteria needs to recognise the synergy between minerals extraction and site restoration with a positive (or low level) scoring for any sites directly associated with the restoration of a mineral workings;</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>Tarmac agree with the approach in relation to site designations but disagree with the inclusion of</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>Compliance with Waste Strategy</p> <p>Need to consider whether we need to amend the scoring criteria</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>Need to consider whether to</p>	<p>Support for the four-stage approach is noted.</p> <p>Compliance with Waste Strategy</p> <p>This is not part of the Waste Strategy within the adopted Core Strategy. However, this is reflected within the restoration strategy.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p>	<p>Compliance with Waste Strategy</p> <p>No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <p>No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Tarmac		<p>protected species populations. Many sites will not have appropriate survey at this time and it would therefore be difficult to make an informed judgement on this basis</p> <p>Transport (including access) The scoring criteria is largely based on the freight hierarchy as based on the LTP. Whilst this is suitable for new sites, such an approach is not acceptable for sites that comprise on extension to operations. In such an instance an acceptable access is already in situ and the routing arrangements already defined and proven to be acceptable by prior grant of consent. The scoring criteria needs to be amended to reflect this circumstance.</p> <p>Evidence Are the Council able to provide an indication on what evidence may be required to determine suitability. If this could be defined early enough it will enable</p>	<p>maintain the inclusion of protected species populations.</p> <p>Transport (including access) Need to consider whether it is necessary to amend the scoring criteria for existing sites.</p> <p>Evidence What evidence is required to determine suitability.</p>	<p>Where this information is available we will use it to inform our decision making.</p> <p>Transport (including access) All sites, including extensions, will be assessed with the same criteria, including traffic implications</p> <p>Evidence At this stage, we have asked all Mineral Operators to complete a Nomination form which includes significant information that we will use to</p>	<p>Transport (including access) No amendments required at this stage</p> <p>Evidence No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document	Main Point / Comments	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Tarmac	Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	(These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)		operators to collate at the earliest opportunity.	assess the sites against the Criteria contained within the methodology. If further information is required, we will contact the site promoters to request it.
031	Natural England	SAM	<p>Welcome methodology generated to screen sites in relation to natural capital, including biodiversity and geodiversity, landscape and visual impact, air quality, soil and water resources.</p> <p>In terms of Sensitivity Score, we are satisfied in the approach for landscape and soils.</p> <p>HRA and Site Assessment In terms of Biodiversity impacts, it is noted that HRA screening will run alongside the Site Assessment Methodology, and any sites with 'Likely Significant effects' would not be taken forward – welcome this approach.</p>	<p>Methodology Supported</p> <p>Approach supported</p> <p>HRA and Site Assessment Need to consider that screening for impacts on European Designated sites is undertaken through the HRA screening and</p>	<p>Acknowledge support for sensitivity score.</p> <p>Acknowledge support</p> <p>HRA and Site Assessment This comment is noted. It is not our intention to use traffic light approach for HRA Assessment. The HRA will be a separate process and it will be undertaken alongside the site assessment. There should be no conflict.</p>	<p>HRA and Site Assessment No amendment required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Natural England		However, we don't consider the traffic light approach to be consistent with the HRA screening; the Regulations do not allow for Red-Amber or Amber categories. Suggest that screening for impacts on European designated sites is undertaken through the HRA screening which would then feed into the site selection, and that this is not through the traffic light assessment. In screening for effects on biodiversity, both indirect and direct impacts will need to be taken into account.	then fed into site selection and not through the traffic light assessment. Both indirect and direct impacts need to be taken into account.		
031	Natural England	SASR	<p>Relevant policies, plans etc Advise types of plans that should be considered</p> <p>Key Sustainability Issues and Sustainability Objectives Welcome that key issues, and accompanying objectives relating to protection and enhancement of biodiversity, landscape protection</p>	<p>Plans Consider advised types of plans where applicable.</p> <p>Need to consider making reference to the effects of air quality on biodiversity and objectives look to monitor this.</p>	<p>Plans We will note the advice on plans to consider and include where applicable.</p> <p>Air quality can have effects on biodiversity and this should be recognised in the key sustainability issues and in the monitoring of sustainability appraisal objectives.</p>	<p>Plans Include advised plans as applicable.</p> <p>Include reference to effect of air quality on biodiversity in key sustainability issues and in monitoring of sustainability appraisal objectives.</p>

Site Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal Consultation Report

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Natural England		<p>and conservation of soils have all been identified.</p> <p>In relation to air quality, suggest reference is also made to the effects of air quality on biodiversity and that the objectives look to monitor this.</p>			
032	Appleford Parish Council	SAM & SASR	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirement Before any sites are assessed a review of mineral requirement should be undertaken. The County has planned for an oversupply of mineral, which, without review will lead to a continual oversupply of sites during the plan to the detriment of Oxfordshire residents.</p>	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirements Need to consider whether we need to review our mineral requirement.</p>	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirements. These requirements for the plan period have been set out within the adopted Core Strategy and will be reviewed as part of the Core Strategy review (intended every 5 years unless the Annual Monitoring report requires otherwise). The Councils Annual Monitoring Report reviews the production, sales and reserves of minerals and at this time we do not consider that there is an oversupply.</p>	<p>Sand and Gravel Requirements No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>Common Dataset A common dataset should be used to compare sites equally at Stage 1 and 2 If two sites show the same proportions of BMV land grade under the regional classification system they should be treated equally by the classification. Any additional information from the promoters soil analysis can be noted but not relied on.</p> <p>Need to consider reliance on information from site promoters.</p>	<p>Common Dataset Need to consider reliance on information from site promoters.</p>	<p>Common Dataset We will look to use as much information as is available to us to try and ensure deliverable sites are put forward for the Plan Period. We have included site promoters as an information source as we feel they are relevant. As part of their site nomination form, we have asked for certain information to be included. These forms can be seen within the methodology. We will consult on this in accordance with our SCI. However, it must be noted that site promoters are just one of the information sources that we will utilise in the Plan Preparation.</p> <p>The Issues and Options consultation will include a question asking "Whether we should only consider sites that have been put forward by</p>	<p>Common Dataset Include question on whether other sites should be considered in Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>No further amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>Sequential Test for Flooding NPPF Sequential Test The NPPF Sequential Test for flooding is a requirement for allocating development sites. The current proposal applies the sequential test only for sites that pass an initial subjective screening against other considerations. We suggest a 'matrix' of flood risk (low/high) and quantity of BMV land (low/high) should be used as a first step to categorise the long list of sites into four groups before any other 'traffic light' criteria are applied.</p> <p>Needs to consider an initial matrix of flood risk to quantity of BMV land to categorise all sites, before other traffic lights. Low & low goes forward, high and high considered last.</p>	<p>Sequential Test for Flooding Needs to consider an initial matrix of flood risk to quantity of BMV land to categorise all sites, before other traffic lights. Low & low goes forward, high and high considered last.</p>	<p>owners/operators or should other sites be considered?"</p> <p>Sequential Test for Flooding We are undertaking the sequential testing as part of a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment at the Detailed Technical Assessment stage of the site allocation plan preparation. This will mean that those sites that are wholly unsuitable due to flood risk will not be carried through in the first place.</p> <p>This process for the sequential test was approved within the Core Strategy (2.58) This will be undertaken alongside the site assessment.</p>	<p>Sequential Test for Flooding No amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>Site Comparison The Site assessment methodology does not indicate how it will compare large site resources with smaller ones. Blanket criteria could inadvertently favour a site when both are equally suitable</p> <p>Need to consider comparable figures and whether blanket criteria is appropriate.</p> <p>Reliance on promoters information OCC should be able to conduct their assessments without reference to the promoter during the screening stage process.</p>	<p>Site Comparison The methodology should better compare large and smaller sites.</p> <p>Reliance on promoters information Need to consider using promoter's material at initial screening time</p>	<p>Site Comparison Each site is assessed on its own merits to determine whether it would be suitable for development.</p> <p>Reliance on promoters information As discussed above, we will look to use as much information as is available to us to try and ensure deliverable sites are put forward for the Plan Period. We have included site promoters as an information source as we feel they are relevant. As part of their site nomination form, we have asked for certain information to be included. These forms</p>	<p>Site Comparison No amendments required at this stage.</p> <p>Reliance on promoters information Include question on whether other sites should be considered in Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>No further amendments required at this stage.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>Parish Councils. Need to use Parish Councils as credible sources of information for the qualitative criteria.</p> <p>Mineral Quality The quality of mineral resource could be better defined in Stage 2. For example the mineral volume per hectare and the</p>	<p>Parish Councils Include Parish Councils as an information source.</p> <p>Mineral Quality Need to define the quality of the mineral resource better in Stage 2.</p>	<p>can be seen within the methodology. We will consult on this in accordance with our SCI. However, it must be noted that site promoters are just one of the information sources that we will utilise in the Plan Preparation.</p> <p>Parish Councils The Council do recognise the importance of consulting the Parish Councils as they have a wealth of local knowledge and are committed to doing so throughout the plan making process as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)</p> <p>Mineral Quality In stage 2 Criterion 4 it considers the resource quality as well as the quantity and depth.</p>	<p>Parish Councils Add Parish councils to the list of information sources.</p> <p>Mineral Quality No amendments required at this stage</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>proportion/variety of mineral within a site could be used as a proxy guide to the quality of a site</p> <p>Hedgerows The Biodiversity and Geodiversity screening criteria do not consider 'important' or 'ancient' hedgerows which are protected from development, are often essential landscape elements, and provide essential habitat in agricultural areas. We suggest an assessment of a site's workable resource by OCC should assume the stated deposit is reduced by the proportion of existing mature landcover in trees and hedgerow to encourage best practice by operators and discourage the loss</p>	<p>Hedgerows Need to consider 'important' or 'ancient' hedgerows. We should assume a deposit is reduced by the proportion of existing mature landcover in trees and hedgerows.</p>	<p>This quality of resource would be assessed using the information sources available to us and through using the data received from the promoter. Currently the Methodology states that we will only consider mineral sites that have been submitted by the Operator due to deliverability.</p> <p>Hedgerows Ancient hedgerows are protected within Policy W7 of the adopted Core strategy.</p> <p>This Policy will be adhered to as we assess the sites.</p> <p>It will be for the promotor to prove that they have protected the ancient hedgerow and how they have come to the reserve calculation whilst considering the existence of the hedgerow.</p>	<p>Hedgerows Add the phrase 'ancient' hedgerows in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity screening criteria and in criterion B1</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>of mature habitats for commercial gain.</p> <p>Need to consider 'important' or 'ancient' hedgerows. We should assume a deposit is reduced by the proportion of existing mature landcover in trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Green Belt We suggest a mineral site in the Green Belt which requires plant, buildings or visible screening elements should have an amber or red-amber rating as these are clear constraints to taking the site forward to planning</p>	<p>Green Belt Need to consider criteria for Green Belt as consider it inadequate and misinterprets wider Green Belt policies of NPPF</p>	<p>Green Belt The NPPF states that mineral extraction is not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided it preserves its openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This can only be established when full details of a proposed mineral working development are known. In view of this element of uncertainty, mineral sites in the Green Belt should be scored amber-green rather than green.</p>	<p>Green Belt Amend Appendix 1 Initial Screening scoring matrix so that mineral sites in the Green Belt will be scored amber-green.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Consultation Document Site Assessment Methodology (SAM)/ Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (SASR)	Main Point / Comments (These are a summary of the full responses received. The full responses have been used when considering them. The full responses are available to view on request at Oxfordshire County Council offices)	Requested action	Discussion	Outcome
	Appleford Parish Council		<p>Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme We welcome the potential benefit on the supply of minerals from the new Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme noted in paragraph 3.71. This is a welcome consideration and the potential contribution should be fully explored before any new sites are allocated.</p> <p>Agricultural land value The description in paragraph 3.104 is incorrect comparing the distribution of mineral vs Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. Fig 25 shows no Grade 1 land in west Oxfordshire - it is only shown occurring in South and East Oxfordshire - and there is no readily discernible difference in the proportion of Grade 2 land overlying mineral deposits in south Oxfordshire in comparison to west Oxfordshire. The paragraph requires amending.</p>	<p>Oxford Flood Alleviation scheme Need to consider the potential contribution before any new sites are allocated</p> <p>Agricultural Land Value Need to amend the paragraph as incorrect.</p>	<p>Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme The application for the scheme has recently been submitted to the County Council and its potential contribution will be explored during the plan preparation and will be taken into account with our provision.</p> <p>Agricultural land value Check the report and amend the paragraph if necessary.</p>	<p>Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme Amend text to acknowledge the application has been submitted.</p> <p>Agricultural land value Amend to: "Much of the main sand and gravel resource to the north of the River Thames in the west of Oxfordshire underlies Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, as does some of the sand and gravel deposit in Southern Oxfordshire. This can be seen in Figures 25 and 26"</p>

