



Consultation Responses for Waste Sites Proposals and Policies Development Plan Document - Issues and Options

Summary of Consultation Responses

Oxfordshire County Council

Consultation Responses for Waste Sites
Proposals and Policies Development
Plan Document – Issues and Options -
Summary of Consultation Responses

Reference: 0051809.07

September 2007

Prepared by: Amanda Ford & Louise Strack

For and on behalf of Environmental Resources Management
Approved by: Paul Fletcher _____
Signed:  _____
Position: Partner _____
Date: 17 September 2007 _____

This report has been prepared by Environmental Resources Management the trading name of Environmental Resources Management Limited, with all reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the client, incorporating our General Terms and Conditions of Business and taking account of the resources devoted to it by agreement with the client.

We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above.

This report is confidential to the client and we accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at their own risk.

CONTENTS

1	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES	1
1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	1
1.3	THE CONSULTATION PROCESS	2
1.4	SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND QUESTIONS, ANNEXES A & B AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO THE DOCUMENT	2
2	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE INITIAL SITE ASSESSMENTS	17

FOR A SUMMARY LIST OF SITES THAT RECEIVED CONSULTATION REPRESENTATIONS REFER TO TABLE 2.1 ON PAGE 17.

1 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Oxfordshire County Council is reviewing the planning policies covering minerals working and waste management in Oxfordshire. This will result in a new policy framework for minerals and waste development in the County – the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework. The preparation of the Waste Sites Proposals & Policies Development Plan Document (Waste Sites Document) is a key document in the framework. This document will cover the period until 2026 and will identify locations for the development of waste management facilities for the period to at least 2019. It will provide a detailed framework for making decisions on planning applications for waste related development at identified sites and elsewhere.

The preparation of the Waste Sites Document began in Summer 2005 when landowners, the minerals and waste industry and interested parties were invited to nominate sites which they wanted to be considered for inclusion in the Waste Sites Document. This invitation was repeated in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (Issues and Options) Consultation Paper produced in June 2006. Some 32 sites were nominated through this process.

In July 2006, Oxfordshire County Council published a Waste Site Selection Methodology which set out an assessment process for identifying sites to be included in the Waste Sites Document. This methodology was subsequently revised and the amended version was included in the Waste Sites Proposals and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper (the Consultation Paper) prepared by ERM in February 2007.

The Consultation Paper sets out the key issues that need to be addressed when preparing the Waste Sites Document and possible options for addressing the issues identified. The report also presented a preliminary long list of sites that had been identified as suitable to be considered for allocation in the Waste Sites Document.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is to summarise the range of ideas and opinions contained in the 75 ⁽¹⁾ representations received in response to the Consultation Paper. The County Council will use the comments to inform the next stage in the production of the Waste Sites Document. This will lead to the preparation of a Preferred Options Consultation Paper to include a list of preferred sites proposed for waste management facilities and to advise on the scope of

(1) Individual responses received in the majority of circumstances contained a response on more than one issue, question and site. Consultation representations were received from statutory consultees and this report does not include representations made by internal Council officers.

preferred policies to determine the way in which future planning proposals for waste facilities will be considered.

1.3 THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

The Consultation Paper was published in February 2007 and responses were sought by Friday 30 March 2007. People wishing to comment could obtain a form from the Council's website or in hard copy form. One comment was requested per form. People could read information about the preparation of the Waste Development Document on the County Council's website. Documents were available for downloading and also in hard copy. Some late consultation responses were accepted by the County Council owing to a slight delay in the printing of hard copies of the Consultation Paper.

1.4 SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND QUESTIONS, ANNEXES A & B AND GENERAL COMMENTS TO THE DOCUMENT

A summary of the responses received is set out in the sections below. In some instances consultees made a general comment about an issue rather than attributing the response to a specific question; therefore some repetition of comments has occurred.

1.4.1 Section 1: Introduction

There were five responses made on the paragraphs within the introductory section and these are as follows:

- Paragraph 1.3 -All DPDs will also need to take account of other documents such as Local Area Agreements, Sustainable Communities Strategies etc
- Paragraph 1.14 - There are good reasons why the plan period should be 2019 rather than 2026. It is extremely difficult to predict anything accurately more than 10 years ahead and current assumptions will almost certainly prove to be wrong. In particular, present economic growth in the south of England may not continue in the manner often assumed and may be halted by the inability of the region to sustain the current level of population growth, house building, water supplies, infrastructure development etc. without unacceptable environmental damage. Examples of additional uncertainties include the impact of unforeseen technological developments, changes in house building techniques and the migration of industry and service centres to other regions.
- Paragraph 1.21: Support the need to take account of the European Habitats Directive.
- Paragraph 1.22 - The County should ensure that it consults Natural England to obtain their views on the need for and extent of any Appropriate Assessments in connection with protected sites/species within and beyond Oxfordshire that could be affected by the plan's proposals.

1.4.2

Issue 1: Provision of Waste Management Facilities and Questions 1a and 1b

There were 4 representations made on Issue 1. One response stated that traffic should be considered irrespective of the site size. Two responses felt it unhelpful to restrict site size as it could restrict innovative technologies and a further comment felt there was a need to know more about the technologies proposed before site sizes could be decided.

Question 1a. What should be the smallest individual site size that should be allocated?

There were 8 representations received for question 1a. These representations acknowledged that the size of site is an important factor to consider but would not wish it to be so prescriptive as to stifle innovation. Some small sites under 0.5 ha may be suitable for community schemes such as the creation of small in-vessel composters at schools to deal with kitchen waste as has happened in some Wiltshire schools. One of the representations acknowledged that in order for larger strategic sites to be viable they need to handle a certain volume of waste and would have a larger land take; thus site size should not be restricted to 0.5ha.

Question 1b. What size of site should be considered as a strategic facility?

There were 5 responses received on question 1b, one of which noted that in order to answer the question it would be helpful to have had more information on the County's need for facilities and the volume of waste that is to be treated. The other responses stated that the size of a strategic site will depend on the waste type and technology to be employed.

1.4.3

Issue 2: Where should Waste Management Facilities be Located? Questions 2a and 2b

Issue 2 generated 8 responses. One response said that issues such as type, scale and need for the facility should be given as much weight as Green Belt and impact on the character of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Also that the full impact of traffic generation from waste facilities must always be considered. There was some support for locating facilities in the Green Belt as long as no other sites were available, although the responses generally favoured sites being within the urban area where possible and near to waste arisings. There was less support for waste development within an AONB and one comment noted that the sequential approach to site selection set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Paper would preclude waste sites being developed in an AONB.

One response was made on paragraph 2.26 noting that environmental designations should be given a high weighting when considering site location. The response drew attention to PPS1 paragraph 17 and the need to give the highest protection for those sites of international or national importance;

Question 2a Should the Waste Sites Document enable the development of waste management facilities and/or identify sites within the Green Belt in order to provide greater site opportunities on which to develop new waste management facilities close to Oxford?

There were 7 responses received for question 2a. Some of the representations received supported the development of waste facilities in the Green Belt to serve Oxford but only if all other options had been exhausted and very special circumstances could be demonstrated. However, other comments objected to development in the Green Belt in the absence of specific information as to what was required in terms of the need for waste facilities.

In relation to paragraph 2.29 one respondent felt that the County Council should define what is meant by Major Development sites.

Question 2bi What should “small –scale waste management facilities for local needs’ mean in the AsONB in Oxfordshire?

Question 2bii Should they include built development?

Question 2biii What, if any, limits in scale or size should be placed on them? Please provide a reason for any limitation proposed.

The responses to question 2bi -2biii stressed that any waste development in the AONB should only be permitted if it was of an appropriate scale and due consideration is given to the design of any buildings to ensure the character of the AONB is conserved and enhanced. The AONB is a constraint like Green Belt. The comments also stated that any facilities within the AONB should be serving a local rather than regional need.

1.4.4

Issue 3: Landfill and Questions 3a and 3b

There were 6 responses made to Issue 3. The majority of the responses supported allocating sites for landfill and/or providing clear policy support if there was a defined need for more facilities. However, one response supported the idea that to encourage other waste treatments there was a need to limit landfill allocations. The responses generally recognised the need for landfill capacity for the residues from the waste treatment processes.

In relation to paragraph 2.34 one response drew specific attention to the need to identify a network of sites to cater for all forms of waste, including specialist waste, and in doing so to ensure that due regard is paid to the wider provision of resources at regional level.

In relation to paragraph 2.36 the same respondent agreed that it was correct to seek to shift waste up the hierarchy away from landfill, but that the County Council must ensure that it maintains an appropriate supply of landfill sites in order to be as self contained as possible and meet its obligations to the wider region over the longer term.

Question 3a. Is an approach of not identifying sites for landfilling/landraising in order to discourage landfill sensible?

There were 8 responses to question 3a. Some made the point that the use of inert waste to restore mineral workings was very important for delivering sustainable mineral extraction; this should be viewed as more of a recovery activity than one of waste disposal. The majority of the comments emphasised the need to allocate sites for landfill if there is a definitive need.

Question 3b. Should policies be included to enable sites for landfilling/landraising to come forward?

There were 11 responses to question 3b. The representations all supported policies being included in the Waste Sites Document to enable sites for landfilling/landraising to come forward. The representations went on to state that policies should be drafted to accord with PPS10 and that they should demonstrate sufficient capacity equivalent to a 10 year supply.

1.4.5

Issue 4: Conflict of Land Uses and Questions 4a and 4b

There were 6 representations relating to Issue 4, two of which supported the idea of long term waste facilities being located in existing quarries as the infrastructure was already in place. However, the need for extended use must be fully assessed to ensure that the basis for a more permanent form of development is acceptable. In addition, any restoration work should be completed prior to any new development being proposed. If such existing sites are to be considered they must be acceptable in relation to the sequential approach set out in the Core Strategy.

Two of the responses received also commented on the issue of locating waste management facilities on industrial/employment land. If this occurs then it could result in a loss of employment land which could damage the local economy. Two responses supported the use of existing employment/industrial land for waste management facilities as long as the proposals were fully assessed in terms of environmental impacts.

With regard to paragraph 2.38 one respondent agreed that the activities associated with the generation of recycled aggregates from C& D wastes may be similar to those associated with the production of primary aggregates. The respondent suggests that if the mineral working (or landfill site) meets the appropriate locational criteria, is well screened, has good access and there is no loss of amenity for nearby residents, it follows that it should be considered and safeguarded for long term waste management uses irrespective of the term of the original planning permission. If, however, the development of a permanent waste treatment facility beyond the life of the original planning permission conflicts with the existing use or prejudices the objectives of the original permission then it should be resisted;

Question 4a Should existing temporary waste management sites be safeguarded for long term waste management uses? If yes::

Question 4ai Should this extend to landfill sites?

Question 4aaii Is it acceptable to allow a permanent waste treatment facility to be located within an existing quarry or landfill site which would normally only be operational for a temporary period of time?

There were 9 representations received on questions 4a-4aaii. There was considerable support for the proposal of safeguarding existing temporary waste management sites for long term use. Those in favour of doing so stated that the sites would not have been granted a temporary permission if the operations were considered detrimental to the environment. Also the existing waste uses represent an important element of the currently available capacity in the County. If such sites, albeit temporary, are not safeguarded then the County will have a shortfall of waste facilities in the future. The minority view was against safeguarding temporary facilities for long term waste management uses. These were concerned about a blanket policy and felt each case had to be determined on its merit.

Question 4b. Should existing industrial estates and land with B2 and B8 land uses be considered as acceptable locations for waste management facilities. If yes:

4bi Is it appropriate for the Waste Sites Document to generally promote waste related development on such sites?

4bii What circumstance, if any would make the use of such sites for waste management inappropriate?

There were 18 responses received on questions 4b-4bii. The idea that B2 and B8 land and existing industrial estates could be an acceptable location for waste management facilities was not well received. Those opposed to the idea were concerned about the loss of employment land, particularly within Oxford where there is a limited supply. Also the location of such facilities on industrial estates could lead to a loss of amenity to adjacent land users. If such land was to be used then each proposal would have to be considered on its own merit. There would be a need to consider the traffic impacts of such a proposal.

1.4.6

Issue 5: Enabling Delivery of Preferred Sites and Question 5

There were 4 representations made on Issue 5. These representations tended to favour not allocating sites if there was no chance of them being delivered. If there is no certainty about whether facilities can be delivered on such sites then a larger number of sites may need to be allocated. This uncertainty affects communities and may increase pressure for other forms of development on the site. However, it was acknowledged that as landowners do change it may be appropriate to allocate sites in some instances.

Question 5. Should sites be allocated in the waste sites document even if it is not clear whether the site owner would release the land for waste related development?

There were 10 representations received on question 5. Again, the objection related to the allocation of sites if it was not clear if they were available. They considered that doing so was contrary to PPS10 and 12 as the Waste Planning Authority (WPA) must be realistic about what can be delivered and avoid making unrealistic assumptions. Those in favour of allocating such sites said it should only be done in a strategic case where there was no sensible alternative. There were alternative views stating that land could be compulsorily purchased and that the allocation of sites without landowner support is already an established principle in allocating land in development plans.

1.4.7 Issue 6: Complementary Waste Development and Questions 6a and 6b

There were 3 representations received on Issue 6 which all supported the principle of grouping of waste management facilities because they would potentially reduce traffic movements. However, although a good idea the potential cumulative effects on the environment and the locality must be considered.

Question 6a. Should the Waste Sites Document promote resource recovery parks/ business eco parks?

There were 8 representations in response to Question 6a. There was some support for promoting resource recovery parks and the grouping of waste management facilities and it was recognised that such an approach was supported by PPS10. Also the Core Strategy should support eco parks and they should be supported through specific allocations.

Question 6b. Should the Waste Sites Document encourage grouping of waste management facilities? If yes:

6bi Is it appropriate to do this through site allocations?

6bii How else could this type of development be promoted?

6biii Should there be a minimum size, capacity, number of facilities applied?

There were 28 comments made on questions 6b- 6biii which generally supported the idea of grouping facilities. However, most emphasised the need to be cautious, acknowledging the difficulty in finding space for such sites. One comment stated that “in the absence of an industry promoted site it is difficult to envisage how the Planning Authority could promote such a facility”. Also the comment was made that the grouping of waste management facilities should not be promoted to the exclusion of separately operated sites.

1.4.8 Issue 7: Equity and Questions 7a, 7b, 7c and 7d

There were 7 representations received on Issue 7. The majority of these did not support the issue of equity:- that is the sharing of waste management

facilities within the districts of Oxfordshire in the fairest way possible. Allocating facilities in each District Council area ignores the issues of waste movement and the scale of waste facilities. It could be a guiding principle but specific circumstances may justify some departures from this principle. In addition the comment was made that the movement of waste will be mostly influenced by commercial considerations; having a local facility will not guarantee that all waste is taken to the nearest facility.

Question 7a. Should the Waste Sites Document seek to deliver the same number/types of facilities in each district?

Question 7b. Should the Waste Sites Document seek to deliver the same amount of waste management capacity in each district?

Question 7c. Should the Waste Sites Document seek to deliver waste management capacity in proportion to population of each district?

Question 7d. Should the Waste Sites Document focus on site allocation on the basis of other criteria, critically the benefits and disadvantages presented by each site rather than gaining equity across the districts?

There were 7 representations made on each of the questions 7a-7d. Some of these supported the concept of equity as it supports the principles of sustainability as set out in PPS10 . However, it was acknowledged that if the land was not available it cannot deliver an equitable distribution of facilities in practice. Other comments stated that it was not a sensible method as sites should be developed in terms of benefits and constraints. Waste planning is a “County Matter” and the distribution of facilities should be based on an assessment of what achieves the most sustainable outcomes, not just equity between District Council areas. One comment was made that socio-economic criteria should also be considered in assessing sites.

1.4.9

Issue 8: Methodology (Site Selection Process) and Question 8

There were 3 representations made on this issue. These suggested additions to the methodology to include an assessment of transport criteria, a strategic flood risk assessment, assessment of hedgerows and lighting. It should also be made clear whether the land has already been allocated in an existing plan or options paper. One comment stated that for agricultural land, only Grade 1 land should be considered as an important constraint.

With regard to paragraph 3.4, one respondent considered that the use of the general and abstract phrase ‘waste treatment facilities’ throughout the document, without any attempt to consider the effects of the different types of waste technologies, has made it difficult to provide a clear response. Not until paragraph B4 is there any illustration of the different sorts of ‘waste treatment facilities’. Even there the term ‘building with a chimney’ is rather odd. This could give rise to a suspicion that something is being hidden in the whole process.

Question 8. Do you consider the methodology as set out in Annex B is appropriate or would you suggest some further amendments?

There were 13 representations made on Question 8. All the comments suggested amending the methodology in some way. Some considered that the definition of urban areas had been wrongly applied and that the Minerals and Waste Forum should not be shortlisting sites. One comment said that it was not appropriate to identify possible sites without providing an initial assessment of possible uses or a reason why the site was being considered. There was also a comment that the process should recognise that other sites would eventually come forward independently in the form of future development proposals. Also, one comment was made that there was a lack of public participation and consultation in the process. The methodology does not consider climate change and it is not clear how proper technical and environmental inputs will be used in the process. Further criteria should be added to take account of the local communities' needs, planning history, impact on groundwater and surface water and impacts of the proposal on designated sites.

1.4.10 *Issue 9: Facility Groupings and Questions 9a and 9b*

There were 3 responses to this issue all of which suggested additional groupings to the four generic groups put forward. Additional groupings were suggested to add a category of outdoor facilities and facilities within buildings, using the example of a builder's waste sorting activity inside a building and a recycling, crushing and screening of aggregate activity outside the building. Another response suggested grouping facilities similar to the Use Classes Order, in order to inform decision making about whether particular types of facilities are suitable in particular locations. The final response suggested that the buildings should be listed as large or small so that they can be best allocated to the different volumes of waste to be managed.

Question 9a. Do you agree with these groupings?

Question 9a received 6 responses, half of which supported the facility groupings suggested in question 9a and the other half wished to amend the groupings to include a mixture of buildings and outdoor activities (as above).

9b. What other groupings or characteristics would you identify?

There were 5 responses to question 9b which suggested that the group types should differentiate on the size and scale of building and the likely impacts it would cause.

1.4.11 *Issue 10: Shortlisting Criteria and Question 10a and 10b*

This issue generated 5 general responses which included a comment that there was a need to establish the type of waste facility that was to take place on a site. Where sites have been identified through the Local Development Framework, then work must be done to assess the suitability of the site for

different waste facilities. Only when this has been done can an assessment be made of the distribution of the sites that have been identified. Some comments considered it necessary to establish a network of small sites to serve large rural areas and to minimise the distance waste is transported (see also Issue 7). The site selection process should only proceed when it has been established that each locality had a number of suitable sites for waste facilities.

Other comments were made that the information given for each site in the Consultation Paper gave too little information, no planning history was provided or details as to how the site was currently being used. Access arrangements must be fully considered. It is essential that the cumulative impacts of development are dealt with through “demand management measures”. In addition some responses stated that the criteria should include distance from main settlements and proximity to sensitive land uses.

Question 10a. Are these appropriate criteria to use in shortlisting sites?

There were 7 responses to this question, two of which were in full support of the criteria used for shortlisting. One response objected to the criteria stating that they should better relate to the Core Strategy Preferred options 11b and 14 and to the Draft South East Plan Policy W17, and suggested the following additional criteria:

- Existing or new waste site;
- Previously-developed or greenfield location;
- Local Nature Reserves, County Wildlife Sites, Proposed County Wildlife Sites, records of Protected Species on sites;
- Groundwater/ aquifer considerations as well as floodrisk;
- Neighbouring land uses which are sensitive to nuisance;
- Traffic impacts, capacity for additional vehicle movements;
- Accessibility and opportunities for transport by other modes e.g. rail or water; and
- Site histories.

Further responses made suggestions for amending the criteria as follows:

- The relationship to urban areas would be better described as ‘proximity to arisings’;
- The criteria should reflect the importance of local considerations.
- Existing waste uses should be included; and
- Sites that experience flooding, have been subject to a flood risk assessment or a pollution control requirement should be identified.

Question 10b. Do you have any other suggestions for shortlisting sites for detailed appraisal?

There were 11 responses to question 10b, three of which supported the criteria as set out in the document. Of the remainder, it was commonly felt that the criteria should better reflect the approach of the Core Strategy Preferred Options - issues 11b and 14. Also there was a need for consistency in the use

of the numbering system already employed in this site assessment exercise which should include flood zones, world heritage sites and ancient woodlands. Six of the responses suggested further criteria as follows:

- Rank each site with regard to their potential, from small scale single use facilities to large scale strategic ones. This would allow all stakeholders to gauge what was achievable on each site and potential impacts;
- State how the site relates to surrounding land uses;
- Make the link between residues from aggregates recycling being used to restore mineral workings;
- Contribution of navigable waterways;
- State proximity to waste arisings (rather than relationship to urban areas);
- Calculate the green house gas emissions from different sites then use this as a selection criteria;
- State whether site is in an existing waste use or its current use, i.e. previously developed, green field land etc;
- Relationship to urban areas needs better definition as does access arrangements;
- State whether site floods and if a flood risk assessment has been undertaken or if site has any pollution control requirements;
- State wildlife designations; and
- Planning history required for each site.

One comment drew specific attention to the fact that the criteria failed to take account of the possible impact of further waste development on navigable waterways, namely the Oxford canal.

1.4.12 Issue 11: Other Comments and Question 11

There were 2 responses received on this Issue. One comment was concerned with the location of facilities and the need to reduce the environmental impact of lorry journeys to and from the facilities. The other comment was concerned about sites identified in the document which are allocated as protected employment land in local plans such as Oxford City and Vale White Horse District Council local plans.

Question 11. Do you have any other comments to make regarding the issues and options raised in this report, or generally?

There were 9 direct responses made to question 11. These can be summarised as follows:

- Need to consider the nature of the activity proposed before assessing the sites;
- Too many errors in the site maps;
- The site assessments should not be too restrictive: assessing the site as a whole not just the policy restrictions;
- Consider water issues, fly tipping and hours of operation;
- Any site selected must be consistent with and integrated into the South East Integrated Regional Framework;
- Include the criterion “site already in waste use”;

- There is a need for a household recycling centre to serve the north east of South Oxfordshire District Council.

A number of general comments were made that were not referenced to a specific paragraph or question in the document even though they may bear relation to specific points in the document. These comments, where they are new points and not repeated or covered elsewhere in this document are summarised below:

- The careful planning and strategic thinking going into the proposals and policies was welcomed;
- Planning for waste management facilities needs to be long-term and well managed, sites need to meet a local requirement as well as being part of a larger strategic picture;
- Waste management sites should promote resource recovery and co-location of facilities encouraged if it leads to more reuse of waste;
- The distribution of sites across the County needs to be done evenly, however this does not need to be strictly divided along district areas per se;
- The usefulness of the basic assessment for all sites is limited. Need to establish the range of waste related activities that the site can be used for and then the distribution of proposed facilities. A site may be rejected because it is in the AONB but there maybe an overriding need to provide facilities in that area. It is justified to balance the need for a facility of the type proposed with the degree of constraint identified;
- AONB cannot be ruled out as a location for development;
- Any development in the AONB should be of the highest quality to ensure that the natural beauty of the AONB is conserved or enhanced;
- Factual errors need to be corrected;
- Insufficient emphasis has been put on the benefits of consultation and education about local networks of waste treatment facilities. It should be a presumption that certain activities are expected to be accommodated locally;
- Support the methodology set out in Annex B as long as all criteria are applied with equal priority;
- Instead of using numbered assessment say yes or no;
- The document is extremely difficult to read and full of unexplained initials and references;
- A quick reference site list would be helpful in future documents, some of the information in the document is not easy to identify as sites have been repeated;
- Priority in shortlisting sites should be given to sites which already have existing waste management use or uses;
- Residents of Stanford-in-Vale have raised concerns about existing waste developments in the area and would not welcome any additional developments in the area;
- The County Council should have regard to guidance in PPS10 when selecting sites for waste management facilities;

- Geological sites must remain accessible and not be compromised by landfilling;
- There should be specific reference to the protection and where appropriate enhancement of the historic environment;
- The County Council may want to consider aligning the plan periods between the Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document and the Oxfordshire Districts Local Development Frameworks. Most Oxfordshire Local Development Frameworks look to plan to 2026, given the connection between housing and related development and minerals and planning there would be an advantage of aligning the plan periods.
- All Development Plan Documents should be underpinned by a robust evidence base. Authorities should prepare and maintain lists of the evidence base they wish to rely on;
- The Lower Windrush Valley is overexploited and there should be no further development at Dix Pit;
- It was acknowledged that the Green Belt has to be considered for development. An interpretation of a sequential approach in terms of site selection is as follows:
 - Within urban areas
 - Close to urban areas, not in the Green Belt
 - In rural areas but not in the Green Belt
 - In the Green Belt
- 40 of the sites proposed in the document are in the Green Belt although some clearly not suitable as too small. We would not wish to see any imported waste treated in the Green Belt;
- Local residents are concerned about the impact of litter, fly tipping and road safety at Alkerton Household Waste Recycling Centre. The facility should be open longer during light evenings and all verges within a mile radius should be checked for litter;
- Waste management technologies are always changing so too rigid an adherence to policies outlined in 2.19 and 2.20 could be counterproductive to innovative ideas;
- The sequential approach set out in Section 2.22 offers some protection to the wildlife interests of these sites. Although there needs to be more sensitive approach in assessing wildlife. The work of Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre in drawing up a list of hotspots within Oxfordshire should be incorporated;
- It would be helpful to indicate the type of waste management facilities for each site;
- If there is to be further development in the Sutton/Stanton Harcourt area there should be a routing restriction to prevent Heavy Goods Vehicles travelling through Stanton Harcourt and standards put into place for the maintenance of the site to ensure that the health and welfare of local residents is not compromised;
- A resource recovery park could be created between Didcot Power Station and the Appleford to Sutton Courtenay Road;

- There should be a careful assessment of the locations and the impacts of existing facilities to ensure that any proposed consolidation of an existing location pattern is sustainable;
- Policies for the restoration and after use of landfill sites should be supported by an assessment of the successes and failures of restoration and after-use at existing sites to ensure that the highest standards and the most appropriate uses are achieved;
- Previously developed land should be considered before greenfield sites are developed and potential opportunities in diverse low tech, industrial areas should not be overlooked;
- The distribution of facilities across the district should primarily be based upon need, but having regard to the sources of waste, transportation infrastructure and traffic impact, the cumulative impact of waste management activities, the constraints on development, the availability of previously developed land in sustainable locations, deliverability issues and the strategic locations of markets and destinations for recovered/recycled waste products if identifiable and certain; and
- No civic amenity sites have been identified near to Thame.

1.4.13

Issue 12: Site Information and Questions 12a and 12b

There were 3 responses made to Issue 12 as follows:

- Need to state what the site is suited for and what the owner/operator would like the site to be used for;
- Split proximity to urban areas into 2 criteria relating to distance to sensitive land uses and then distance to main settlements. Other criteria should include planning history, assessment of access, state if land is already developed;
- There seems to be a duplication of sites and no clear sense of location or existing use.

Question 12a. Is there any important information missing for the sites that would help determine whether the site is appropriate in the detailed assessment of the sites?

There were 10 responses to questions 12a. The responses made the following points:

- The current condition and land use of the site should be stated and if the land is in Green Belt whether the existing use conforms to policy;
- If the site is in the AONB then there is a need to properly assess any proposal which should be small in scale and in keeping with the AONB. Any development within the AONB should be of the highest quality;
- The inclusion of Shipton-on-Cherwell quarry is supported, need to amend the site assessment details which are incorrect;
- Inclusion of Dix Pit, Sutton Courtenay, Oakley Wood and Dean Pit are supported, although the details in the site assessments are sketchy and therefore difficult to see how this is an adequate basis for initial sieving down of numbers;

- Many of the sites listed have the potential to impact on nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or European designated Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). We would remind the Council of the duties placed on local authorities under Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations to conserve and enhance these sites, and to avoid damage to the sites when considering where to place waste management facilities. As set out in the Issues and Options consultation document, if a proposal is likely to have a significant effect on a European site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, then an appropriate assessment must be undertaken to determine the environmental impact; and
- Add these additional criteria:
 - Whether the site is an existing or new waste site;
 - Previously developed land or greenfield location;
 - Any wildlife designations or records of protected species;
 - Groundwater or aquifer considerations as well as floodrisk;
 - Note any neighbouring landuses sensitive to nuisance;
 - Traffic and transport impacts;
 - Site history.

Question 12b Are there any other sites that might be suitable that have not been listed?

There were 4 responses received putting forward additional sites that should be considered for the development for waste management facilities. One comment received stated that the long list of sites includes two to the west of Shellingford Quarry which overlap. The existing quarry, which is a major landfill site, should also be included as it has potential for additional waste management facilities. Another comment put forward two sites Ambrose Quarry in Ewleme and a gravel extraction site at Brazes Lane in Benson. One response set out an additional site in Banbury off Thorpe Way, this site is the focus of a proposal already submitted to the County Council for Overthorpe MRF. One other response put forward land west of Wroxton as a potential site, it is a site that has been previously worked for ironstone and has been restored but is stated to be of very poor agricultural quality.

1.4.14 *Annex A: Preferred Options for waste from Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Document*

No specific Responses were received on Annex A.

1.4.15 *Annex B: Site Selection Methodology*

There were 8 responses made on Annex B which can be summarised as follows:

- The site selection process may rule out sites where objections can be overcome through mitigation of impacts. There should be some recognition that sites not initially selected could eventually come forward with appropriate development proposals;

- Additional shortlisting criteria should include:
 - Planning history;
 - Land use and land use history of the site;
 - Conformity of the site to planning policy including to the preferred options of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy; and
 - Access by water.
- Location of sites should take account of miles travelled and impact of traffic on residential areas to include moorings;
- The impact upon the historic environment should have been used on the long list. Policy BE7 of the draft regional spatial plan policy includes reference to historic landscape and urban character assessment to inform plans and strategies.
- The Municipal Waste Management Strategy should appear in Box 1.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE INITIAL SITE ASSESSMENTS

This section provides a summary of comments received on the initial assessment of potential waste sites included in *Annex C* of the Consultation Paper. For quick reference *Table 2.1* details the sites that received a response during the consultation period.

Table 2.1 *Sites that Received Consultation Representations*

Site No.	Description	Page No.
1	Hickman bros. Landscapes Ltd, Fullbrook.	20
2	Prospect Farm, Chilton.	20
3	Dix Pit, Stanton Harcourt.	20
4	Slape Hill Landfill (John Sheehan, Oxford, Ltd.), Glympton.	20
5	Playhatch Quarry, Playhatch.	21
6	Childrey Quarry (Mr. David Lewis), Childrey.	21
7	Greenhill Farm Quarry (Mr. David Hackett), Bletchingdon.	21
8	Mc. Kenna plant hire (Oxford Ltd.) New Wintles Farm, Eynsham.	21
9	Worton Rectory Farm, Yarnton.	22
10	Sutton Courtenay landfill (Waste Recycling Group), Sutton Courtenay.	22
11	Finmere Quarry (Premier Aggregates Ltd.)	22
12	Gosford grain silos (RPS Planning), Kidlington.	22
13	Ewelme MRF and transfer station, Ewelme.	23
14	Ashgrove Farm (Agrivert), Ardley.	23
15	Showell Farm (Agrivert),	23
17	Crowmarsh Battle Farm (Agrivert), Wallingford	23
18	Holloway Farm (John Sheehan, Oxford Ltd.), Waterstock.	23
19	Bicester sewage treatment works (Thames Water), Bicester.	24
20	Wicklesham Quarry (Grundon Waste Management Ltd.), Sandshill.	24
21	Green sands (Mr. Wells, Farntech Ltd.), East Hendred.	24
22	Ardley Quarry and landfill , Ardley.	24
23	Alkerton landfill and civic amenity (Sita UK Ltd.), Banbury.	24
25	Mr John Hedges and the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, Wroxton.	25
26	Whitehall Quarry (Smith & Sons, Bletchingdon Ltd.), Burford.	26
27	Former quarry off downs road (smith & sons, bletchingdon ltd.), standlake.	26
28	Gill Mill Quarry (Smith & Sons, Bletchingdon Ltd.), Ducklington.	26
29	Land at the Bourne, Hook Norton.	26
30	Shipton on Cherwell Quarry, Shipton on Cherwell.	26
31	Former prices candles , Bicester.	27
32	Units 31-37, Murdock Road Industrial Estate, Bicester.	27
33	Land east of railway line and north of Waterworks Lane, Banbury.	27
34	Engineering work, Mill Lane, Kirtlington.	27
35	Neithrop House	28
36	B Line Business Centre Ltd., Enslow.	28
37	Waterworks , Banbury.	28
38	Alcan Laboratories, Banbury.	28
39	Bessemer Close and Launton Road, Bicester.	29
40	Junction of Warwick Road and Foundry Street.	29
41	Cripley Road and land at north end yard, Jericho.	29
42	Former junior school off Pioneer Road, Faringdon.	29
43	Council depot, Challow Road, East Challow.	29
44	Grove Technology Park, Grove.	29
45	Milton Park industrial estate, Didcot.	30

Site No.	Description	Page No.
47	North of Abingdon police station	30
48	Disused Milton reservoir and pumping station, Sutton Courtenay.	30
49	Harwell international business centre for science and technology, Harwell.	30
50	The works and bakers yard, Ardington.	30
51	White Horse business park, Faringdon.	30
52	3 to 11 West Way, Botley.	30
53	Ukaea Harwell Laboratory, Didcot.	31
54	Former sewage works, Longcot.	31
55	Disused waterworks, Sutton Courtenay.	31
56	Disused sewage works, Abingdon.	31
59	Scrap yard off Sutton Wick Lane (Abingdon car breakers), Drayton.	31
62	The depot, Enstone road, Little Tew.	32
63	Areas of brownfield land at former Bradwell airfield, Bradwell.	32
64	Charlbury quarry, Charlbury.	32
65	Former airfield off b4449, Stanton Harcourt.	32
66	Alfred groves , Milton under Wychwood.	33
67	Coalyard adjacent to disused railway, Great Rollright.	33
68	Begbroke Hill Farm, Yarnton.	33
69	Oxford airport, Kidlington.	33
70	Thames water depot, Kidlington.	33
72	Castle Quay, Banbury.	34
76	Beaumont Close, Banbury.	34
79	Southam Road North, Banbury.	34
80	Spital Farm, remainder of allocation (BANNT C7), Banbury.	34
81	Edward Street business centre, Banbury.	34
82	Wildmere Industrial Estate, Banbury.	35
85	Land to the south of Overthrope Road and west of M40, Banbury.	35
89	Bicester Airfield, Bicester.	35
90	Banbury Business Park, phase 2, Adderbury.	36
91	Langford Locks, Kidlington.	36
92	Oxford Spires Business Park, phase 3, Kidlington.	36
94	Brymo Ironworks, Hook Norton.	36
95	Oxford Industrial Park, Yarnton.	36
97	Oxford Business Park (DS57), Cowley.	36
98	Wolvercote Paper Mill (DS90), Wolvercote.	37
99	West of Downs Road (policy E1 & proposal 9), Witney.	37
100	East of Downs Road (policy E1 and proposal 9), Witney.	37
102	Chipping Norton depot (policy E1), Chipping Norton.	37
103	Lakeside Industrial Estate (policy E1), Standlake.	37
104	Land at Southmead Business Park, 1 (DID9), Didcot.	37
107	Land at the southern end of Tramway Road Industrial Estate, Henley on Thames.	38
108	Land near junction 11 of M40 (ref. BA90), Banbury.	38
109	Land east of M40 (ref. BA91), Banbury.	38
110	Regeneration area (east & west of railway line), Banbury.	38
111	Land south of Milton Road/ north of Milton Road, Bloxham.	38
112	Land north of Milton Road (ref BL16), Bloxham.	38
113	Sutton Wick Landfill, Sutton Wick.	39
114	Appleford siding, Sutton Courtenay.	39
116	Worsham Quarry, Asthall.	39
118	Tubney Wood (Hills, Minerals & Waste Ltd.), Besselsleigh.	40
119	Elm Farm Quarry (Stratton Audley Quarries Ltd.), Bicester.	40
121	Old Brickworks Farm (R. Miller), Bletchingdon.	40
122	Hornton Grounds Quarry, Hornton.	40
123	Old Sewage Works (Land Network), Clifton Hampden.	41
126	Varney's Garage (R. Pannozzo & P. Grossi), Hornton.	41
127	Banbury Motor Spares (Banbury Motor Spares Ltd.), Banbury.	41
128	Berinsfield Breakers (E. Neighbourhood), Dorchester on Thames.	41

Site No.	Description	Page No.
129	Milton pools, London Road, Milton Common, Thame.	41
132	Alumini Holdings Ltd, 47-49 Whitecross, Wootton, Abingdon.	42
133	Peter, Pauline & Thomas Smith, Bloxham.	42
134	Walter Breakspear & Son (W & R Breakspear), Charlton.	42
135	Haynes of Challow Ltd, East Challow.	42
136	Mc. Gregor Railway Services, Bicester.	42
137	L C Hughes (Ducie Hughes), Bicester.	42
138	Mains Motors Ltd. (Mains Motors), Ewelme.	43
139	Units 2a & 4 Sturt Farm Industrial Estate, Burford.	43
142	Sandfields Farm (KJ Millard Ltd.), Over Norton.	43
143	Banbury Transfer Station (Grundon), Banbury.	43
144	Hill Farm, Wood Recy. Facility (J. James Ltd.), Didcot.	43
145	Ferris Hill Farm, Hook Norton.	44
146	Oxford Sewage Treatment Works (Thames Waste Management), Sandford.	44
150	Horspath Road Depot (S. Grundon, Waste Ltd.) Oxford.	44
151	Drayton Depot Transfer Station (Oxfordshire County Council), Drayton.	44
152	Ewelme No. 1 (S. Grundon, Waste Ltd.), Ewelme.	44
153	Merton Street Depot (S Grundon Waste) Ltd.), Banbury.	45
156	City Insulation Contractors, Cowley.	45
158	Dean Pit (Waste Recycling Group), Chadlington.	45
159	Drayton WRRRC (G Thompson & J Rickett), Drayton.	45
160	Faringdon (G Thompson & J Rickett), Stanford In The Vale.	45
161	Redbridge Waste Centre (Wyvern Waste Services Ltd.), Oxford.	46
163	Cowley Marsh Depot (Oxford City Council), Cowley.	46
168	Manor Farm (JB Stevens & Son), Tywford.	46
169	Sydenham Grange Farm, Sydenham.	46
170	Old chalk pit, Chinnor.	46
171	Akzo, Abingdon.	47
172	Doop Services, Watlington.	47
173	Charlett Tyres (Douglas L Charlett, Tyres Ltd.), Yarnton.	47
175	Field Farm, Thame.	47
178	Bowling Green Farm, Faringdon.	48
180	Elmwood Farm, Black Bourton.	48
181	Langford Lane, Kidlington.	48
182	Phillips Tyres, nothern bypass, Oxford.	48
184	R Hazell Recycling Waste, Ewelme.	48
185	RMC Materials, Sutton Wick leachate treatment plant, Abingdon.	48
186	Metal Salvage Ltd, Oxford.	48
187	College Motors/ Simon Ballard, Sturt Farm, Burford.	49
188	Waterland Farm (Claydon - Folly Kevin), Chinnor Road, Thame.	49
189	Station yard (Wilson Martin Gerad), Shrivenham.	49
190	Pophleys Farm, Crowell.	49
191	Bablakes Farm, Letcombe Regis.	50
192	Waterstock golf course, Waterstock.	50
198	Eight Acre Field, Radley.	50
200	Land adjacent to cut mill, Cuxham.	50
202	Cross Trees Farm, Sutton Courtenay.	50
205	Greenwoods of Garsington, Garsington.	50
207	Former Fullers Earth Quarry (W J Liddiard, Skyers Farm), Baulking.	51
208	Exxon Mobil At Milton Hill (E12), Milton Hill.	51
210	Steventon depot, Steventon.	51
211	Former camping ground, Didcot Power Station, Didcot.	51
212	Amey's Sutton Courtenay (E13), Sutton Courtenay.	51
213	Messers Gantlett (Multi Agg. Ltd.), Shellingford.	52
214	Manor Farm (KWC Amor of Kelmscott), Kelmscott.	52
215	Culham Laboratories (UKAEA), Clifton.	52

2.1 SITE 1: HICKMAN BROS. LANDSCAPES LTD, FULLBROOK.

There were 5 responses made on this site of which 1 supported the site and suggested amendments to the site details. The 4 objectors to the site were opposed on the following grounds:

- its remote location and its prominence within the AONB;
- it would have a substantial effect on the adjoining ancient woodland; and
- no overriding need for this facility in this environmentally sensitive area.

2.2 SITE 2: PROSPECT FARM, CHILTON.

There were 4 responses made on the site 2 in support and 2 objecting to the proposal. Supporters for the site stated:

- Well located to the strategic road network (SRN), with direct access to the A34; and
- Impact upon the AONB can be mitigated through detailed landscape planting.
- Objectors to the site were concerned about:
 - Impact of any proposal upon the AONB; and
 - Proposal generating additional traffic on the SRN.

2.3 SITE 3: DIX PIT, STANTON HARCOURT.

There were 4 comments received, 1 supporting and 3 objecting to the site. Supporters for the site stated:

- Site is an existing waste facility, it would be all right in principal during life of landfill operations.

Objectors to the site were concerned about:

- Impact upon the countryside, perceived as AONB;
- Development must not adversely affect the landscape value, biodiversity or the future restoration prospect of this despoiled rural location; and
- There are some issues of traffic, close proximity to the neighbouring village, and nuisances of smell, flies and seagulls.

2.4 SITE 4: SLAPE HILL LANDFILL (JOHN SHEEHAN, OXFORD, LTD.), GLYMPTON.

There were 4 comments received on this site, 2 objecting to the inclusion of the site and 2 comments making amendments to the details of the report.

Grounds for objection included:

- The site is isolated with very poor road access. Lorry traffic approaching this site must pass through Woodstock where there will be an adverse impact on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. There are stretches of A 44 in Old Woodstock where the carriageway width is substantially less than the standard. At these sites the footways are too narrow for safety.

- Lorry traffic would have an adverse impact on the main entrance to the World Heritage Site at Blenheim Palace.

2.5 SITE 5: PLAYHATCH QUARRY, PLAYHATCH.

There were 3 comments received, 1 of which amended details in the report and the other 2 raised the following objections to the proposal:

- The site is adjacent to an AONB and also affects an ancient woodland; and
- Expansion of this site would result in increased traffic, noise and pollution.

2.6 SITE 6: CHILDREY QUARRY (MR. DAVID LEWIS), CHILDREY.

There was 1 objection made to this site on the grounds that the site is in close proximity to an AONB.

2.7 SITE 7: GREENHILL FARM QUARRY (MR. DAVID HACKETT), BLETCHINGDON.

There were 10 responses received on this site, 3 of which made amendments to the details in the report. 1 supporting comment stated that the site might be suitable for temporary not permanent facilities to complete the restoration of the landfill site. Objections to the site were on grounds of:

- This disused quarry lies in a relatively isolated location in the Green Belt;
- Potential SRN impact (A34);
- Close proximity to an SSSI / SAC. (Info from the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan, 2011);
- The site is registered as a Regionally Important Geological or Geomorphological Sites (RIGS). Therefore it has been designated as RIGS under the national RIGS scheme for its important scientific, educational, historical or aesthetic value;
- The quarry has caused a great deal of concern for residents at Enslow, and the Bletchington Parish Council, since permission was first granted for the import of inert materials in June 2002. The planning conditions to limit traffic movements have not been adhered to and there is a poor history of site management.

2.8 SITE 8: MC. KENNA PLANT HIRE (OXFORD LTD.) NEW WINTLES FARM, EYNSHAM.

There were 2 representations received supporting the site:

- As it has very good road access; and
- It is currently in waste use as it is being used for refilling an old sand and gravel quarry and for recycling concrete waste.

2.9 *SITE 9: WORTON RECTORY FARM, YARNTON.*

There were 7 responses received on this site, 4 of which asked for amendments to the site information. Other comments were:

- It is existing sand and gravel site where the management of inert waste associated with site restoration could be appropriate;
- There may also be potential for more temporary facilities associated with existing minerals and waste operations;
- The Parish Council want to see any plans prior to the approval; and
- Need to consider the potential impact of the site on the Oxford Canal.

2.10 *SITE 10: SUTTON COURTENAY LANDFILL SITE (WASTE RECYCLING GROUP), SUTTON COURTENAY.*

There was one response made on this site stating that this site has a potential impact on the strategic road network (SRN) the A34.

2.11 *SITE 11: FINMERE QUARRY (PREMIER AGGREGATES LTD.)*

There were 3 responses received, all supporting the site and citing the following:

- The site benefits from good existing access directly off and onto the A421 and thereafter the Motorway network.
- The site has potential for additional waste management facilities. The land has been assessed as comprising sub grades 3a, 3b and 4 with only a few scattered profiles of Grade 2; and
- The site could serve settlements within a 25 mile radius of the site;

2.12 *SITE 12: GOSFORD GRAIN SILOS (RPS PLANNING), KIDLINGTON.*

There were 10 responses received on this site, 2 supporting the site, 2 objecting and the remainder were general comments about the site. Grounds for objecting to the site were as follows:

- The site forms part of the designated Otmoor Area of High Landscape Value, and this should be a material consideration; and
- The site is in a particularly vulnerable area of the Green Belt in terms of the coalescence of settlements (the Kidlington gap).

Grounds for supporting the proposal were as follows:

- Small scale in-vessel composting might be suitable on this site.

General comments on the suitability of this site:

- The access to rail is material for the existing use of the adjoining area as a rail-head for mineral workings;
- If the site was to be used as a waste collection point this would allow for waste to be collected from parts of the County by rail (unlikely) or to be distributed after processing to a rail-based destination. This might be

appropriate for paper collection and distribution to rail served paper-mills in Kent (for instance), but as the by-products of incineration (fly ash and bottom ash) would need to be transported to landfill sites which are unlikely to be rail served, its access to railway sidings is of little actual use; and

- If the site were to be serviced from satellite collection points across the County, the type of lorry will be particularly heavy, and long. This would be a particularly undesirable consequence of such a development.

2.13 *SITE 13: EWELME MRF AND TRANSFER STATION, EWELME.*

There were 3 responses to this site, one objecting to the proposal on grounds that the site lies in close proximity to an AONB and is affected by it.

Comments received on the site were as follows:

- The site also has some outstanding planning applications for its redevelopment but no decision has been reached yet. The applications are :
- P04/W1164/CM - Construction of replacement waste transfer station, formation of access and associated landscaping
- P04/W1169 – Redevelopment of depot involving construction of workshops and offices, formation of car parking areas and access road and associated landscaping.

2.14 *SITE 14: ASHGROVE FARM (AGRIVERT), ARDLEY.*

There were 4 responses made on this site which can be summarised as follows:

- The site is in the vicinity of Ardley Cutting and Quarry Hill SSSI; and
- Site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.15 *SITE 15: SHOWELL FARM (AGRIVERT),*

There was 1 response objecting to the site as it is in an inappropriate place, in a remote location with very poor road access.

2.16 *SITE 17: CROWMARSH BATTLE FARM (AGRIVERT), WALLINGFORD*

There was 1 response received suggesting amendments to the site details.

2.17 *SITE 18: HOLLOWAY FARM (JOHN SHEEHAN, OXFORD LTD.), WATERSTOCK.*

There were 3 responses received, 1 in support of the site as it appears to have good access, and two comments about the potential SRN impact (M40) and need for amendments to the site data.

2.18 *SITE 19: BICESTER SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS (THAMES WATER), BICESTER.*

There were 4 responses received on this site, 3 of which support the inclusion of this site on grounds of:

- Its potentially a good site for waste uses;
- Proximity to local transport networks; and
- The site's visual screening.

The other response noted the impact of any development on the SRN.

2.19 *SITE 20: WICKLESHAM QUARRY (GRUNDON WASTE MANAGEMENT LTD.), SANDSHILL.*

Two responses were received which stated:

- The site already has as an existing waste transfer permission and benefits from good access and the local level of quarry floor allows easy screening; and
- The site location map needs to be redrawn more accurately.

2.20 *SITE 21: GREEN SANDS (MR. WELLS, FARNTECH LTD.), EAST HENDRED.*

There were 3 responses received, 2 of which objected to the inclusion of the site owing to its proximity to the AONB and the other response stated the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.21 *SITE 22: ARDLEY QUARRY AND LANDFILL SITE, ARDLEY.*

There were 4 responses received and the following points were made:

- The site is close to or in the vicinity of the Ardley Cutting and Quarry Hill SSSI;
- The site has a potential SRN impact (M40).
- The site is registered as Regionally Important Geological or Geomorphological Sites (RIGS). The protection of dinosaur footprints, the identification and protection of any further prints and the potential for the site to be designated as an SSSI need to be resolved before the future of the site can be determined;
- The site is an active quarry undergoing progressive extraction and landfill working southwards. It also functions as a civic amenity site. The adjoining extension to the quarry called the Middleton Stoney Quarry, is unsuitable for waste management facilities.

2.22 *SITE 23: ALKERTON LANDFILL AND CIVIC AMENITY SITE (SITA UK LTD.), BANBURY.*

There were 6 responses received on this site 2 of which support the inclusion of the site as follows:

- The facility can make a valuable contribution to the County's future waste management needs; and
- Any potential for temporary recovery/recycling operations associated with some existing minerals and waste operations, would be encouraged provided there is no significant increase in traffic movements.

The following general responses were made:

- Non-waste activities should not be supported in this isolated location. Complete restoration should be required. There should be no encouragement for a permanent waste management facility. After restoration this site is unlikely to remain a sustainable location for a civic amenity site;
- The present site is nearly full and the preferable area for waste related activity would be the extension immediately to the south of the indicated site. This area is even closer to the village and has a large frontage onto the principal approach road;
- The drop off facilities at Alkerton Landfill are inadequate and a different site should be selected for development rather than wasting money on it. If this site is to be persisted with, a much more improved screening would be desirable as recent planting has been ineffective;
- The site under extraction currently should not be used for domestic waste landfill, but inert waste instead which would be acceptable in restoring the land for agricultural use.

2.23

SITE 25: MR JOHN HEDGES AND THE DEAN AND CHAPTER OF CHRIST CHURCH, WROXTON.

There were 5 responses received on this site. One objected to the site being used as a landfill because it would delay restoration of the site and the access is not suitable. Any development would have an impact upon the SRN. The site is highly visible on a tourist route.

The following general responses were made about the site:

- The site is an active landfill and civic amenity site. Temporary recovery/recycling operations might be appropriate if ancillary to the main operations and there is no significant increase in traffic movements; and
- In the southeast corner of the site the surface lies about 6m below the road level and the surface of the field slopes gently away from this corner. The result of this is that the southern half of the site regularly floods, making the area of little use for productive agriculture. A scheme has been drawn up involving the use of 500,000m³ of fill, which would enable the site to be restored to its original level and thus eliminate the flooding problems. The responses indicate that the site would only be useful for inert material. There is a need for additional void space for inert material arising from site clearance works on development land around Banbury, which this site would fulfil.

2.24 *SITE 26: WHITEHALL QUARRY (SMITH & SONS, BLETCHINGDON LTD.), BURFORD.*

There were 2 responses received, one stated that this site is becoming an active quarry again with new vehicular access under construction. The second response was an objection to this site stating that other more suitable locations should be investigated before sites within or in close proximity to the AONB are considered.

2.25 *SITE 27: FORMER QUARRY OFF DOWNS ROAD (SMITH & SONS, BLETCHINGDON LTD.), STANDLAKE.*

There were 2 responses received on this site, both of which objected to the site on grounds that:

- There is a public right of way which runs through the site and it lies within close proximity to residential properties; and
- An increase in heavy traffic may not be appropriate, considering the current impact caused by the car racing circuit located nearby.

2.26 *SITE 28: GILL MILL QUARRY (SMITH & SONS, BLETCHINGDON LTD.), DUCKLINGTON.*

There were 3 responses received, one of which supported the use of the site if it plays an acceptable part of the overall restoration proposals for the area.

The two further responses objected to the use of the site in relation to its close proximity to Ducklington Mead SSSI. This site is also adjacent to a developing nature reserve at Rushy Common to the North West of the proposed access road. The area on both sides of this road has the potential to become an important 'lung' for the population of Witney if inappropriate development is avoided. The access at Coffs Road is inadequate and the A417 is the only accessible access road.

2.27 *SITE 29: LAND AT THE BOURNE, HOOK NORTON.*

There were 2 responses received on this site both objecting to the location for a waste management facility in this location:

- The site is located at the northern edge of the village adjacent to housing and playing courts; and
- Housing or open space are in principle considered to be the most likely appropriate uses of this land.

2.28 *SITE 30: SHIPTON ON CHERWELL QUARRY, SHIPTON ON CHERWELL.*

There were 5 responses received on this site. One objected to the inclusion of the site because of the unresolved issues on the site (no information regarding

the issues was given). Two responses stated that the site has been identified in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan. One response requested that they be included in specific consultation on the site if it were to be developed and the final response didn't object to the inclusion of the site for waste management purposes, but drew attention to the location of the site adjoining the Shipton on Cherwell SSSI and Whitehill, SSSI. It also lies within a County Wildlife Site.

2.29 *SITE 31: FORMER PRICES CANDLES SITE, BICESTER.*

There were 2 responses received on this site, one of which indicated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The second comment stated that the site is no longer available because it has been developed and is now occupied by a builder's merchants / DIY store.

2.30 *SITE 32: UNITS 31-37, MURDOCK ROAD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, BICESTER.*

There were 2 responses received, one of which objected to the inclusion of this site as the building is not obviously suitable for waste management uses, and one stating that planning permission has been granted for flats and shops at this disused laundry. Any development would have an impact upon the SRN.

2.31 *SITE 33: LAND EAST OF RAILWAY LINE AND NORTH OF WATERWORKS LANE, BANBURY.*

There were 3 responses received on this site one of which objected to its inclusion on grounds that the site is low lying with poor access and a telecommunications mast is located on the site. The other responses stated that the site is in close proximity to housing and employment areas and is small and unsuitable for waste management. Development of the site would have an impact upon the SRN.

2.32 *SITE 34: ENGINEERING WORK, MILL LANE, KIRTLINGTON.*

There were 6 responses made on this site which can be summarised as:

- The site has a potential SRN impact (M40);
- The site lies in close vicinity of Kirtlington Quarry SSSI; and
- The site is inappropriate for waste development even though it was included in the National Land Use Database (NLUD). Planning permission has been since granted for housing on this site.

2.33 *SITE 35: NEITHROP HOUSE*

There were 5 responses received on this proposal. One response objected to the site being included as it is an important Grade II Listed Building with permission for conversion to flats. Other comments didn't object to use of the site for waste management purposes, but provided planning history of the site.

2.34 *SITE 36: B LINE BUSINESS CENTRE LTD., ENSLOW.*

There were 4 responses received, 2 of these objected to the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- The site is in close proximity of Shipton on Cherwell and Whitehill SSSI;
- Planning permission has been granted for replacement offices and the site is generally considered to have a commercial future. The site is unsuitable for waste management as housing, canal and active wharf are close by.

Two further responses stated the need to consult local parishes and residents.

2.35 *SITE 37: WATERWORKS SITE, BANBURY.*

There were 5 responses received, 4 of these objected to or raised concerns about the inclusion of the site on the grounds of:

- The site being situated mostly in the flood zone next to the waterworks;
- The site is considered to be unsuitable for waste management use as it might have a potential impact on the Oxford Canal; and
- Access to this site by HGV's would be difficult.

Comment was also made that the site could have a potential impact upon the SRN.

2.36 *SITE 38: ALCAN LABORATORIES, BANBURY.*

There were 4 responses received on this site, 3 of which do not support its inclusion on the following grounds:

- The site lies in an indicative flood zone;
- The site includes some high quality buildings with well-fitted out laboratories. The frontage block is included on the Local List of Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest; and
- The site has been developed and is an important employment site, required for employment purposes, not waste management.

The fourth comment indicated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.37 SITE 39: BESSEMER CLOSE AND LAUNTON ROAD, BICESTER.

There were 3 responses received, one drew attention to the site having a potential SRN impact (M40). The other two raised specific objection to the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- The site is already allocated for mixed-use development including residential in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011; and
- Cherwell District Council (CDC) is seeking comprehensive redevelopment of this site to create housing and jobs (B1).

2.38 SITE 40: JUNCTION OF WARWICK ROAD AND FOUNDRY STREET.

There were 4 responses received which in summary state that the site has already been granted permission for residential use. It is understood that the developer intends to implement this but it is being held-up by highway issues.

2.39 SITE 41: CRIPLEY ROAD AND LAND AT NORTH END YARD, JERICHO.

There were 2 responses received, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34). The other comment objected to inclusion of the site because it is unsuitable as a waste management facility:

- It is within Flood Zone 3;
- Within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA); and,
- It is an extremely small area of land in the centre of Oxford.

2.40 SITE 42: FORMER JUNIOR SCHOOL SITE OFF PIONEER ROAD, FARINGDON.

One response received stated that the site is in close proximity of Wicklesham and Coxwell Pits SSSI.

2.41 SITE 43: COUNCIL DEPOT, CHALLOW ROAD, EAST CHALLOW.

There was 1 response received stating that the most critical impact of this site's development is likely to be on the Oxford Canal. This statement has been verified and the site is in proximity to the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal.

2.42 SITE 44: GROVE TECHNOLOGY PARK, GROVE.

There was 1 response received stating that the most critical impact of this site's development is likely to be on the Oxford Canal. This statement has been verified and the site is in proximity to the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal.

2.43 *SITE 45: MILTON PARK INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, DIDCOT.*

There were 2 responses received, the first response stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34) and secondly, the most critical impact of this site's development is likely to be on the Oxford Canal. This statement has been verified and the site is in proximity to the Wiltshire and Berkshire Canal.

2.44 *SITE 47: NORTH OF ABINGDON POLICE STATION*

One response was received for this site and stated the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.45 *SITE 48: DISUSED MILTON RESERVOIR AND PUMPING STATION, SUTTON COURTENAY.*

One response was received for this that stated the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.46 *SITE 49: HARWELL INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS CENTRE FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, HARWELL.*

There were 2 responses received, one of which drew attention to the site having a potential SRN impact (A34), the other objected to its inclusion as it is within or in close proximity to the AONB.

2.47 *SITE 50: THE WORKS AND BAKERS YARD, ARDINGTON.*

There was 1 response received objecting to inclusion of the site as more suitable locations should be investigated before sites within or in close proximity to the AONBs are selected for waste related activities.

2.48 *SITE 51: WHITE HORSE BUSINESS PARK, FARINGDON.*

There were 2 responses received on this site one of which stated details in the site assessment needed amending and that the site is located in close proximity of Shellingford Crossroads Quarry SSSI. The other response stated that this site would be unsuitable for heavy vehicles as it is serviced by a minor road.

2.49 *SITE 52: 3 TO 11 WEST WAY, BOTLEY.*

There was 1 response received that stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.50 *SITE 53: UKAEA HARWELL LABORATORY, DIDCOT.*

There were 2 responses received; one of these objected to the site, indicating that other more suitable locations should be investigated before sites within or in close proximity to AONB are selected for waste related activity. The second response stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34)

2.51 *SITE 54: FORMER SEWAGE WORKS, LONGCOT.*

There were 2 objections received to the inclusion of this site on grounds that it is:

- Small and in the close vicinity of the Fernham Meadows SSSI;
- Entrance to the site is from a country road (B4058) which would be unsuitable for large vehicles while the rail access is several fields away; and
- Access is via a footpath/bridle path and is adjacent to a housing area.

2.52 *SITE 55: DISUSED WATERWORKS, SUTTON COURTENAY.*

There was one response received stating that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.53 *SITE 56: DISUSED SEWAGE WORKS, ABINGDON.*

There was 1 response received objecting to inclusion of the sites on grounds that:

- Proximity to the Radley Church of England Primary School - almost all types of waste treatment facility encourage pests and vermin as well as causing malodour, air quality management issues and other pollution problems that would adversely affect the pupils and staff;
- Policy NE7 of the Vale of White Horse District Council Local Plan states that any development in the north vale corallian ridge will not be permitted without great steps to minimise the impact on the landscape; and
- The site is close to flood zone 3 and would not be suitable for most waste management activities.

2.54 *SITE 59: SCRAP YARD OFF SUTTON WICK LANE (ABINGDON CAR BREAKERS), DRAYTON.*

There was 1 response received stating the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.55 *SITE 62: THE DEPOT, ENSTONE ROAD, LITTLE TEW.*

There were 2 responses received, one which states that the site is in close proximity of the Little Tew Meadows SSSI. The other responses object to the inclusion of this site on the following grounds:

- It is an inappropriate remote location;
- It adjoins a conservation area; and
- Lies in close proximity to residential properties.

2.56 *SITE 63: AREAS OF BROWNFIELD LAND AT FORMER BRADWELL AIRFIELD, BRADWELL.*

There were 2 objections to the inclusion of the site on grounds that it:

- is located remotely on a sensitive plateau landscape with little brownfield land remaining; and
- affects ancient woodland, so any development could be visually intrusive. The area has not been managed for many years so it may be rich in ecology which could be destroyed.

2.57 *SITE 64: CHARLBURY QUARRY, CHARLBURY.*

There were 4 responses received on this site, 3 of which objected to the inclusion of the site on the grounds that:

- The site lies in an appropriate location for waste development - within an AONB and a designated SSSI - Ditchley Road Quarry SSSI. It is also registered as Regionally Important Geological or Geomorphological Sites (RIGS).
- There is no suitable vehicular access and the site lies in close proximity of residential properties; and
- Other more suitable locations should be investigated before sites within or in close proximity to the AONB are considered.

The remaining response sought to clarify the location of the site.

2.58 *SITE 65: FORMER AIRFIELD OFF B4449, STANTON HARCOURT.*

There were 3 objections to the inclusion of this site on grounds that:

- The site is in close proximity of the Stanton Harcourt SSSI.
- The site would be inappropriate for waste development as it is part of a village and adjoins a conservation area, an ancient monument and a Grade I building; and
- There is an inadequate surrounding road network with 'Steady's Lane' access being non-practical. Pertinent traffic problems within 7.5 ton limit roads are also mentioned.

2.59 *SITE 66: ALFRED GROVES SITE, MILTON UNDER WYCHWOOD.*

Two responses were received; one response confirmed that this site is fully developed for housing and employment use. The other responses stated that other more suitable locations should be investigated before sites within or in close proximity to the AONB is selected for waste related activities.

2.60 *SITE 67: COALYARD ADJACENT TO DISUSED RAILWAY, GREAT ROLLRIGHT.*

There were 2 objections received to the inclusion of this site on grounds that:

- This is an inappropriate site for waste related activity as it is remotely situated; and
- The site has a prominent location within AONB. More suitable locations should be investigated before sites within or in close proximity to the AONB is selected.

2.61 *SITE 68: BEGBROKE HILL FARM, YARNTON.*

There were 3 responses received objected to the inclusion of this site on grounds that:

- It is situated in the close vicinity of Rushy Meadows SSSI;
- It has a particularly poor vehicular access; and
- To the east there is a weight restriction on Sandy Lane on the bridge over the Oxford Canal into Kidlington. To the west Sandy Lane is a very windy route with a number of corners with poor visibility.

2.62 *SITE 69: OXFORD AIRPORT, KIDLINGTON.*

There were 2 responses received that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34) and that it lies in close vicinity of Rushy Meadows SSSI.

2.63 *SITE 70: THAMES WATER DEPOT, KIDLINTON.*

There were 6 responses received on this site, one of which objected to the inclusion of the site on grounds of:

- The site being located in the Green Belt; and
- In close proximity of Rushy Meadows SSSI and is currently used for a business office and site depot for Thames Water.

The further responses stated that the site provides essential infrastructure and expansion of waste uses would be supported in principle.

2.64 *SITE 72: CASTLE QUAY, BANBURY.*

There were 4 responses received on this site one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other responses stated they were unclear as to why the site has been included as it had already been developed.

2.65 *SITE 76: BEAUMONT CLOSE, BANBURY.*

There were 2 responses received, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other response indicated that there would be no objection to the development of sites located near existing facilities or in existing industrial areas and therefore away from residential areas.

2.66 *SITE 79: SOUTHAM ROAD NORTH, BANBURY.*

There were 2 responses received which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The responses indicate that that there would be no objection to the development of sites located near existing facilities or in existing industrial areas and therefore away from residential areas.

2.67 *SITE 80: SPITAL FARM, REMAINDER OF ALLOCATION (BANNT C7), BANBURY.*

There were 3 responses received, one of which objected to the inclusion of this site on grounds that:

- Banbury Sewage Treatment Works is an existing facility and there is no land available for other forms of waste treatment; and
- Spital Farm site has outline planning permission for business uses and would not be suitable for a waste treatment use.

The other responses indicated that there may be some potential for permanent waste management facilities in the nearby Thorpe Mead area of Banbury (site 80) and the Langford Lane area of Kidlington (site 181) which are primarily industrial and diverse in character. There are existing waste management activities in the wider area (waste transfer, waste recovery and sewage works) and potentially suitable land and buildings for waste related activities. If the site was developed there is a potential SRN impact(M40).

2.68 *SITE 81: EDWARD STREET BUSINESS CENTRE, BANBURY.*

There was 1 response received that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.69 *SITE 82: WILDMERE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, BANBURY.*

There were 3 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other responses raised objections to the inclusion of the site on grounds of the potential impact of the site on the Oxford Canal and the need for clearer plans to identify the site.

2.70 *SITE 85: LAND TO THE SOUTH OF OVERTHROPE ROAD AND WEST OF M40, BANBURY.*

There were 2 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other response raised objections to the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- Waste management would not be appropriate on this site as the site is beside the M40, allocated for B1/B2 employment purposes in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011; and
- The site is considered to be a gateway site, being very prominent from the motorway and close to the motorway junction. The northern part of the site has already been granted permission for light industrial with ancillary storage and office use.

2.71 *SITE 89: BICESTER AIRFIELD, BICESTER.*

There were 7 responses received on this site, one of which indicated that it has a potential SRN impact (M40). The further responses objected to the inclusion of the site on the following grounds:

- It is contrary to policies in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011. This site is a conservation area and in heritage terms is important in the national context. Policy EN49a of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 provides the Council's policy position on this site;
- The airfield is a greenfield site and lies in close vicinity of Stratton Audley Quarries SSSI;
- The site has relatively poor access. It does not have a rail access; bearing a small gauge railway system, which was used to move bombs from secure storage compounds in the site to the airplanes. This is largely in disrepair.
- Traffic would be a major consideration if the site is to be considered for a waste management facility. With the M40 to the south of Bicester, it is completely inappropriate to build a waste management facility to the north of the town, as the extra traffic it will generate will only compound existing traffic congestion and rat running; and
- Bicester airfield provides the ideal opportunity to address the serious shortfall in the open space and recreation requirements of Bicester and the surrounding area as borne out in the Bicester Open Space and Playing Pitch Assessment.

2.72 *SITE 90: BANBURY BUSINESS PARK, PHASE 2, ADDERBURY.*

There were 2 responses received on this site. The first indicated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The latter response stated that the area would not be appropriate for waste management uses, as this is considered to be a prestigious employment location attracting high profile occupiers and high-tech firms.

2.73 *SITE 91: LANGFORD LOCKS, KIDLINGTON.*

There were 2 responses received made to the inclusion of this site. It has a potential SRN impact (A34). The other response stated that the area's sensitive higher grade commercial location makes it unlikely to be suitable for waste management uses. It is also within close proximity to Rushy Meadow SSSI.

2.74 *SITE 92: OXFORD SPIRES BUSINESS PARK, PHASE 3, KIDLINGTON.*

There were 4 responses received, one of which advises that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34) and is located in the close vicinity of Rushy Meadows SSSI. The other responses indicate that the site, located to the north of Langford Lane, is only suitable for higher grade offices/commercial uses rather than for waste management.

2.75 *SITE 94: BRYMO IRONWORKS, HOOK NORTON.*

There were 2 responses received. The site is a former ironstone works containing old industrial buildings, allocated for B1/B2 uses in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan. The responses suggested that small-scale local facilities and small workshop units for low traffic generating uses might be suitable for its development. They also indicate that it might be suitable for small-scale, local waste management appropriate to the rural location.

2.76 *SITE 95: OXFORD INDUSTRIAL PARK, YARNTON.*

There were 4 responses received on this site. The site has a potential SRN impact (A34) and is close to the Oxford Meadows SAC. The site's high grade, recently developed, commercial premises are not suited for waste management. The respondents are concerned with the potential impact of the site on the Oxford Canal.

2.77 *SITE 97: OXFORD BUSINESS PARK (DS57), COWLEY.*

There were 2 responses received on this site. The site has a potential SRN impact (A34). The other response objected to the consideration of this site on grounds that:

- The site is not considered appropriate as a waste management facility, because it is predominantly BI with B2 or B8 uses as acceptable alternatives; and
- A waste management site is not considered as an 'appropriate ancillary use' for this prime employment land. There is only a very limited amount of employment land available for development, given that there is only 5.35 hectares (out of a total 34.5 hectares) currently undeveloped at this time, and this site will be at capacity by 2010-2011.

2.78 *SITE 98: WOLVERCOTE PAPER MILL (DS90), WOLVERCOTE.*

There were 3 responses received on this site making the points that it has a potential SRN impact (A34), adjoins the Oxford Meadows SAC and is being redeveloped for housing by the University of Oxford.

2.79 *SITE 99: WEST OF DOWNS ROAD (POLICY E1 & PROPOSAL 9), WITNEY.*

One response was received objecting to this site on grounds that it is an inappropriate site within close proximity to residential properties.

2.80 *SITE 100: EAST OF DOWNS ROAD (POLICY E1 AND PROPOSAL 9), WITNEY.*

One objection was received to this site stating that it would be an inappropriate site as it is within close proximity to residential properties. Virtually all of the allocated land has planning consent now for employment development.

2.81 *SITE 102: CHIPPING NORTON DEPOT SITE (POLICY E1), CHIPPING NORTON.*

One response was received stating the site is not suitable as the site is within or in close proximity to AONB and could affect it.

2.82 *SITE 103: LAKESIDE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE (POLICY E1), STANDLAKE.*

One response received, objecting to the site, indicated that it is not suitable in terms of access and traffic issues.

2.83 *SITE 104: LAND AT SOUTHMEAD BUSINESS PARK, SITE 1 (DID9), DIDCOT.*

One response was received that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.84 *SITE 107: LAND AT THE SOUTHERN END OF TRAMWAY ROAD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, HENLEY ON THAMES.*

There were 3 responses received on this site indicating that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The District Council has a clear policy position regarding this site. ie. that it is part of the Regeneration Area (identified in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011) that requires comprehensive mixed use redevelopment, including residential. Waste facilities would therefore not be supported.

2.85 *SITE 108: LAND NEAR JUNCTION 11 OF M40 (SITE REF. BA90), BANBURY.*

One response was received that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.86 *SITE 109: LAND EAST OF M40 (SITE REF. BA91), BANBURY.*

One response was received that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.87 *SITE 110: REGENERATION AREA (EAST & WEST OF RAILWAY LINE), BANBURY.*

There were 3 responses received on this site. The site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The location of the site is to the east of the railway line on the former cattle market (part of the regeneration area-east). Currently under construction, the land identified is to be used for housing, sports and recreation facilities hence ruling out the potential for waste management.

2.88 *SITE 111: LAND SOUTH OF MILTON ROAD/NORTH OF MILTON ROAD, BLOXHAM.*

Two responses objected to the inclusion of this site on grounds that:

- This site is very close to residential property and public footpaths, regularly used by local residents and dog owners. This site offers managed office accommodation to small businesses and is a source of local employment; and
- The site is identified for housing and light industrial purposes, although this area is presently open greenfield land prominent from the eastern approach to the village hence waste management would be incongruous in this location.

2.89 *SITE 112: LAND NORTH OF MILTON ROAD (SITE REF : BL16), BLOXHAM.*

There were four responses to this site all objecting to its inclusion. They variously referred to the following:

- The land is allocated for housing in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011;
- The site is very close to residential property and a public footpath that runs along its western boundary. The footpath is regularly used by dog owners and local residents; and
- Others plots have been developed, or are expected to be developed imminently for non-waste uses (e.g. part of the site north of Milton Road, Bloxham (site 112). The District Council has resolved to 'grant planning permission for housing on the allocated site and is not aware that the telephone exchange is available for redevelopment. The small adjoining area of greenfield land has been suggested for consideration in the Banbury and North Cherwell Site Allocations Development Plan Document for light industrial or residential use. However, it is considered to be unsuitable for waste management in view of its small size (0.14 hectares) and its location between two areas of housing (existing housing to the west and expected new housing to the east).

2.90 *SITE 113: SUTTON WICK LANDFILL, SUTTON WICK.*

One response was received advising that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34)

2.91 *SITE 114: APPLEFORD SIDING, SUTTON COURTENAY.*

Three responses were received on this site. One of the responses stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34). The two further comments supported use of the site which could be incorporated into a major resource recovery park(s)/ business eco parks to serve central and southern Oxfordshire. Oxfordshire's proportion of waste could be transported from London via rail transport and if appropriate waste by rail from Banbury and Bicester could also be taken.

2.92 *SITE 116: WORSHAM QUARRY, ASTHALL.*

There were 5 responses received on this site. One of the responses objected to the inclusion of the site as it lies close proximity to the Cotswolds AONB. The other responses stated that Worsham Quarry is registered as Regionally Important Geological or Geomorphological Sites (RIGS). Therefore it has been designated as RIGS under the national RIGS scheme for its important scientific, educational, historical or aesthetic value. It is also in the vicinity of Worsham Lane SSSI

It has been pointed out that the site has planning permission for recycling and the use of inert wastes for quarry restoration. Also that the landfill has a Pollution Prevention Control Permit and that recycling is operated under a Recovery Waste Management Licence. The site appears to produce up to

50,000 tonnes of recycled aggregates for supply to the construction industry each year.

2.93 *SITE 118: TUBNEY WOOD (HILLS, MINERALS & WASTE LTD.), BESSELSLEIGH.*

There were 4 responses received on this site. They variously point out that the site is registered as Regionally Important Geological or Geomorphological Sites (RIGS), contains ancient semi-natural woodland and is located in close vicinity of Cothill Fen SAC.

2.94 *SITE 119: ELM FARM QUARRY (STRATTON AUDLEY QUARRIES LTD.), BICESTER.*

There were 5 responses received on the site. They variously point out that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40) and adjoins Stratton Audley Quarries SSSI. Responses indicate there might be scope for some temporary facilities in the appropriately restored areas of the quarry, provided that this is compatible with the protection of the Sites of Special Scientific Interest. They also indicate that there is a history of unauthorised tipping at this site

2.95 *SITE 121: OLD BRICKWORKS FARM (R. MILLER), BLETCHINGDON.*

Four comments were made on this site. They variously point out that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34). It is indicated that although this site is in an isolated location, in principle it might be suitable for small-scale and local waste management activities.

2.96 *SITE 122: HORNTON GROUNDS QUARRY, HORNTON.*

There were 3 responses made on this site. They variously point out that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). One objection is made to the inclusion of this site on the following grounds:

- It is an isolated site and restoration should be quickly completed.

One response supported the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- Although it might cause a little distress to the occupiers of Hornton Grounds Farm, otherwise it is considered an ideal landfill site as it is hidden from view, has a recently made-up access road, good facilities and plenty of off road queuing/parking area. The response also suggest that it would be preferred if this site be used for landfill and followed on immediately from site 23 (Alkerton landfill and civic amenity site) and before site 23's next phase.

2.97 *SITE 123: OLD SEWAGE WORKS (LAND NETWORK), CLIFTON HAMPDEN.*

There were 3 responses received on this site, one of which advised that the site has potential to impact upon the SRN. The responses otherwise made objection to the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- There is poor access via A415 - HGV volumes through the local communities are currently too great;
- The site is too close to a residential area - Clifton Hampden is expected to enlarge on the western fringes - and the site could have potential effects to this through windblown detritus/ odour; and
- There is a risk of flooding and contamination of ground water from this site.
- There is a possible impact on the Green Belt

2.98 *SITE 126: VARNEY'S GARAGE (R PANNOZZO & P. GROSSI), HORNTON.*

There were 2 responses received on this site, one of which points out that the existing car repair/ scrap yard operations have an outline planning permission for redevelopment for housing. If the redevelopment for housing does not occur the respondents consider that there should not be any expansion of the existing activities in this isolated location.

2.99 *SITE 127: BANBURY MOTOR SPARES (BANBURY MOTOR SPARES LTD.), BANBURY.*

There were 2 responses received on this site. The site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The land at Thorpe Mead is primarily industrial and diverse in character. The second response stated that this site was unsuitable for development for waste facilities on the grounds that there are existing waste management activities in the wider area (waste transfer, waste recovery and sewage works) and potentially suitable land and buildings for waste related development.

2.100 *SITE 128: BERINSFIELD BREAKERS (E. NEIGHBOURHOOD), DORCHESTER ON THAMES.*

There was 1 response received suggesting that the site is within the Green Belt.

2.101 *SITE 129: MILTON POOLS, LONDON ROAD, MILTON COMMON, THAME.*

There was 1 response received which supported inclusion of the site provided that it is not enlarged and that vehicle movements are not increased.

2.102 *SITE 132: ALUMINI HOLDINGS LTD, 47-49 WHITECROSS, WOOTTON, ABINGDON.*

One response was received objecting to the inclusion of this site on the grounds that the area is residential in nature and that it has poor transport links. The B4017 already suffers from traffic problems therefore any expansion or change of use would be inappropriate for this site.

2.103 *SITE 133: PETER, PAULINE & THOMAS SMITH, BLOXHAM.*

There were 2 responses received on this site both of which object to the expansion of the site on grounds that:

- It is close to a traveller's caravan site; and
- The site is in close proximity to the sites BL3 and BL3B which have been proposed for residential development for a total of over 140 dwellings. Undue expansion of the site and waste activities are likely to be inappropriate in this detached rural location.

2.104 *SITE 134: WALTER BREAKSPEAR & SON (W & R BREAKSPEAR), CHARLTON.*

One response was received objecting to the site on grounds that it lies within or in close proximity to an AONB; also that the site has a potential SRN impact.

2.105 *SITE 135: HAYNES OF CHALLOW LTD, EAST CHALLOW.*

One response was received stating the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.106 *SITE 136: MC. GREGOR RAILWAY SERVICES, BICESTER.*

There were 3 responses received on this site one of which pointed out that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The further responses stated that there is an existing architectural and railway salvage operation on this land. The District Council is seeking redevelopment of this land as part of wider proposals in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 for comprehensive mixed use. The former railways sidings have recently been sold by the British Residuary Body and only continuation of existing activities would be appropriate in advance of comprehensive redevelopment.

2.107 *SITE 137: L C HUGHES (DUCIE HUGHES), BICESTER.*

There were 3 responses received on this site. They point out that this is an active scrap yard having a potential SRN impact (M40); also that development

should be limited to the continuation or upgrading of waste management facilities because of the site's relatively isolated rural location.

2.108 *SITE 138: MAINS MOTORS LTD. (MAINS MOTORS), EWELME.*

There were 4 responses received which object to the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- The site is located particularly close (around 500 m) to ancient woodland, Mogpits Wood; and
- The site is close to the AONB.

2.109 *SITE 139: UNITS 2A & 4 STURT FARM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, BURFORD.*

One response was received objecting to the inclusion of the site as it lies within or in close proximity to an AONB and could potentially affect it.

2.110 *SITE 142: SANDFIELDS FARM (K J MILLARD LTD.), OVER NORTON.*

There were 2 responses received which advise that the site lies within or in close proximity to a AONB and could potentially affect it.

2.111 *SITE 143: BANBURY TRANSFER STATION (GRUNDON), BANBURY.*

There were 3 responses received on this site. They variously point out that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The responses suggest that Grundons have purchased this Waste Transfer Station with a view to expand its uses as a Materials Recycling Facility presently located on land immediately east of the railway line and there is unlikely to be land potential for further activities beyond this.

2.112 *SITE 144: HILL FARM, WOOD RECY. FACILITY (J JAMES LTD.), DIDCOT.*

Four responses were received on this site one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34). The three further responses supported inclusion of the site on the following grounds:

- The site enjoys good road access from the existing A4130 and may have the potential to be allied to the national rail network, thus negating the reliance upon the local road network and supporting the notion of sustainable transport methods set out in annex E of PPS10;
- The site and its surrounding environment is ideally suited for waste management purposes as its location would not cause detriment to any national or local landscape/environmental designations, and there would also be no potential land use conflict;
- This site could be incorporated into a major resource recovery park(s)/ business eco parks to serve central southern Oxfordshire. Oxfordshire's proportion of waste could be transported from London via rail transport

and if appropriate waste by rail from Banbury and Bicester could also be manageable. The importance of local facilities for receiving waste to minimise road transport is recognised and hence the inclusion of the site is encouraged.

2.113 *SITE 145: FERRIS HILL FARM, HOOK NORTON.*

There was 1 response received which states that the site has permission for waste recycling activities with a skip hire business and the sale of hardcore material. The response suggests that further waste management activities on the site would not be appropriate.

2.114 *SITE 146: OXFORD SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS (THAMES WASTE MANAGEMENT), SANDFORD.*

Three representations were received on this site, pointing out that the site is an active sewage treatment facility that is within the Green Belt. The two further responses object to the development of a waste facility on grounds that: The site and the surrounding land is being promoted through the South East Plan for a mixed-use urban extension to Oxford City, and include for the relocation of the treatment site hence it is inappropriate to designate the current site as a future waste facility.

2.115 *SITE 150: HORSPATH ROAD DEPOT (S. GRUNDON, WASTE LTD.) OXFORD.*

There were 3 responses made to this site. One response pointed out that the site lies in close proximity of the Brasenose Wood and Shotover Hill SSSI and the two further responses indicated that it is not appropriate for a waste management facility as it is currently in use by Oxford City Council and is likely to remain that way for the duration of the Waste and Minerals Plan.

2.116 *SITE 151: DRAYTON DEPOT TRANSFER STATION (OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL), DRAYTON.*

One response was received stating that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.117 *SITE 152: EWELME NO. 1 (S. GRUNDON, WASTE LTD.), EWELME.*

There were 3 responses received on this site, they are as follows:

- The site is an active hazardous waste transfer and treatment site & depot for waste activities;
- The site is subject to an undetermined application for re-development for waste purposes; and

- The site lies within or in close proximity to an AONB and could potentially affect it.

2.118 ***SITE 153: MERTON STREET DEPOT (S GRUNDON (WASTE) LTD.), BANBURY.***

There were 4 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

Other respondents suggest that an application was made to convert the facility into a MRF but that was rejected solely on building design. It is pointed out that the existing Grundon's site (further south) is to be redeveloped for housing/ mixed use development in accordance with the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 and associated Supplementary Planning Guidance once Grundon's have relocated to the site adjoining site 143.

2.119 ***SITE 156: CITY INSULATION CONTRACTORS, COWLEY.***

There were 2 responses received objecting to the inclusion of this site on grounds that:

- It is a protected key employment zone and therefore unsuitable for waste management facilities; and
- The development of the site as a waste facility could potentially affect an ancient woodland which lies in its vicinity.

2.120 ***SITE 158: DEAN PIT (WASTE RECYCLING GROUP), CHADLINGTON.***

There were 3 responses received, all objecting to the inclusion of the site on grounds of:

- Close proximity to an AONB; and
- Close proximity to ancient woodland.

2.121 ***SITE 159: DRAYTON WRRC (G THOMPSON & J RICKETT), DRAYTON.***

There was one response for this site that stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.122 ***SITE 160: FARINGDON (G THOMPSON & J RICKETT), STANFORD IN THE VALE.***

There were 3 responses objecting to the site on grounds of:
Potential impact on neighbouring land uses including a nature reserve containing Shellingford Crossroads SSSI – an important area for geological interest based on a fossilised coral reef.

2.123 *SITE 161: REDBRIDGE WASTE CENTRE (WYVERN WASTE SERVICES LTD.), OXFORD.*

There were 3 responses received. They variously pointed out that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34) and that it lies in the vicinity of Iffley Meadows SSSI. One response indicated that the site would be inappropriate as a waste management facility as it is already a popular, successful recycling centre, within flood zone 2 and 3, but with little room for expansion. The West End Area Action Plan (AAP) has also earmarked an area adjacent to this site for use as an out-of-city vehicle park for tourist coaches, which could prevent any expansion.

2.124 *SITE 163: COWLEY MARSH DEPOT (OXFORD CITY COUNCIL), COWLEY.*

There were 2 responses received regarding this site. They objected to the use of this site for waste management as it is currently in use by Oxford City Council and is likely to remain that way for the duration of the Waste and Minerals Plan. Access could also be an issue as the site; while off the arterial Cowley Road, this is through a densely populated along a narrow car-lined street. Any waste management facility would have a negative impact upon residential amenity.

2.125 *SITE 168: MANOR FARM (JB STEVENS & SON), TYWFORD.*

There were 2 responses received one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other response indicated that electricity is generated on this site from farm products (waste straw) and from imported wood residues from a saw mill. The response was supportive of waste to energy schemes but would wish to ensure that in this isolated location the activities continue to relate to existing agricultural operations.

2.126 *SITE 169: SYDENHAM GRANGE FARM, SYDENHAM.*

There were two responses received for this site, one indicated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The second response indicated that the location ring required amendment.

2.127 *SITE 170: OLD CHALK PIT, CHINNOR.*

There were 5 responses received on this site. One indicated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other four responses objected to the inclusion of this site for waste management on the following grounds:

- The site has a SSSI designation and contributes significantly to the surrounding landscape;
- The site adjoins the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC; and

- The Chinnor Cement Works site is allocated in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 policy RUR1 1 for a mixed use redevelopment (housing with employment and or commercial & leisure) including a comprehensive scheme to maintain the chalk pits in a way which recognises their amenity, geological and ecological value and their potential for quiet countryside recreation. Subsequently the District Council adopted a Chinnor Cement Works Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Guidance in 2004.

2.128 ***SITE 171: AKZO, ABINGDON.***

There was one response received for this site that indicated the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.129 ***SITE 172: DOOP SERVICES, WATLINGTON.***

There were 3 responses received on this site, one stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The other two responses objected to the site for waste management development on the grounds of:

- The site lies within close proximity of an AONB and could potentially affected it;
- The site could impact upon the Oxford Canal; and
- The site has been allocated in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011: Policy RUR1 5 for B1 use.

2.130 ***SITE 173: CHARLETT TYRES (DOUGHLAS L CHARLETT, TYRES LTD.), YARNTON.***

There were 4 responses received on this site. They do not consider it suitable for waste management and make the following points:

- The site lies in close proximity to the Oxford Meadows SAC;
- The site is located within the built-up limits of the village, is adjacent (in three directions) to the Green Belt and is visually prominent; and
- It is understood that in the longer term the site may have potential for low density housing in what is presently considered to be one of the district's most sustainable villages.
- From work undertaken recently it is understood that the owner wishes to continue its use a Tyre Depot.

2.131 ***SITE 175: FIELD FARM, THAME.***

There were 2 responses made on this site, one stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). The second response indicated support for development of the site provided that it is not enlarged and that the vehicle movements are not increased.

2.132 *SITE 178: BOWLING GREEN FARM, FARINGDON.*

There were 2 responses made on this site, one of which stated that the site could affect the nearby ancient woodland and further response indicated that some of the plan details needed to be changed.

2.133 *SITE 180: ELMWOOD FARM, BLACK BOURTON.*

There was one response received in relation to this site is in close vicinity of Alvescot Meadows SSSI.

2.134 *SITE 181: LANGFORD LANE, KIDLINGTON.*

There were 4 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34). One response objected to the inclusion of the site for waste management development on the grounds that it lies in the close proximity of Rushy Meadows SSSI. Two further comments supported the inclusion of the former dairy site stating that it is being redeveloped for car sales and offices, or general industrial uses. There may be some potential for waste management opportunities, but the units are relatively small.

2.135 *SITE 182: PHILLIPS TYRES, NOTHERN BYPASS, OXFORD.*

There were 2 responses received for this site. Philips Tyres on the Northern Bypass is the subject of enforcement action by the local authority and the second response indicated that some of the site details need changing.

2.136 *SITE 184: R HAZELL RECYCLING WASTE, EWELME.*

There were 2 responses received for this site stating that it lies in close proximity of the AONB and it could potentially affect it and that some of the site details need changing.

2.137 *SITE 185: RMC MATERIALS, DUTTON WICK LEACHATE TREATMENT PLANT, ABINGDON.*

There was one response received for this site that stated that it has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.138 *SITE 186: METAL SALVAGE LTD, OXFORD.*

There were 2 responses received for this site both objecting to the inclusion of the site on grounds that the site:

- Lies in close proximity of the Iffley Meadows SSSI; and

- The site is unsuitable for use as a waste management facility as it is an identified Development Site in the current Oxford Local Plan for residential or purpose built student accommodation. It is also on low-lying land, in Flood Zone 3 and adjacent to a conservation area; and
- Access is via a narrow lane from the Iffley Road that would not be appropriate for a WMF that would require regular access.

2.139 ***SITE 187: COLLEGE MOTORS/SIMON BALLARD, STURT FARM, BURFORD.***

There was one response received that indicated the site lies in close proximity to an AONB and could potentially affect it.

2.140 ***SITE 188: WATERLAND FARM (CLAYDON - FOLLY KEVIN), CHINNOR ROAD, THAME.***

There was one response received that indicated that some of the site details need to be amended.

2.141 ***SITE 189: STATION YARD (WILSON MARTIN GERAD), SHRIVENHAM.***

There were 3 responses received on this site, all objecting to the site and the following grounds were raised:

- The site is too small for a meaningful waste management facility;
- It has poor rail and extremely poor road access;
- The site is located next to a steep, narrow railway bridge and on local country roads via small villages. The road network is unsuitable and would seriously undermine the benefits of constructing the Shrivenham bypass with heavy traffic coming through Shrivenham from the A420 in order to access the site (or worse still via Bournton or Ashbury). In addition the site is on the very edge of Oxfordshire and will encourage unnecessary travel and create its own carbon footprint;
- It is also uncertain whether British Rail would wish to encourage such a use so close to the main line apart from the problems on bridge access. The area is low lying and often floods. The site is surrounded by good quality agricultural land. The site is too close to dense housing in Shrivenham, and a high quality restaurant (The Fat Dog) with outside seating. It is also within half a mile of the Bournton village conservation area which is just 2/3 miles from the AONB and would be clearly visible from the ancient Ridgeway and White Horse Hill.

2.142 ***SITE 190: POPHLEYS FARM, CROWELL.***

There were 2 responses received objecting to the inclusion of the site on grounds of location within the AONB.

2.143 *SITE 191: BABLAKES FARM, LETCOMBE REGIS.*

There was one response received and it objected to the inclusion of the site on grounds of location within the AONB.

2.144 *SITE 192: WATERSTOCK GOLF COURSE, WATERSTOCK.*

There were 4 responses received for this site. Two of the responses objected to the inclusion of the site on grounds that:

- The site should not be included because of the public footpath crossing the site.
- The existing material dumped on the site is also a matter of concern.

The two further responses indicated that the site has potential to impact upon the SRN and some of the site details need to be amended.

2.145 *SITE 198: EIGHT ACRE FIELD, RADLEY.*

There were 2 responses received for this site that indicated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34) and some of the site details and location marker need to be amended.

2.146 *SITE 200: LAND ADJACENT TO CUT MILL, CUXHAM.*

There were 2 responses received for this site, one stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40) and the further response indicated that some of the site details need to be amended.

2.147 *SITE 202: CROSS TREES FARM, SUTTON COURTENAY.*

There was one response received for this site that stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.148 *SITE 205: GREENWOODS OF GARSINGTON, GARSINGTON.*

There were 3 responses received for this site, two of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40) and lies within the Green Belt. The third response objected to inclusion of the site indicating that until recently there was a lot of illegally dumped waste on the site, which has now been forcefully removed.

2.149 *SITE 207: FORMER FULLERS EARTH QUARRY (W J LIDDIARD, SKYERS FARM), BAULKING.*

One response was received stating this former quarry has been landscaped with a significant investment in tree planting. It is also reported that the flooded quarry is developing significant wildlife interest, especially of wintering and breeding waterfowl. The wildlife value of the site must not be compromised by inappropriate development close to the site. A particular consideration in this isolated site must be to minimise noise and light pollution.

2.150 *SITE 208: EXXON MOBIL SITE AT MILTON HILL (E12), MILTON HILL.*

There was one response received for this site that stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40).

2.151 *SITE 210: STEVENTON DEPOT, STEVENTON.*

There was one response received for this site that stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

2.152 *SITE 211: FORMER CAMPING GROUND, DIDCOT POWER STATION, DIDCOT.*

There were 2 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34). The further response indicated that the site proposed is the Sutton Courtenay Environmental Centre operated by BBOWT. Recycling and renewable energy are topics covered in the centre's educational role, turning it into a waste management facility seems a little extreme.

2.153 *SITE 212: AMEY'S SITE SUTTON COURTENAY (E13), SUTTON COURTENAY.*

There were 3 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (A34).

A more general comment was made against this site that a resource recovery park could be created between the Didcot power Station's north boundary and the Appleford to Sutton Courtenay Road. The site limits on the west would include the Amey's site 212 and on the east by the Oxford to Didcot railway line. These boundaries could extend to existing gravel pits to the north of the Appleford to Sutton Courtenay road if it is compatible for existing or future gravel pits to be filled with inert material and does not increase the flood risk to property elsewhere. This also applies to gravel pits that may be worked and landfilled between Appleford and Long Wittenham, if permitted. This comment would also encompass sites 10 (Sutton Courtenay Landfill site)

and 14 (Ashgrove Farm). Oxfordshire's proportion of waste could be transported from London via rail transport and if appropriate waste by rail from Banbury and Bicester.

The third response indicated a major disadvantage of the site as there are inadequate road connections to Abingdon and south Oxford. This could be resolved by the provision of a new alternative A class road network between Didcot, Abingdon and Oxford that would pass through the centre of the waste site and relieve much pressure from surrounding major and minor roads.

2.154 *SITE 213: MESSERS GANTLETT (MULTI AGG. LTD.), SHELLINGFORD.*

There were 2 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site is in close proximity of the Shellingford Crossroads Quarry SSSI whilst the second comment indicated that the site was in close proximity to Shellingford village containing approximately 60 dwellings..

2.155 *SITE 214: MANOR FARM (KWC AMOR OF KELMSCOTT), KELMSCOTT.*

There was one response received for this site objecting to the development of this site on grounds of:

- Planning history;
- Poor local transport routes; and
- Potential for flooding.

2.156 *SITE 215: CULHAM LABORATORIES (UKAEA), CLIFTON.*

There were 3 responses received on this site, one of which stated that the site has a potential SRN impact (M40). Two response objected to the inclusion of the site on grounds of:

- Environmental impacts of the operations on this site and transit of materials. The road access via A415 is not practical as the HGV traffic on this road has reached heavy volumes through the local community;
- The proximity to local residential area i.e. Clifton Hampden is expected to enlarge on western fringes and the possible effects of windblown detritus (SW wind) and odour might add to a loss of amenity; and
- The site is also at a risk of flooding and there might be possible contamination of groundwater from this site.