



**Oxfordshire Minerals & Waste
Development Framework**

**MINERALS AND WASTE
CORE STRATEGY**

PREFERRED OPTIONS

**Consultation Paper
February 2007**

Published for consultation in accordance with
Regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning
(Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



**OXFORDSHIRE
COUNTY COUNCIL**

ENVIRONMENT & ECONOMY

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk

Contents

Section	Title	Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Background and Context	5
3	Aims and Objectives of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework	8
4	Preferred Options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework	11
5	Issue 1 – Minerals and Waste Development Framework (Plan) Period	12
6	Issue 2 – Mineral Supply	14
	Issue 2a – Provision for Mineral Supply	14
	Issue 2b – Provision for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand	18
7	Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings	20
8	Issue 4 – Strategy for Location of Crushed Rock (Limestone and/or Ironstone) Workings	27
9	Issue 5 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	31
	Issue 5a – Provision for Supply of Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	31
	Issue 5b – Where Aggregate Recycling Facilities should be Located	34
10	Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots	38

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

11	Issue 7 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Areas or Sites for Mineral Working	40
12	Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings	43
13	Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impact of Mineral Working and Supply	46
14	Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals	49
15	Issue 11 – Waste Management Facilities	51
	Issue 11a – How the Plan makes Provision for Waste Management Facilities	52
	Issue 11b – Where Waste Management Facilities should be Located	57
16	Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy	62
17	Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management	65
18	Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities	69
19	Issue 15 - Landfill	72
20	Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management	76
Annex A	Provision Needed for Aggregates Supply	78
Annex B	Background to Waste Issues for Oxfordshire	80

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The County Council is reviewing the planning policies covering mineral 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.
- 1.2 The first policy document to be prepared is the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy development plan document. Last year the Council carried out consultation on issues and options for the Core Strategy (Minerals & Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper, June 2006).
- 1.3 The next stage in preparing the Core Strategy is this consultation paper on preferred options. The purpose of this consultation paper is to set out the Council's strategic aims and objectives for minerals and waste planning in Oxfordshire and what the Council at this stage sees as the preferred options for addressing the key issues that were identified in the earlier issues and options paper.
- 1.4 These preferred options are now published for public consultation. The County Council wants to get as wide a response as possible on these options before it puts together a full Core Strategy, including key policies and proposals, for submission to the Secretary of State and further consultation.
- 1.5 This document is published for consultation in accordance with Regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

How to respond to this consultation document

- 1.6 Please use the response form that accompanies this document. Further copies of the response form can be downloaded from the County Council website or obtained from the address below. Please send your response by post, fax or email to:

Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation
Minerals & Waste Policy (SPED)
Environment & Economy
Oxfordshire County Council
Speedwell House
Speedwell Street
Oxford OX1 1NE

Fax No: 01865 815787
Email: minerals.wasteplan@oxfordshire.gov.uk

The closing date for responses is 23 March 2007.

- 1.7 For further information, please contact the Minerals and Waste Policy Team on 01865 816025, or at the email or postal address above.

What happens next

- 1.8 This is an important opportunity to make your views known on the content of the documents that will make up the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. The County Council will consider carefully all comments received in preparing the full Core Strategy. Submission of the Core Strategy to Government and consultation on the document is programmed for October 2007 and it is hoped the County Council can adopt it by December 2008, following independent examination.
- 1.9 The comments received on the preferred options will also be considered by the County Council in preparing the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies and the Waste Site Proposals and Policies development plan documents (hereafter referred to as the Minerals and Waste Sites Documents). Consultation on preferred options and proposals for these two documents will take place later this year. Subsequently these documents will be submitted to Government, for further consultation and independent examination, following which the documents will be adopted as part of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

2. Background and Context

- 2.1 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 and Minerals and Waste Local Plan provide the current policy framework for minerals and waste planning in Oxfordshire. The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 sets the broad policy context for preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.
- 2.2 The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted by the County Council in 1996. It contains more detailed policies for mineral working and supply and for the provision of waste management facilities and identifies specific sites for working of sharp sand and gravel.
- 2.3 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 local plans are being replaced by local development frameworks. The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework when adopted will be a portfolio of local (minerals and waste) development documents setting out policies and proposals for a period of at least 10 years, against which planning applications for minerals and waste and related development will be considered.
- 2.4 The programme for the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework is set out in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Scheme, which also explains what each development document will cover. The latest version of the Development Scheme can be seen on the County Council website.
- 2.5 Development plan documents, which together with the regional spatial strategy will form the statutory development plan, must be prepared, including a core strategy; site specific allocations; development control policies; and a proposals map.
- 2.6 In preparing this Core Strategy Preferred Options document account has been taken of the existing and emerging national, regional and local policy framework. This is provided by:
- National planning policy statements and guidance, including:
 - Planning Policy Statement 12 –Local Development Frameworks (PPS 12) (September 2004);
 - Planning Policy Statement 10 – Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (PPS10) (July 2005); and
 - Minerals Policy Statement 1 – Planning and Minerals (MPS1) (November 2006);
 - The regional spatial strategy, Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9), particularly the Waste and Minerals Alterations (June 2006);
 - The submitted draft South East Plan (March 2006); and
 - The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 (adopted October 2005).

- 2.7 The Core Strategy and the Waste Sites Document must also have regard to the Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Strategy. The Oxfordshire Waste Partnership (a partnership of Oxfordshire County Council and the five district councils in Oxfordshire) has prepared a new Joint Municipal Waste Strategy for Oxfordshire, 'No Time to Waste'. This was agreed by the six authorities in September 2006 and provides a framework for the management of municipal waste in the county over the next 25 years.
- 2.8 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 was adopted in October 2005. The strategy and policy direction in it are recently developed and therefore where appropriate they have been carried forward into this Core Strategy Preferred Options document. The policies in the Structure Plan will be replaced by the South East Plan when it is adopted, which is expected to be in February 2008, unless the Secretary of State agrees to 'save' any of the policies for a longer period. When it is adopted, the South East Plan will replace RPG9 and become the new regional spatial strategy for the South East.
- 2.9 PPS12 says that the core strategy should set out the key elements of the planning framework for the area and should comprise a spatial vision and strategic objectives for the area; a spatial strategy; core policies; and a monitoring and implementation framework with clear objectives for achieving delivery.
- 2.10 For minerals and waste, PPS12 says that the core strategy:
- for minerals should take account of the need to contribute appropriately to national, regional and local requirements at acceptable social, environmental and economic costs; and
 - for waste should set out a planning strategy for sustainable waste management which enables provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations.
- 2.11 At this stage in the plan-preparation process, these matters are looked at in a general, strategic manner; detailed site options will be considered later, when the separate minerals and waste sites documents are prepared.
- 2.12 All policies and proposals in development plan documents must be subject to sustainability appraisal, including strategic environmental assessment. The County Council has prepared and published a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, which sets a framework for the appraisal of policies and proposals. The Scoping Report will be updated as and when necessary.
- 2.13 The preferred options in this document have been subject to sustainability appraisal (including strategic environmental assessment). This included holding an appraisal workshop, involving interest groups, technical bodies and council officers. The

outcomes of this appraisal are set out in the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report. This is available on the County Council website.

- 2.14 In addition, where a land use plan either alone or in combination with other plans or projects is likely to have a significant effect on European nature conservation sites (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas) an 'appropriate assessment' must be made of the implications of the plan for the site in relation to the conservation objectives for the site, in accordance with requirements of the European Habitats Directive. There are a number of Special Areas of Conservation in Oxfordshire and, depending on the location of options for mineral working and waste management development relative to these areas, appropriate assessment(s) may need to be carried out.
- 2.15 Development plan documents must be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination to test the soundness of the document and ensure that legal requirements for its preparation have been met. When preparing documents for inclusion in a development framework, planning authorities should carry out consultation at an early stage, on issues and alternative options, before drawing up proposals. The Oxfordshire Statement of Community Involvement, which sets out how the Council will involve and consult organisations and individuals, was adopted in November 2006.
- 2.16 As part of the process of community involvement, a small stakeholder group – the Minerals and Waste Forum – has been set up to provide input and views from a range of interest groups. Meetings of the Forum have been held to discuss the development of aims and objectives, issues and options for the documents that will make up the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. These meetings were independently facilitated by Proteus Public Relations. Reports of the meetings are available on the County Council website.
- 2.17 All documents published by the County Council in the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework are on the County Council website at:
www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/links/public/mineralsandwastepolicy

3. Aims and Objectives of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Introduction

- 3.1 The purpose of setting aims and objectives for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework is to provide a basis for the development of strategy, policies and proposals in the development plan documents. The strategy, policies and proposals should together work towards achieving the County Council's aims and objectives for minerals and waste planning in Oxfordshire.

Response to Consultation

- 3.2 The Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper included a draft set of minerals and waste aims and objectives. General support was expressed in consultation responses, with some amendments being suggested. Additional objectives were also suggested, relating to more detailed policy issues.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.3 It is important that the objectives for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework are in accordance with sustainability principles. The interim sustainability appraisal therefore included a compatibility assessment of the objectives for the Development Framework against the sustainability appraisal objectives (from the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report). This concluded that most of the Development Framework objectives have either a positive or no relationship with the sustainability appraisal objectives, but there are concerns over the following two objectives:
- To provide for the supply of minerals in accordance with national and regional policy; and
 - To provide for sufficient capacity for the treatment and disposal of waste equivalent to the quantity produced in Oxfordshire plus a contribution to regional waste management requirements, including waste from London, in accordance with national and regional policy.
- 3.4 The appraisal showed that these two objectives are in conflict with the majority of the sustainability appraisal objectives. However these objectives represent the underlying purpose of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework, i.e. to enable the minerals and waste development that is needed in Oxfordshire, and therefore they cannot be removed. Wherever possible, appropriate mitigation measures should be put in place to reduce the effects of these two objectives, in accordance with the other Development Framework objectives.

Proposed Aims and Objectives

3.5 Some amendments have been made to the aims and objectives in response to points made in responses to the Issues and Options Consultation Paper, in particular to make them clearer and more consistent with national and regional policy. The more detailed policy issues for which consultation respondents have suggested additional objectives are generally covered by the aims and objectives; it is not necessary to increase the number of objectives to cover these issues. The proposed aims and objectives below are essentially the same as in the Issues and Options Paper.

3.6 **Minerals Aim**

To provide for an adequate and appropriate contribution from Oxfordshire towards society's needs for minerals in a way that contributes towards sustainable development and protects and enhances the environment and quality of life in Oxfordshire.

3.7 **Minerals Objectives**

M1. To provide for the supply of minerals in accordance with national and regional policy.

M2. To encourage efficient and sustainable use of mineral resources and safeguard mineral deposits from development that would sterilise them.

M3. To encourage and provide for increased use of recycled and secondary materials in place of primary aggregates.

M4. To minimise the impact of transportation of minerals, including minimising the distance materials need to be transported by road; avoiding the use of unsuitable roads; and encouraging the use of other modes of transport where practicable.

M5. To ensure working and supply of minerals is carried out in an environmentally acceptable way, in particular to ensure impacts on local communities, the landscape and natural environment are controlled to acceptable levels.

M6. To ensure good restoration of mineral workings for appropriate after-uses and secure enhancement of the environment, in particular through long-term benefits for nature conservation, landscape, recreation and local communities.

3.8 **Waste Aim**

To provide for the safe and sustainable treatment and disposal of waste requiring management in Oxfordshire in a way that makes the best practical use of resources and protects and enhances the environment and quality of life in Oxfordshire.

3.9 **Waste Objectives**

- W1. To provide for sufficient capacity for the transfer, treatment and disposal of wastes equivalent to the quantities produced in Oxfordshire plus a contribution to national and regional waste management requirements in accordance with national and regional policy, including the waste hierarchy.
- W2. To promote reduced production of waste and increased use of waste as a resource, with an increase in recycling, composting and other recovery of resources from waste and a decrease in landfill of waste, to ensure that national and regional targets are at least met.
- W3. To ensure waste management objectives and requirements are taken into account in the planning and design of other development, in particular to encourage provision for re-use, recycling and recovery of resources from waste in new development.
- W4. To minimise the impact of transportation of waste, including minimising the distance materials need to be transported by road; avoiding use of unsuitable roads; and encouraging the use of other modes of transport where practicable.
- W5. To ensure management of waste is carried out in an environmentally acceptable way, in particular to ensure impacts on local communities, the landscape and natural environment are controlled to acceptable levels.
- W6. To ensure good restoration of landfills for appropriate after-uses and secure enhancement of the environment, in particular through long-term benefits for nature conservation, landscape, recreation and local communities.

4. Preferred Options for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework

4.1 In preparing the minerals and waste development documents it is necessary first to develop the strategy and key policies for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework as a whole and to then identify site options that accord with that strategy and key policy framework. This Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document sets out the County Council's preferred options for addressing each of the key issues that have previously been identified as relevant to the Development Framework as a whole.

4.2 For each issue, this document briefly sets out:

- the background to the issue;
- the options that were set out, or the questions that were posed, in the Minerals and Waste Issues and Options Consultation Paper, June 2006 and have been considered by the County Council;
- the response to the consultation on issues and options;
- the results from interim sustainability appraisal of the options; (sustainability appraisal was not carried out in the case of those issues where questions were posed rather than options being set out);
- the County Council's proposed preferred option(s) for addressing the issue with the Council's reasoning for selection of the preferred option(s); and
- the County Council's proposals for the sort of policies that should be included in the Core Strategy to deliver the preferred option(s).

4.3 This consultation document does not cover specific site options for development or more detailed matters relating to specific proposals. Those are matters to be considered in the subsequent more detailed stages of site identification and assessment and development of detailed policies for minerals and waste development, or in the planning application process. Separate consultation on specific site options will be carried out at the appropriate stages in the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Sites Documents.

5. Issue 1 – Minerals and Waste Development Framework (Plan) Period

Background to Issue

- 5.1 A key issue for the preparation of the minerals and waste development documents is the period that the overall strategy, policies and specific proposals should cover.
- 5.2 Government policy in PPS12 is that a core strategy should cover a period of at least 10 years from the date of adoption but should also look ahead to any longer-term horizon set in the regional spatial strategy. PPS10 says waste development documents should make provision for waste management capacity for 10 years. MPS1 says minerals development documents should make provision for the apportioned supply of aggregates over the plan period, and landbanks of permitted reserves of at least 7 years for sand and gravel and at least 10 years for crushed rock should be maintained.

Options Considered

- 5.3 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options:
- a) Core Strategy: to 2018; to 2026; some other date;
 - b) Minerals and Waste Sites Proposals Documents: to 2016; to 2018; to 2026; to some other date.

Response to Consultation

- 5.4 Consultation responses mostly preferred a Core Strategy period to 2018, but a significant minority favoured 2026, and some a longer period. The most preferred period for the Minerals and Waste Sites Documents was to 2018.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 5.5 The target date for adoption of the Minerals and Waste Sites Documents is now 2009. To provide at least 10 years coverage, the three development plan documents should therefore cover the period at least to 2019. Coverage of only 10 years for the Core Strategy would be the minimum length for such a strategy document and would be out of step with the emerging South East Plan, which covers the period to 2026. This would also be a short period for the Minerals and Waste Sites Documents, as provision would quickly fall below 10 years and an early review would be needed to maintain 10 years provision for waste management and to enable adequate landbanks of aggregate minerals to be maintained.

- 5.6 Provision to 2026 would give greater certainty and enable better planning to meet long-term objectives. But this needs to be considered against the possible effects of allocating sites over 10 years in advance of them being needed, which could also reduce flexibility to respond to any changes in circumstances. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 1a and 1b

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

6. Issue 2 – Minerals Supply

Issue 2a – Provision for Mineral Supply

Background to Issue

- 6.1 Aggregate minerals account for most of Oxfordshire's mineral production. Over the last 3 years (2003 – 2005) average annual production was: 1.46 million tonnes of sand and gravel (including soft sand); and 0.58 million tonnes of crushed rock (limestone and ironstone).
- 6.2 The Government published new guidelines for aggregates provision in June 2003. Based on these, RPG9 (policy M3) says Oxfordshire should make provision for the supply of 1.82 million tonnes a year of sand and gravel and 1.0 million tonnes a year of crushed rock from local land-won sources over the mineral plan period.
- 6.3 To provide for these annual levels of supply, taking into account reserves of minerals with planning permission for extraction and sites where the County Council has resolved to grant permission, the Minerals and Waste Development Framework will need to make the following additional provision (see Annex A for calculations):
- c) 29.3 million tonnes of sand and gravel for the Core Strategy period to 2026, including 16.6 million tonnes for the period to 2019.
 - d) 6.8 million tonnes of crushed rock for the Core Strategy period to 2026, with no provision needed for the period to 2019.
- 6.4 The Minerals and Waste Development Framework should make this additional provision by identifying new locations for mineral extraction. Government policy in MPS1 is that minerals development documents should identify sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search to provide greater certainty of where future mineral working will take place, in particular to make provision for aggregates supply. Related government guidance in 'Planning for Minerals: Practice Guide' is that it is not generally appropriate to identify only areas of search because these provide less certainty of where development might take place.
- 6.5 Additional mineral reserves can be provided by new free-standing sites or by extensions to existing operations (either adjacent or linked by conveyor, pipeline or haul road). Extensions can take advantage of existing quarry infrastructure such as processing plant and access. New sites (unless worked as satellites to existing operations) require new infrastructure to be set up, which means they need to be of sufficient size to justify the investment involved. Extensions can be smaller. A greater number of extensions than of

new sites will usually be needed to make the same required amount of mineral provision.

- 6.6 Government policy in MPS1 is that the benefits of extensions to existing mineral workings, in terms of reduced environmental disturbance and more efficient use of mineral resources, rather than new sites, should be considered. However it will not always be preferable to adopt a policy preference for extensions because some existing workings may be unsuitably located or may have already reached their acceptable boundaries.

Options Considered

- 6.7 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options on how the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should provide for future mineral supply:

- a) Options for the sort of areas the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should identify:
- (i) broad areas of search for new workings;
 - (ii) specific site allocations (preferred areas);
 - (iii) a combination of broad areas of search and specific site allocations;
 - (iv) locational criteria for planning applications to be considered against.
- b) Options for the type of new workings that should be preferred:
- (i) extensions to existing quarries;
 - (ii) new quarries.
- c) Options for the period sites / areas should be identified for:
- (i) the whole of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework period;
 - (ii) to 2016 or 2018 only with criteria policies for the remainder of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework period.

Response to Consultation

- 6.8 Responses mostly preferred specific site allocations, although the options of a combination of broad areas and specific sites and locational criteria also received significant support. There was very little support for broad areas of search only.
- 6.9 Responses strongly preferred extensions to existing quarries or a mix of extensions and new quarries, recognising that extensions will not be able to provide all future requirements.
- 6.10 More responses favoured identification of sites / areas for part of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework period, but a

significant number supported identification for the whole period as this would provide better, more sustainable long-term planning.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.11 There would be more certainty and greater control if site allocations are specified in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework, bearing in mind that the areas selected must be commercially workable. Just having criteria based policies could lead to development in less sustainable locations as proposed sites will not have been subject to sustainability appraisal / strategic environmental appraisal.
- 6.12 On the issue of extensions to existing quarries or new quarries, the appraisal recommends each site should be assessed on its own merits. Extensions would not need new infrastructure but would add to cumulative impact locally. The economics of the size of extension or of new sites would also be a factor.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 6.13 Identification of specific sites gives greater certainty as to where mineral working will and will not be permitted and is to be preferred where possible, unless geological and other information is insufficient to enable sites to be identified and assessed. There can be significant environmental advantages in extensions to existing operations and they are usually preferable in terms of making best use of the mineral resource. But it will not be possible to meet all the required provision for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework period in this way and new quarry sites will be needed, particularly for sand and gravel. The Core Strategy and the Minerals Sites Document should include policies for mineral supply for the period to 2026 and the provision for mineral supply in the Minerals Sites Document should include site allocations for the period at least to 2019 (see Issue 1 above). This does not preclude site provision for beyond 2019 being made in the Minerals Sites Document if there is good reason. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 2a(i), 2a(ii) and 2a(iii)

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 2a(i), 2a(ii) and 2a(iii)

- 6.14 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy to deliver these preferred options in general terms, including provision for mineral working to 2026;
 - strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for mineral working;
 - general indication of areas of mineral resource unlikely to be appropriate and areas where there may be appropriate locations.
- Detailed delivery will be through the Minerals Sites Document, which will identify sites for mineral working for the period to at least 2019 and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

Issue 2b – Provision for sharp sand and gravel and soft sand

Background to Issue

- 6.15 Oxfordshire produces two distinct types of sand and gravel: soft sand - used mainly for mortar and asphalt; and sharp sand and gravel – mainly used for making concrete and other construction uses. Soft sand occurs mainly in a band between Faringdon, Oxford and Abingdon, with smaller outcrops in the north of the county. Sharp sand and gravel deposits are found in the Thames, Windrush and other river valleys and also in the Chilterns and near Finmere (north of Bicester).
- 6.16 Government policy in MPS1 is that where different aggregate types occur for which there are distinct markets, separate landbank provisions may be appropriate. The Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1996) subdivided the total sand and gravel apportionment for Oxfordshire of 2.0 million tonnes a year (mtpa): 0.2 mtpa soft sand (10%); and 1.8 mtpa sharp sand and gravel (90%).
- 6.17 The actual average production over the last 5 years (2001 – 2005) was 0.28 mtpa soft sand (17%); and 1.34 mtpa sharp sand and gravel (83%) (average total production 1.62 mtpa). (Before figures for 2004 and 2005 became available, the 5 year average split was 18% : 82%, as used in the Issues and Options Consultation Paper.)

Options Considered

- 6.18 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options for subdivision of the 1.82 million tonnes a year sand and gravel supply requirement (apportionment) for Oxfordshire between soft sand and sharp sand and gravel:
- (i) 10% soft sand to 90% sharp sand and gravel (as in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan);
 - (ii) 18% soft sand to 82% sharp sand and gravel (in line with production in recent years);
 - (iii) Some other split.

Response to Consultation

- 6.19 The majority view from responses was that a split in line with production in recent years is now more appropriate than the historic Minerals and Waste Local Plan split, although a significant number favoured a flexible approach to allow response to possible changes in demand.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 6.20 Oxfordshire's apportionment should be subdivided between soft sand and sharp sand and gravel with a higher percentage of soft sand provision than in the existing Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The reasons for this are mainly to do with increased market demand for soft sand and the need for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework to make provision to meet this, thereby avoiding ad-hoc development.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 6.21 The sand and gravel apportionment for Oxfordshire should be subdivided because soft sand and sharp sand and gravel generally occur in different locations and they have distinct and separate uses and markets. A subdivision is needed in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework to provide a basis for the amount of provision that needs to be made for each of these two mineral types. There is no rational basis for continuing with the subdivision in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. In the absence of demand forecasts at this level of detail, the most appropriate basis for subdivision is recent past production patterns, reflecting recent actual demand. Flexibility to respond to changes in demand can best be provided through the regular monitoring and, if necessary, review of relevant elements of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework, which forms an integral part of the new plan-making system. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 2b

Plan on the basis of a subdivision of the sand and gravel supply requirement (apportionment) of 17% soft sand and 83% sharp sand and gravel.

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 2b

- 6.22 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy for the maintenance of separate landbanks of soft sand and sharp sand and gravel based on current national and regional policy;
 - a subdivision of the apportionment between these two mineral types based on recent production; and
 - the provision required for each of these two mineral types over the Core Strategy period, to provide the basis for the requirements for site identification in the Minerals Sites Document.

7. Issue 3 – Strategy for Location of Sand and Gravel Workings

Background to Issue

- 7.1 The Core Strategy should set out a strategy for the location of sand and gravel workings in Oxfordshire, to provide a basis for identification of sites in the Minerals Sites Document.
- 7.2 The previous Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2011 identified four areas: Sutton Courtenay; Sutton Wick; Stanton Harcourt (Lower Windrush Valley); and Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton where the principle of sharp sand and gravel working was accepted. Areas for working are no longer identified in the current Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016. This plan instead includes a new policy (M2) which states that locations for sand and gravel working will be identified in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework, and sets out factors to be taken into account in identifying appropriate locations.
- 7.3 Of the four former Structure Plan areas, production from Sutton Courtenay and Sutton Wick has declined and most of Oxfordshire's sharp sand and gravel production (80% in 2005) is now from the Lower Windrush Valley and Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton areas.
- 7.4 In response to this situation, in the preparation of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 a study was carried out to identify a potential new strategic area for sand and gravel working in southern Oxfordshire. The following 15 potential sharp sand and gravel resource areas were considered:
- Radley;
 - Marcham;
 - Appleford – Little Wittenham;
 - Wallingford – Cholsey – South Moreton;
 - Wallingford – Benson;
 - Stadhampston – Berinsfield – Warborough – Benson;
 - Stadhampston (north of);
 - Brightwell Baldwin;
 - Oakley Wood – Ewelme;
 - Ipsden;
 - Sonning Common;
 - Mapledurham;
 - Caversham;
 - Culham – Clifton Hampden; and
 - Chalgrove.
- 7.5 The County Council's assessment of these options was reported in the Sand and Gravel Background Information Report, October 2003. Following consideration of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel Report, no locations (new or existing)

are identified in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016. All options for sand and gravel working are to be reassessed in the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

- 7.6 Most of Oxfordshire's soft sand production is from quarries in the county's main soft sand resource area, between Faringdon, Oxford and Abingdon. One quarry works soft sand from the more limited deposits in the north of the county. Options for future soft sand working are almost all within the Faringdon – Oxford – Abingdon resource area.
- 7.7 Issue 2a above establishes that the Minerals and Waste Development Framework needs to make provision for an additional 29.3 million tonnes of sand and gravel for the period to 2026, including 16.6 million tonnes for the period to 2019. Therefore there is a need for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework to identify new locations for the working of a substantial amount of sand and gravel. Applying the preferred subdivision of the overall sand and gravel supply requirement (from preferred option 2b above), the separate requirements for new provision for soft sand and sharp sand and gravel are (see Appendix 1 for calculations:
- Soft sand – 5.1 million tonnes for the period to 2026, including 2.9 million tonnes for the period to 2019; and
 - Sharp sand and gravel – 24.3 million tonnes for the period to 2026, including 13.7 million tonnes for the period to 2019.
- 7.8 Meeting these requirements will require new locations for working to be identified, and this will almost certainly involve locations outside the existing working areas, for both soft sand and sharp sand and gravel.
- 7.9 In parallel with preparation of the Core Strategy, an assessment of all potential sand and gravel sites / areas is being carried out for preparation of the Minerals Sites Document. This will identify which sites or areas are the most suitable to be identified for future working. This assessment will cover all potential options for sand and gravel working within Oxfordshire and not just the options in the Issues and Options Consultation Paper. This work is being carried out in two stages. Firstly a higher level strategic assessment of broad strategic sand and gravel resource areas is being carried out to identify the key constraints and other factors affecting them. Secondly, from within those broad strategic resource areas that are assessed as the best options in the first stage, specific potential sites or areas for working will be identified and these will be assessed in more detail.
- 7.10 Work carried out so far for the first stage of the assessment has informed selection of the preferred options below and indicates that:

- (i) Most of the larger sand and gravel resource areas of the county are located in south, central and west Oxfordshire;
- (ii) Areas of sand and gravel deposits in the north, east and far south of the county are generally dispersed, small and thin, and information on mineral quality and suitability in areas in the north and east is poor, but small scale working could be feasible in these areas;
- (iii) Large parts of the sand and gravel resources, especially in the southeast of the county, are within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- (iv) Areas in the south and west of the county are affected by Special Areas of Conservation;
- (v) There are large resource areas in west and southern Oxfordshire that are well located relative to planned growth at Didcot, Wantage and Grove, Bicester and Oxford in the short and long term;
- (vi) There are large areas of resource unaffected by key environmental constraints in west and southern Oxfordshire (although in selecting individual sites or areas to be included in the Minerals Sites Document a detailed assessment of other constraints will need to be carried out to identify any significant impacts);
- (vii) There is potential for extensions to some existing sand and gravel workings in west and southern Oxfordshire in the short and longer term;
- (viii) Some areas in west and southern Oxfordshire (including existing quarries) are well located for access to strategic routes.

Options Considered

- 7.11 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options for the location of strategic areas for sand and gravel working:
- (i) Continue to concentrate new workings in the main existing sharp sand and gravel working areas in West Oxfordshire, the Eynsham – Cassington – Yarnton and the Lower Windrush Valley areas;
 - (ii) Identify new strategic working area(s) in the southern part of the county, to spread production more evenly in relation to the main areas of demand for aggregates in Oxfordshire;
 - (iii) Promote a more dispersed pattern of smaller scale working areas;
 - (iv) Some other pattern of new working areas.

Response to Consultation

- 7.12 The largest number of responses to the Issues and Options Consultation Paper favoured the continued concentration of new workings in the main existing working areas in West Oxfordshire as

the most appropriate option; this option may offer opportunities for the extension of existing quarries. But some thought that continued working in the existing West Oxfordshire areas would be inappropriate due to environmental constraints. Significant numbers of responses favoured the options of a dispersed pattern of smaller working areas and new strategic working area(s) in southern Oxfordshire.

- 7.13 A number suggested a combination of options (ii) and (iii) to provide supply of aggregates closer to where they will be used and reduce impact on communities and roads. Others were concerned about dispersal to new areas in southern Oxfordshire, particularly impact on the environment including Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The view was expressed that, as well as impact on local communities, transport and environmental features, the identification of locations of new working areas should also consider potential for environmental enhancement.
- 7.14 This issue was considered by the Minerals and Waste Stakeholder Forum. The Forum identified the following important factors: depletion of reserves in southern Oxfordshire; spread of supply in relation to main areas of demand; and transport implications of having to move aggregates longer distances. The view of the Forum generally was that a dispersed pattern of working was least favoured and that a combination of options (i) and (ii) should be the preferred approach. Because of the lead time required to bring a new quarry on stream, shorter term needs are most likely to be met from extensions to existing operations, but in the longer term new working areas will be needed, including in southern Oxfordshire near to towns where there will be demand from new development.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 7.15 The appraisal recommended a slightly broader spread of sand and gravel working than at present. This would help reduce the transport impacts associated with production and location of market areas. This strategy would also reduce the cumulative impact of developments. However, this would be dependent on the existence of workable deposits and the economics of developing such sites.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 7.16 New working areas will be needed for both sharp sand and gravel and soft sand over the periods to 2019 and 2026. The scale of the requirements is such that it is unlikely to be possible to meet them in an acceptable way just from identifying sites within existing working areas; a new working area or areas will be required. A dispersed pattern of smaller scale workings would have the disadvantage of spreading the impact of mineral working across more of the county. Such a piecemeal approach to planning would

provide much less opportunity to secure benefits, like infrastructure provision and coordinated restoration and afteruse, that can be gained when workings are concentrated in larger areas.

- 7.17 The large sand and gravel resource areas in west and southern Oxfordshire are most likely to provide for large scale working in the future due to the quantity and quality of the mineral resource, existing infrastructure and location in terms of proximity to strategic routes and main markets. Identification of new working area(s) for sharp sand and gravel in southern Oxfordshire would restore a more balanced supply pattern and provide sources of aggregate closer to markets in that part of the county, thus reducing transport distances. In West Oxfordshire, the resource areas east of Ducklington / Yelford / Shifford are generally much better located relative to strategic routes and main markets than the resource areas further west. In southern Oxfordshire significant areas of the sand and gravel resource lie within the Chiltern Hills and North Wessex Downs Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, particularly between Wallingford and Reading. Government policy in MPS1 is that major minerals developments should not be permitted in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty except in exceptional circumstances. The Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty should therefore generally be protected from sand and gravel extraction.
- 7.18 In view of the time it takes to plan and develop a new quarry, shorter term requirements will largely have to be met from existing areas, mainly through extensions to existing operations. In the longer term, new workings will be needed to meet supply requirements; this should include a new working area or areas in southern Oxfordshire, but could also include new areas in West Oxfordshire to replace existing operations when they are exhausted. For soft sand the only feasible option is to identify locations for new sand working within the main resource area between Faringdon, Oxford and Abingdon. This could involve extensions to existing quarries where feasible and acceptable but is likely also to require new quarry locations. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 3(i) and 3(ii)

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

7.19 These preferred options above set out broad areas for future sand and gravel working. These broad areas, and any subsequently identified detailed locations for working within them, will be tested in full through preparation of the Minerals Sites Document. This will include testing of whether the preferred option of continued working in West Oxfordshire and a new area(s) in the south of the county is preferable to identification of areas elsewhere or a more dispersed pattern of working. This work will also include consideration of when new working areas will be needed and the potential contribution of each area to the overall supply of sand and gravel across the county.

7.20 Where relevant, these preferred options will also be subject to appropriate assessment of the potential impacts of mineral working on Special Areas of Conservation (see paragraph 2.14 above). Any appropriate assessment(s) required will be carried out in conjunction with the site assessment work undertaken for preparation of the Minerals Sites Document. Policies and proposals for inclusion in the Core Strategy submission document will not be finalised until any necessary appropriate assessments have been carried out.

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 3(i) and 3(ii)

- 7.21 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy that permission will be granted for sand and gravel working in appropriate locations to meet needs and maintain landbanks;
 - strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for mineral working;

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

- general indication of areas of sand and gravel resource unlikely to be appropriate and areas where there may be appropriate locations.

7.22 Detailed delivery will be through the Minerals Sites Document, which will identify sites for mineral working and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

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

Background to Issue

- 8.1 The Core Strategy will set out a strategy for the location of crushed rock (limestone and/or ironstone) workings in Oxfordshire, which will provide the basis for the identification of any areas and/or sites required in the Minerals Sites Document.
- 8.2 Crushed rock production in Oxfordshire makes a contribution to meeting demands for aggregates both within and outside the county, particularly to the east and southeast. The draft South East Plan notes that resources of rock suitable for aggregate use are very limited in the region and identifies Oxfordshire and Kent, at opposite ends of the region, as the only counties which are to contribute to the requirements for crushed rock across the region.
- 8.3 Neither the Minerals and Waste Local Plan nor the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 identifies areas for limestone or ironstone working. The location of areas for limestone and ironstone working has not been a major issue for the development plan in the past because levels of permitted reserves have historically been high and production levels generally low. In recent years production (particularly of limestone) for use as aggregate has increased and permitted reserves have declined. There is now a figure (sub-regional apportionment) in RPG9 for the amount of crushed rock provision to be made in Oxfordshire – 1.0 million tonnes a year.
- 8.4 Over the last 5 years (2001 – 2005) production of crushed rock in Oxfordshire has averaged 0.74 mtpa, comprising about 60% limestone and 40% ironstone. Most of the limestone production comes from the limestone resources in the Oxford – Bicester / Ardley area and the Witney – Burford area. Limestone is also produced from the soft sand quarries near Faringdon. Both the Witney – Burford and Oxford – Bicester / Ardley areas are well located to meet needs for crushed rock arising in the central Oxfordshire area and can be accessed from strategic routes. Also, the Oxford – Bicester / Ardley area and the Witney – Burford area to the south of the A40 both lie outside the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which covers much of the limestone resource of Oxfordshire.
- 8.5 Ironstone is worked from the ironstone resources in the Alkerton – Hornton – Wroxton area to the north west of Banbury. This area is more remote from strategic routes and, with the exception of Banbury, more distant from the main areas of aggregates demand in the county. This area is close to the county boundary and some of the ironstone produced in the area goes out of the county to markets elsewhere. Large reserves of ironstone were granted

planning permission for extraction in this area in the 1950s, but much of the remaining permitted land is now considered unsuitable for working by current standards and extraction is currently limited to particular sites within the overall permitted areas, and production of ironstone from this area is currently limited to an average of 0.35 million tonnes a year.

- 8.6 Issue 2a above establishes that the Minerals and Waste Development Framework needs to make provision for an additional 6.8 million tonnes of crushed rock for the period to 2026, but that no additional provision is needed for the period to 2019. But if actual production continues to be less than the apportionment rate of 1.0 million tonnes a year, current permitted reserves will last longer and the requirement for additional provision will be reduced.

Options Considered

- 8.7 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options for the location of strategic areas for sand and gravel working:
- (i) Locate new limestone workings in the Witney – Burford area;
 - (ii) Identify new limestone workings in the Oxford – Bicester area;
 - (iii) Make increased provision for ironstone working from the north of the county; or
 - (iv) Some other pattern of new working areas.

Response to Consultation

- 8.8 Consultation responses included support for all options, with slightly more responses favouring option (ii) and slightly less option (iii). Some responses preferred moving to a more dispersed pattern of smaller workings, to reduce impact from concentrations of large workings; but others favoured extensions to existing workings as a means of minimising impact, with continuation of working in existing areas and the situation being reviewed towards the end of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework period. Some responses thought there are sufficient permitted reserves of ironstone and therefore no need for further provision to be made in the ironstone resource areas.
- 8.9 This issue was considered by the Minerals and Waste Stakeholder Forum. The Forum saw transportation as a key issue in locating future workings. The Forum recognised that the ironstone resource area in the north of the county is distant from areas of future development in the county, other than Banbury. The general view of the Forum was that the Oxford – Bicester / Ardley limestone resource area is better located in relation to transport infrastructure and areas of future development and should therefore be considered first when looking for possible locations for new workings for crushed rock.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 8.10 The appraisal suggests that a slightly broader spread of workings for meeting the crushed rock apportionment would be preferred. However, this will be dependent on availability of sites and economics.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 8.11 Provision needs to be made for additional working areas for crushed rock for the period to 2026. The ironstone resource area in the north of the county is less well located relative to strategic routes and market areas than the limestone resource areas; and there are substantial permitted reserves of ironstone remaining to be worked. Therefore preference should be given to making any additional provision required within the limestone areas.
- 8.12 Government policy in MPS1 is that major minerals developments should not be permitted in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty except in exceptional circumstances. The Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should therefore be protected from further significant working for aggregates. This accounts for a substantial part of the limestone resource. Broadly, the remaining options for any additional provision required for working limestone for aggregates are the Burford – Witney area to the south of the A40 and the limestone resource area east of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (mainly east / northeast of a line from Woodstock to Chipping Norton, across the county to Ardley and Finmere). The latter area could provide site options that are generally closer to the main areas of future demand for aggregates in the county, but it is not otherwise possible at this stage to indicate a preference for locations. That must await completion of further more detailed assessment work for the Minerals Sites Document.
- 8.13 There may be scope for extensions to existing workings, but it is likely that new limestone working areas will be needed towards the end of the period to 2026. It is also possible that some additional reserves of limestone will be released in conjunction with new soft sand workings in the Faringdon – Oxford – Abingdon area. A dispersed pattern of smaller scale workings would have the disadvantage of spreading the impact of mineral working and would provide less opportunity to secure benefits like infrastructure provision and coordinated restoration and afteruse that can be gained from larger workings. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 4

For crushed rock, subject to the results of further work on site assessment, to identify locations for working crushed rock in the main limestone resource areas outside the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty:

- (i) in the Witney – Burford area (south of the A40); and**
- (ii) in the area east / northeast of Woodstock / Chipping Norton (including the Oxford – Bicester area).**

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 4

- 8.14 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy for the maintenance of a landbank of crushed rock based on current national and regional policy;
 - the provision required for crushed rock over the Core Strategy period, to provide the basis for the requirement for site identification in the Minerals Sites Document;
 - policy that permission will be granted for crushed rock working in appropriate locations to meet needs and maintain landbanks;
 - strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for mineral working;
 - general indication of areas of crushed rock resource unlikely to be appropriate and areas where there may be appropriate locations;
- 8.15 Detailed delivery will be through the Minerals Sites Document, which will identify sites for mineral working and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

9 **Issue 5 – Recycled and Secondary Aggregates**

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

Background to Issue

- 9.1 National policy is to increase the use of recycled and secondary materials as substitutes for natural minerals. It is a prime objective of regional minerals policy to increase supplies of secondary aggregates and encourage greater use of mineral waste in the construction industry in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. The draft South East Plan sets challenging targets for the recycling of construction and demolition waste. The Minerals and Waste Development Framework must determine how much provision should be made in Oxfordshire for recycled and secondary aggregates.
- 9.2 Recycled aggregate is principally derived from construction and demolition waste, including road planings. The main source of secondary aggregates in Oxfordshire is ash from the Didcot A Power Station. There is no reliable and comprehensive data on production of recycled and secondary aggregates available for Oxfordshire. A survey in 2004 recorded production of 261,000 tonnes, but there was only a partial response from site operators and this figure is believed to be significantly less than the total production.
- 9.3 The County Council's Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report 2006 records that a recent review of planning permissions for construction and demolition waste recycling facilities for production of aggregates indicates a total production capacity in Oxfordshire of 385,000 tonnes per annum. However, much of this capacity is in facilities that have planning permission for a temporary period only.
- 9.4 The draft South East Plan (policy M2) seeks an increase in use of recycled and secondary aggregates in the South East from 6.6 to at least 7.7 million tonnes by 2016. To enable this target to be met, and where possible exceeded, the draft South East Plan proposes a sub-regional apportionment of the provision to be made by 2016. The proposed figure for Oxfordshire is 0.9 million tonnes a year of recycled and secondary aggregates. Additional recycling facilities will be required to achieve this. The draft South East Plan says mineral planning authorities should identify sites to contribute to this provision in their minerals development frameworks. In addition to permanent sites, the draft South East Plan says that temporary facilities, including mobile recycling facilities, can make a useful contribution to overall provision. Temporary recycling facilities are often located at mineral workings and landfill sites.

Options Considered

- 9.5 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options on:
- a) How the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should make provision for additional aggregate recycling facilities:
 - (i) identify sites for temporary facilities;
 - (ii) identify sites for permanent facilities;
 - (iii) set locational criteria.
 - b) How much provision the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should make for aggregate recycling:
 - (i) enough just to meet the regional targets for supply of recycled aggregates;
 - (ii) more than is required to meet those targets.

Response to Consultation

- 9.6 Consultation responses favoured identifying sites for permanent facilities as the most suitable provision, although setting locational criteria for the consideration of planning applications was also thought important. Locational criteria should apply based on need and demand, whilst also protecting Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This may also allow the Minerals and Waste Development Framework to adapt to new technological changes over time and allow a more flexible approach. Temporary sites could be appropriate, but were not favoured due to their impact on road networks and local residents.
- 9.7 Respondents thought that the provision for aggregate recycling should be higher than is required to meet national targets providing there is sufficient supply. Construction and demolition waste provides the greatest recycling potential, and recycling aggregates conserves mineral resources. Suitable sites that are proposed should meet (and possibly exceed) regional targets enabling a more sustainable approach. The market place, price differential and waste management legislation were felt to drive aggregate recycling more than targets or objectives.
- 9.8 This issue was considered by the Minerals and Waste Stakeholder Forum. The Forum supported the provision of permanent facilities where possible but thought most facilities will continue to be temporary and that locational criteria will be needed to consider proposals. Recycling at demolition sites should also be taken into account. However, the Forum questioned whether there are sufficient materials available in Oxfordshire to meet the apportionment level in the draft South East Plan. A sequential approach to site options was suggested, depending on availability

of sites. Criteria for the location of sites should include impacts of recycling operations such as noise and dust.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 9.9 On the issue of how much provision should be made for aggregate recycling, the appraisal concluded there are no negatives in providing either sufficient capacity or over-provision of capacity for recycling of aggregates. However, over-provision seemed to be more positive in developing a sustainable strategy bearing in mind the lack of accurate data on the amount of aggregate materials being recycled.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 9.10 The preferred option should be to identify permanent facilities where possible and appropriate. But temporary facilities, particularly at minerals and waste sites, will continue to be an important source of supply. Locational criteria will be needed against which applications for both permanent and temporary facilities can be considered on their merits.
- 9.11 The preferred option should be to aim to make provision for more than is required through identification of permanent sites so far as is possible and appropriate together with locational criteria policy to enable other sites, for both permanent and temporary facilities, to be considered on their merits. The regional targets should be used as a guide to the level of provision that is required as a minimum. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 5a(i) and 5a(ii)

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 5a(i) | Identify permanent facilities for aggregate recycling where possible supported by temporary facilities at minerals and waste sites. |
| 5a(ii) | Maximise the provision for aggregates recycling through a positive policy approach. |

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 5a(i) and 5a(ii)

- 9.12 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- the provision required for recycled and secondary aggregates supply in Oxfordshire over the Core Strategy period;
 - policy that permission will be granted for both permanent and temporary recycled and secondary aggregates facilities at appropriate locations, including at major demolition and

development sites, to meet the target for recycled and secondary aggregates supply;

- strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for recycled and secondary aggregates facilities;

Detailed delivery will be through the Minerals Site Proposals and Policies document, which will identify sites for recycled and secondary aggregates facilities and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

Issue 5b – Where Aggregates Recycling Facilities should be Located

Background to Issue

- 9.13 To meet national and regional targets for recycled and secondary aggregates, the draft South East Plan says mineral planning authorities should identify sufficient sites for recycling plants, primarily on brown field sites or within new employment developments to ensure that there is an increase in the recycling of construction, demolition and other waste for use as secondary aggregates.
- 9.14 The draft South East Plan says mineral planning authorities should take into account the need for recycling operations to be located within a viable catchment area close to the origins of the waste materials and subsequent markets; the ability for recycling operations to be enclosed in an industrial building; and the need to provide an indication of typical site sizes, acknowledging the need for materials storage before and after processing.
- 9.15 The draft South East Plan (policy M2) also states that mineral recycling facilities should not be precluded from the Green Belt where this is consistent with the proximity principle, where there are no alternative sites and provided the objectives of the designation would not be harmed. In exceptional circumstances minerals recycling facilities for local materials should not be precluded from Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Options Considered

- 9.16 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following options for the type of sites the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should identify to provide for aggregates recycling facilities:
- a) Options for the type of site to be used for recycling aggregates:
 - (i) sites on industrial or employment land;

- (ii) sites at existing minerals and/or waste sites;
 - (iii) sites on previously developed (brownfield) land in the countryside;
 - (iv) greenfield sites.
- b) Options for location of sites in relation to the Green Belt around Oxford:
- (i) only at locations either in urban areas or in areas of countryside outside the Green Belt;
 - (ii) at suitable locations within the Green Belt as well.

Response to Consultation

- 9.17 Consultation responses favoured use of existing sites, with the possibility of identifying sites on industrial or employment land and using locational criteria that take into account protection of environmental designations. However, industrial / employment sites are scarce and their relatively high land value may mean that use for aggregate recycling is not viable. There are also potential conflict issues with existing industrial or employment land users. Aggregate recycling will occur in association with demolition and re-development of brownfield sites. Some responses considered brownfield sites to be unsustainable. The costs of haulage and disposal are important in determining where wastes are taken. Impact on the road network also needs to be considered.
- 9.18 Most responses preferred the location of aggregate recycling facilities in urban areas or countryside areas outside of the Green Belt. Facilities should be sited within the Green Belt only at suitable locations such as brownfield sites. Redundant industrial sites, army depots, old airfields etc may be an alternative to Green Belt sites. Assessment of the impact on road networks should be a factor. Sites should have good access; if possible sites with rail access should be identified.
- 9.19 This issue was considered by the Minerals and Waste Stakeholder Forum. The Forum had concerns about locating aggregate recycling facilities in the Green Belt, but recognised this could reduce transport distances and help to reduce the need for quarrying. Mineral workings could be suitable locations if they have screening and good access and are distant from residential areas. The Forum generally supported taking a sequential approach to site options.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 9.20 These options were not specifically appraised in relation to this issue, but the following results of appraisal of the same options in relation to waste treatment facilities generally (Issue 15b) are relevant. The appraisal concluded that the suitability of sites

depends on factors such as the type of technology, size of facility, size of site and the density of surrounding human population. Each site must be assessed on its own merits. It was highlighted that for all options the impact upon the flood plain must be considered.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 9.21 Identification of sites for recycled and secondary aggregates is a matter for the Minerals Sites document, but the Core Strategy should indicate which types of site are preferred through a general criteria policy. In view of the likely difficulty in finding suitable sites for these facilities, a sequential approach should be adopted, with the following orders of preference: urban areas; close to urban areas; rural areas; and then brownfield land; temporary minerals and waste sites; greenfield sites. This approach generally accords with the views arising from the consultation.
- 9.22 The preference should be for non-Green Belt land close to urban areas, but with the recognition that suitable Green Belt sites can enable facilities to be provided close to sources of waste and markets for aggregates. Therefore facilities should not be precluded in the Green Belt where this is consistent with the proximity principle, where there are no suitable alternative sites and where the objectives of the designation will not be harmed. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 5b

Locate aggregate recycling facilities using the following sequential approach:

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

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

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

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 5b

- 9.23 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy expressing the sequential approach to locating sites for recycled and secondary aggregate facilities in this preferred option;

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

- strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for recycled and secondary aggregates facilities.

9.24 Detailed delivery will be through the Minerals Sites Document, which will identify sites for recycled and secondary aggregates facilities and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

10. Issue 6 – Imported Aggregates and Rail Depots

Background to Issue

10.1 Many construction projects require rock that is harder than the limestones and ironstone that occur in Oxfordshire. This hard rock must be sourced elsewhere. Significant quantities of crushed rock aggregate are brought into Oxfordshire by rail to two rail depots, at Banbury and Sutton Courtenay¹. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan welcomes in principle proposals for additional rail depots if there is shown to be a need for more capacity.

10.2 The draft South East Plan (policy M5) says mineral planning authorities should assess the need for wharf and rail facilities for the handling and distribution of imported minerals and processed materials and identify strategic sites for safeguarding in minerals development frameworks.

Questions Posed

10.3 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions relating to making provision for aggregates imported into Oxfordshire, including aggregates transported by rail:

- (i) Should the Core Strategy promote an increase in the supply of aggregates from outside the county to meet needs in Oxfordshire?
- (ii) Should the Minerals Sites Document identify new sites for rail aggregate depots?

Response to Consultation

10.4 Consultation responses expressed strong support for an increase in supply of aggregates from outside the county, preferably from a source close to Oxfordshire and with transport by rail. But it was recognised this would depend on production capacity at exporting quarries and may be contrary to government policy. Responses favoured inclusion of a policy on new rail aggregate depots and, if possible, identification of sites for depots in the Minerals Sites Document.

Proposed Preferred Options

10.5 The aggregates supply strategy for Oxfordshire should accord with current government and regional policy, and the aim should be to meet the local land-won aggregates apportionment for the county. But there will be an ongoing need for importation of aggregate materials that cannot be sourced locally, particularly hard rock for

¹ A third rail depot at Hinksey Sidings, Oxford is solely for the supply of ballast to Network Rail and is not therefore considered part of the County's supply of aggregates.

roadstone, and it is likely there will be a long-term need for increased supply from outside the county (and region) as local supply of minerals resources within the South East declines further. Rail and water transport should take priority over road, particularly for longer distance movements. Therefore there should be a policy on new aggregate rail depots and if possible new sites should be identified, but the capacity of the rail network will need to be taken into account. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 6a and 6b

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 6a | Continue local supply of aggregates at levels in line with regional policy plus imports to meet demands that cannot be met from this local supply. |
| 6b | Include a policy for new rail aggregate depots and, where possible, identify sites for rail aggregate depots. |

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 6a and 6b

- 10.6 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy policy for the establishment of new rail aggregate depots at suitable locations. If suitable locations can be identified, sites for rail aggregate depots will be identified in the Minerals Sites Document.

11. Issue 7 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Areas or Sites for Mineral Working

Background to Issue

- 11.1 The identification and approval of mineral sites, their working and their subsequent reuse / restoration cannot be seen in isolation. Minerals make a crucial contribution to the wider economy. Workings and the transport of minerals have environmental and social impacts and local extraction often has special significance for rural areas.
- 11.2 Structure Plan policy M1 says permission will be granted for mineral working at appropriate locations provided any adverse impact is outweighed by need for the mineral. Structure Plan policy M2 says that in identifying appropriate locations, the County Council will take account of the distribution of sand and gravel resources; the existing pattern of supply and distribution of workings; proximity to main market areas; accessibility to main transport routes; risk of birdstrike; restoration and after use potential; and development plan policies (in particular those which seek to safeguard important environmental features and areas).

Questions Posed

- 11.3 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions on identifying and assessing options for the location of new areas or sites for mineral working in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework:
- (i) What factors or criteria that should be used to identify and assess site / area options?
 - (ii) Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? If so, how?
 - (iii) What weight that should be given to environmental designations compared with the impact on people?
 - (iv) What weight should be given to access and proximity to market?
 - (v) What weight should be given to the protection of high grade agricultural land?
 - (vi) Should restoration potential and after-use opportunities should be taken into account in site / area selection and assessment?

Response to Consultation

- 11.4 Consultation responses favoured the prioritisation of sites already identified and / or developed, whilst avoiding environmental designations and areas of archaeological interest where possible. Identifying existing patterns of supply and distribution and the proximity of use of the product together with the impact on the road networks should be used in assessment. The restoration of sites is

an important factor, including emphasis on restoration to some form other than water. National, regional, structure plan and district local plan policies should be taken into account. The approach in the existing Minerals and Waste Local Plan could be used, with the inclusion of issues relating to biodiversity impact; hydrological impact; protection of rights of way networks; and landscape features. Locations that can deliver benefits in line with key strategies should be encouraged.

- 11.5 Factors and criteria may differ substantially between sites and impacts should be identified in the environmental assessment process. Weighting is considered to be subjective and may change over the period of the plan, and should take into account the hierarchy of designated sites. Factors such as the community and environment were recognised as important together with noise and pollution levels, ability to support increased traffic and restoration strategy. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Green Belt should have greater protection than other land.
- 11.6 Environmental designations should have high weighting, but developments affecting the environment also have an impact on the people living there. Irreplaceable assets should be protected unless legislation allows this to be overridden.
- 11.7 High weighting should be given to access and proximity to market, as they can reduce the effect of mineral transportation. The “proximity principle” should apply.
- 11.8 Giving high grade agricultural land high weighting is favoured, although there is recognition that this land can be used to restore lost habitats and preserve distinctive species. The promotion of local food production is a reason to protect high grade land.
- 11.9 Taking account of restoration potential is strongly supported. Sites should be chosen for their long term environmental and social benefits, including opportunities to increase public access to the countryside. If restoration cannot be guaranteed, the site should be rejected.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 11.10 This issue was recently considered in the preparation of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016, which includes a locational policy (M2) for the identification of sites for mineral working. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 7

Include a policy for the identification of appropriate locations for mineral working based on Structure Plan Policy M2:

In identifying appropriate locations, the County Council will take account of the distribution of mineral resources; the existing pattern of supply and distribution of workings; proximity to main market areas; accessibility to the main transport routes; risk of birdstrike; restoration and afteruse potential; and development plan policies, in particular which seek to safeguard:

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 7

- 11.11 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy policy setting out strategic criteria for the location of mineral workings based on Structure Plan Policy M2. These criteria will be used in the assessment of sites for identification in the Minerals Sites Document.

12. Issue 8 – Restoration of Mineral Workings

Background to Issue

- 12.1 One of the most significant impacts of mineral working is the disturbance of the landscape and visual intrusion it can cause. Structure Plan policy M1 seeks to ensure that the minimum amount of land is taken up by mineral working at any one time and that restoration is carried out to enable an acceptable after-use.
- 12.2 The Minerals and Waste Development Framework should give guidance on the types of after-uses that may be appropriate in different areas. It is important that agreed after-uses are managed and maintained following restoration. Where appropriate, aftercare schemes and / or long-term management and maintenance agreements will need to be secured.
- 12.3 Generally, restoration to agriculture, woodland, nature conservation or recreation are acceptable after-uses. Mineral working can provide opportunities for environmental enhancement and public benefit, such as the creation of new habitats and improved public access, which give some local long-term gain to offset the impact of working. The County Council is keen to see an increase in the extent of woodland, nature conservation and general public access to the countryside, and pursues these aims through the restoration of mineral workings.
- 12.4 Because of the generally high water table and a shortage of inert waste material for infilling (due in large part to increased recycling), most new sand and gravel workings in the river valleys of Oxfordshire will have to be restored to water bodies. The issue of risk to aircraft from birdstrike will be an important consideration which may restrict the location of workings and affect the design of restoration schemes.
- 12.5 Where the impact of mineral working affects a significant area, as for instance in the Lower Windrush Valley, the Council works with landowners, operators and others to secure a coordinated approach to environmental improvements across the whole area.

Questions Posed

- 12.6 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions about priorities in setting policies and proposals for the working and restoration of sites or areas for mineral extraction in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework:
- (i) What should the priorities for restoration be: agriculture; habitat creation; recreation; or other?

- (ii) Should there be a preference for restoration back to land; or for creation of lakes; or for partial infilling, e.g. to create reed-beds?
- (iii) Should infilling and restoration of mineral workings be a priority use for inert waste materials?
- (iv) How should environmental enhancement be promoted and secured?

Response to Consultation

- 12.7 Consultation responses strongly favoured restoration back to land, with restoration to agriculture the most preferred method. Some thought there should be a presumption for restoration back to the original state. Others advocated habitat creation or recreation, or that a balance of after-uses should be sought. Some considered that restoration back to lakes provides little diversity and is out of keeping with local landscapes. However, reed-bed creation is a priority in the Biodiversity Action Plan. Using sites for geological and other scientific, conservation and educational purposes was also suggested.
- 12.8 Some responses saw restoration as being dependent on geology, hydrogeology and availability of restoration materials. Some thought setting priorities can be prescriptive, so sites should be considered individually to increase diversity. Restoration should be decided on a case by case basis, using factors like location, geology, agricultural land grade, and views of the community and landowner. Involving the local community in restoration projects was considered important. Consultation with local communities and parish councils can achieve well-designed after-use schemes.
- 12.9 Responses supported infilling and restoration of mineral workings as a priority use for inert waste materials, but the type of waste involved and whether it could be recycled, and any traffic impacts should be taken into account. Inert waste sites could be used for habitat restoration.
- 12.10 Responses supported promotion of environmental and biodiversity enhancement through restoration of mineral workings as part of a wider land management strategy. There should be consultation with local communities and parish councils to achieve well-designed schemes and funding for schemes should be obtained from developers.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 12.11 This issue was recently considered in the preparation of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option, based on Structure Plan Policy M1:

Preferred Option 8

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 8

- 12.12 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy policy seeking the progressive restoration of land within reasonable timescales to appropriate after-uses, including guidance on particular types of after-use, in particular aiming to maximise restoration for agriculture, habitat creation, restoration and public access at appropriate locations. The Minerals Sites document will include specific proposals for restoration and after-use at identified sites and the means of securing these in the long-term.

13. Issue 9 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Mineral Working and Supply

Background to Issue

- 13.1 Government policy in MPS1 is that development plans should set out criteria to be used in assessing mineral proposals and in formulating planning conditions, to ensure that operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment or people. The draft South East Plan recognises that mineral working and transport can have an adverse impact on the environment and local amenity, and says that mineral development frameworks should include policies to manage specific impacts such as noise and dust and encourage good site management and effective restoration.
- 13.2 Structure Plan policy M1 says permission will be granted for mineral working at appropriate locations provided it can be demonstrated that any adverse environmental or other impact that the development would be likely to cause is outweighed by the need for the mineral. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan includes policies to protect the environment.

Questions Posed

- 13.3 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions on setting policies and proposals for the working and supply of minerals in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework:
- (i) How should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework ensure developments for mineral working and supply will be environmentally acceptable?
 - (ii) Should standard buffer zone distances for mineral workings be specified in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework or should these distances be set at the planning application stage on a case by case basis, related to the particular circumstances of the proposed development?
 - (iii) How can the Minerals and Waste Development Framework reduce the environmental impact of mineral transport?

Response to Consultation

- 13.4 Consultation responses favour planning policies that promote sustainable development, backed up by site monitoring. Policies should protect Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and local communities from the effects of increased traffic, noise and pollution. Development proposals should be assessed for their impacts in relation to policies.
- 13.5 A majority of respondents favour specifying buffer zones at the planning application stage, on a case by case basis, rather than in

the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. If standard distances are set out in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework they should be able to be varied on a case by case basis. Others consider that strong policies should be set and consistently applied.

- 13.6 Implementation of transport management measures such as using routing agreements for heavy vehicles is suggested. Concerns are raised about weight limits on roads; a reduction in mineral traffic is preferred. The application of the “proximity principle” should reduce impact of traffic. Alternative transport methods such as water and rail are advocated.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 13.7 The Core Strategy can set a policy framework for provision of protection to local residents and other interests of importance from unacceptable impacts caused by mineral working, but the actual measures required to do this at any particular site can only be established when detailed information is available. Setting standards across the board is likely to lead to unnecessary restrictions being imposed and minerals being unnecessarily sterilised in some cases, and inadequate protection measures in others. To be effectively addressed, this issue needs to be considered on a case by case basis at the planning application stage. The Minerals Sites Document and the Minerals and Waste Development Code of Practice should play a role in this. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 9

Provide protection for environmental interests and for local residents and others against unacceptable impacts from mineral working by:

- (a) establishing the need for buffer zones around mineral workings and other mitigation measures on a case by case basis, at the planning application stage; and**
- (b) specifying any buffer zones required and requiring any other necessary mitigation measures when planning permission is granted.**

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 9

- 13.8 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy general policy for the protection of local residents and others, and environmental and other areas and features of importance, from unacceptable impacts and damage from mineral working. More detailed policy will be a matter for the Minerals Sites Document and

the Minerals and Waste Development Code of Practice. Implementation will be through consideration of planning applications, attaching conditions to planning applications and, if necessary, legal agreements accompanying planning permissions.

14. Issue 10 – Safeguarding of Minerals

Background to Issues

- 14.1 Mineral resources can only be worked where they occur naturally. Environmental and other constraints can make it difficult to secure an adequate number of sites for the extraction and processing of minerals to meet economic needs. It is a Government objective that mineral resources should be safeguarded as far as possible; Government policy in MPS1 is that mineral safeguarding areas should be defined to avoid needless sterilisation of proven resources. RPG9 (policy M5) says existing mineral sites, proposed sites and areas of search should be identified and safeguarded in development frameworks. Structure Plan policy M3 seeks to safeguard mineral resources of potential economic importance for possible future use. It is for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework to say how this policy will be implemented in accordance with national, regional and other local policies.

Questions Posed

- 14.2 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions about safeguarding of minerals:
- a) How should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework safeguard mineral resources:
 - (i) by identifying all mineral deposits?
 - (ii) by identifying only those mineral resources that would be economic to work?
 - (iii) by identifying only mineral resources required for the Minerals and Waste Development Framework period?
 - b) Which minerals should be safeguarded in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework:
 - (i) sand and gravel?
 - (ii) limestone and ironstone?
 - (iii) fullers earth?
 - (iv) other minerals?

Response to Consultation

- 14.3 Consultation responses gave mixed views, but identification and safeguarding of all mineral deposits was favoured. The view was expressed that mineral deposits should be safeguarded because they will be needed beyond the duration of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. Minerals identified in RPG9 and the draft South East Plan should be prioritised for safeguarding as well as those that are in greatest demand. Fullers earth is of strategic importance and should also be safeguarded.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 14.4 This issue was considered recently in the preparation of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 (policy M3). RPG9 and the draft South East Plan (policy M5) both include safeguarding of aggregate minerals. They also include safeguarding of clay and chalk, which both occur extensively in Oxfordshire. Apart from some extraction of clay at sand and gravel quarries and landfill sites, there has been no significant working of clay or chalk in Oxfordshire in recent years. Safeguarding of these minerals is unlikely to be necessary. Fullers earth is a scarce mineral that may be of future economic importance; it would be prudent also to safeguard this mineral. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 10

Safeguard mineral resources of potential economic importance for possible future use, in particular sand and gravel, limestone, ironstone and fullers earth.

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 10

- 14.5 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy policy for safeguarding of mineral resources of economic importance. Mineral resources to be safeguarded will be identified in the Minerals Sites Document.

15. Issue 11 – Waste Management Facilities

General Background

- 15.1 A total of approximately 2 million tonnes of waste produced by Oxfordshire's residents, businesses and organisations is managed in the County each year. This comprises municipal (15%), commercial and industrial (43%) and construction and demolition wastes (42%), with smaller quantities of hazardous wastes. This waste all has to be treated and / or disposed of somewhere. At present the main method of management is disposal at local landfill sites. In addition, Oxfordshire has for many years received waste (mainly by rail) from London, which does not have sufficient facilities to deal with all its own waste. Background information on waste issues is set out in Annex B.
- 15.2 It is important that the Minerals and Waste Development Framework makes appropriate provision – through sites and policies – for the new waste management facilities that will be needed to enable a shift from disposal of waste by landfill to recovery of resources from waste, in particular for municipal waste but also for other types of waste.
- 15.3 The Minerals and Waste Development Framework will need to establish the requirements for waste management for different types of waste over the plan period. It will need to establish the level of provision that should be made for each waste management route – recycling, composting, other recovery (treatment) methods and landfill – for the different waste streams, and consequently the requirement for new facilities over the plan period.
- 15.4 The Core Strategy should set a locational strategy for waste management in Oxfordshire. Different strategy options for delivering the required additional waste management provision will need to be considered and assessed.
- 15.5 For the Waste Sites Document it will be necessary to decide for which types and sizes of facilities sites should be identified, and to consider and assess the different site options. The inclusion of locational criteria policies will also need to be considered, including policies for any types of facilities for which it is not practical or appropriate to identify sites.
- 15.6 There is uncertainty as to Oxfordshire's detailed waste management requirements over the new plan period (see Annex B) but it is clear that new waste management facilities will be needed. In particular there will be a significant need for new capacity for recycling, composting and other resource recovery and treatment of waste in order to reduce the quantities of waste disposed by landfill. The draft South East Plan indicates a requirement for additional

capacity for waste recycling, composting and resource recovery in Oxfordshire totalling over 0.6 million tonnes a year by 2015, but this is thought to be an underestimate and will be reviewed when new information becomes available. The Minerals and Waste Development Framework will need to make provision to ensure the facilities that are needed can be delivered.

- 15.7 It is less clear what if any requirement there will be for additional landfill capacity. The draft South East Plan shows there to be no additional requirement at least to 2015, but this will be reassessed when new information on landfill capacity becomes available later this year.

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

Background to Issue

- 15.8 PPS 10 says the core strategy should ensure sufficient opportunities for the provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations, in line with the regional spatial strategy and informed by the municipal waste management strategy. It goes on to say that development plan documents should identify sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities for the waste management needs of the area, in particular sites and areas to support the pattern of waste management facilities, broad locations and apportionment (amount of waste requiring management within the plan area) set out in the regional spatial strategy. Development plan documents should make provision for capacity equivalent to at least 10 years and should identify the types of waste management facility that would be appropriate for allocated sites and areas.
- 15.9 The draft South East Plan (policy W7) says waste planning authorities should provide for an appropriate mix of development opportunities to support the waste management facilities required to achieve targets. In identifying sites, authorities should consider the type, size and mix of facilities required, taking into account activities requiring open sites; activities involving either segregated or mixed materials requiring enclosed industrial premises; and hybrid activities.

Options Considered

- 15.10 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper put forward options relating to the following three aspects of this issue:

- a) The sort of locations the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should identify to provide for the waste management facilities needed:
 - (i) broad locations;
 - (ii) specific site allocations;
 - (iii) combination of broad locations and specific sites;
 - (iv) locational criteria.

- b) How the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should relate locations identified to types of waste management facility:
 - (i) identify locations suitable for and restricted to specified types of facility;
 - (ii) identify locations more generally suitable for a range of types of facility;
 - (iii) rule out particular types of facility that would be unacceptable.

- c) The types of sites for waste treatment that the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should identify:
 - (i) small number of strategic sites for large-scale facilities or integrated groups of facilities;
 - (ii) larger number of more local sites for small-scale facilities;
 - (iii) mix of sites for both large and small facilities.

Response to Consultation

- 15.11 Identification of specific sites for waste management facilities was preferred by most respondents, with some favouring a combination of specific sites and broad locations; but a large number preferred locational criteria for planning applications to be considered against. It was suggested there should be a range in size and location from localised smaller facilities up to large strategic sites near urban areas and the primary road network, to provide flexibility.

- 15.12 A majority of respondents preferred identification of sites that can support a wide range of facilities. But a significant number preferred sites to be restricted to specified types of facilities. Some respondents wished to see particular types of facility ruled out, such as in-vessel composting and incinerators.

- 15.13 Opinion was split between the three options for sizes of sites. Some preferred a mix of sites for both large scale and small scale facilities, as there is demand for local waste centres from which waste could be sent elsewhere for treatment. This would improve recycling and recovery levels and reduce traffic impact. Some respondents felt the size of a facility should be related to its location and the types of waste it will be handling and that, although larger

facilities are more commercially viable, a hierarchy of sites is needed to handle different types of waste

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 15.14 The appraisal concluded that identification of site specific allocations in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework would be the most sustainable option. However, the other two approaches (broad locations and locational criteria) would allow flexibility. Therefore it is considered that a combination of the three options (criteria, identification of broad areas and actual site selection) may be the most appropriate sustainable strategy.
- 15.15 The appraisal did not reach a clear conclusion on which would be the overall best strategy on how to provide new waste management facilities. A flexible approach which does not restrict the types of waste management facility at a site was supported; but the best solution may be a combination of approaches, with some sites specified for certain types of facility and other sites proposed for a more general range of facilities.
- 15.16 The appraisal recommended the option of a small number of larger sites which could accommodate strategic and / or integrated management facilities. However, this option is heavily dependent on the transport effects being sustainable.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 15.17 Identification of appropriate sites will provide security for industry to invest in waste management facilities, helping to ensure targets for diversion of waste from landfill are met. Identifying sites will also help ensure development takes place at appropriate locations and conformity with national and regional policy. Including broad areas for facilities to serve communities will allow flexibility in the siting of facilities, especially where ideal sites are not forthcoming. This should ensure sufficient opportunities for the provision of waste management facilities in appropriate locations, in conformity with national and regional policy. Identification of areas could also encourage developers to come forward with alternative sites previously not available. If areas are not identified for waste treatment facilities this will limit the flexibility of the plan and will reduce the potential to deliver appropriate and needed facilities. Not identifying areas could also limit new sites coming forward and potentially reduce the choice of available sites. Identification of areas and sites will be subject to sustainability appraisal, including strategic environmental assessment.

- 15.18 Identifying locations that are generally suitable for a range of facilities would accord with national policy, allow for the emergence of new waste technologies and provide flexibility for the type of waste facilities to be provided. It would also allow flexibility within the plan to provide an appropriate mix of development opportunities to achieve the targets while also allowing the opportunity to move waste up the hierarchy and create opportunities for landfill, recycling, composting and recovery targets to be met.
- 15.19 Planning only for specific types of facilities could restrict the evolving development of new technologies by reducing the flexibility of the plan to accommodate future changes and developments. Identifying locations suitable for a range of facility types will provide the opportunity for new technologies to come forward. Restricting sites to specified types of facilities where there are sound planning reasons will ensure appropriate development and give assurances to local communities.
- 15.20 Providing for a mix of facilities will provide the flexibility needed to create a strong, robust infrastructure for sustainable waste management. Providing for a range of facilities will allow the opportunity for waste to be treated locally, in line with national policy. This will also allow the development and implementation of strategic scale facilities dealing with waste that cannot be treated locally and that are more dependent on economies of scale, and will help ensure recycling, recovery and landfill reduction targets are met.
- 15.21 Providing sites for only small scale facilities would limit the types of technology that could be implemented and could result in insufficient waste treatment capacity to achieve targets for landfill reduction. But identifying only a few strategic sites would also limit the types of facility and the potential for local waste treatment and increase the transport of waste across the County. Identifying locations where potential integrated waste management facilities could be located would be in line with regional policy and support the sustainable management and transport of waste. Identifying such locations would help bring together potentially co-existing beneficial facilities and industry.
- 15.22 The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 11a(i), 11a(ii) and 11a(iii)

- 11a(i) Identify specific sites in the Waste Sites Document, particularly for strategic facilities; and indicate broad areas where more local facilities will be needed to serve communities or where specific sites cannot be identified. Support identified sites and areas with locational criteria policies.**
- 11a(ii) Identify locations that are generally suitable for a range of facilities, to provide flexibility and allow for evolving waste management technology; but where there are sound planning reasons for doing so, restrict locations to specified types of facility.**
- 11a(iii) Provide for a mix of sites for both large and small scale facilities. For large-scale facilities, identify specific sites in the Waste Sites Document; and for smaller-scale facilities, for which identification of sites is likely to be more difficult, include locational criteria policies.**

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 11a(i), 11a(ii) and 11a(iii).

- 15.23 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy to deliver these preferred options in general terms, including provision for waste management to 2026;
 - strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for mineral working;
- 15.24 Detailed delivery will be through the Waste Sites Document, which will identify sites for waste management for the period to at least 2019 and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

Issue 11b – Where Waste Management Facilities should be Located

Background to Issues

- 15.25 PPS10 says waste planning authorities should consider: opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises; and a broad range of locations including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate facilities. The suitability of sites and areas should be assessed against:
- the extent to which they support the policies in PPS10;
 - physical and environmental constraints on development;
 - the cumulative effect of waste disposal facilities on the local community;
 - the capacity of transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste and products from resource recovery.
- Priority should be given to re-use of previously developed land and redundant agricultural buildings and curtilages.
- 15.26 The draft South East Plan (policy W17) states that priority should be given to expanding suitable existing waste management sites with good transport connections, and that the suitability of existing and potential new sites should be assessed on the basis of:
- good accessibility from existing urban areas and planned new development;
 - good transport connections, including rail or water where possible;
 - compatible land uses – active mineral workings; industrial land; contaminated or derelict land; land adjoining sewage works; or redundant farm buildings and curtilages;
 - capability of meeting local environmental and amenity criteria.
- 15.27 The draft South East Plan (policy W17) also states that waste facilities should not be precluded in Green Belt where this is the nearest appropriate location, there are no alternative sites and the objectives of the designation would not be harmed. In exceptional circumstances small-scale facilities for local needs should not be precluded in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The types of facilities that could be included are construction and demolition waste recycling; household waste recycling sites; in-vessel composting; anaerobic digestion; and transfer stations.
- 15.28 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 does not specify locational factors for waste management facilities, except that policy WM2 refers to the proximity principle. Paragraph 12.15 says waste management facilities should be located close to where waste is produced and that in considering where facilities should be located other relevant Structure Plan policies will be taken into account,

including policies on transport, protecting and enhancing the environment, and the Green Belt.

Options Considered

- 15.29 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper put forward options relating to the following three aspects of this issue:
- a) The strategy for locating waste treatment facilities that should form the basis for identifying sites in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework:
 - (i) locate within or close to the main urban areas;
 - (ii) locate in more rural locations, away from centres of population.

 - b) The sort of sites the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should identify for waste treatment facilities:
 - (i) sites on industrial or employment land;
 - (ii) sites at existing waste management facilities;
 - (iii) sites on previously developed land in the countryside;
 - (iv) greenfield sites.

 - c) The type of location the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should identify in relation to the Oxford Green Belt:
 - (i) only identify locations either in urban areas or in areas of countryside outside the Green Belt;
 - (ii) identify suitable locations within the Green Belt as well

Response to Consultation

- 15.30 A large majority of respondents preferred facilities to be located within or close to the main urban areas; but there was recognition that some sites may need to be located in rural areas due to the potential effects of treatment of certain types of waste, although these should still be close to settlements. There was concern about locating facilities in Green Belt or in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Some respondents considered a mix of locations appropriate.
- 15.31 Use of existing waste management sites is strongly preferred, although significant numbers of respondents favour brownfield sites or industrial / employment land. Very few respondents favour greenfield locations. Use of other sites such as redundant farm and horticultural sites and old airfields is also suggested.
- 15.32 A small majority of respondents preferred locating facilities either in urban areas or countryside outside of the Green Belt; but there was also significant support for suitable sites within the Green Belt,

provided that selection criteria are met. Concerns were raised that adequate transport infrastructure should be in place.

- 15.33 This issue was considered by the Minerals and Waste Stakeholder Forum. The Forum gave support in principle for a sequential approach to locating waste treatment facilities, encouraging locations within or close to urban areas in preference to locations further away from sources of waste. A sequential approach would recognise the difficulty of finding sites within or close to urban areas. There are also concerns about the acceptability of locating waste facilities in urban areas.
- 15.34 The Forum also supported a sequential approach to the type of land identified for waste treatment facilities, but there were differences of view as to whether existing waste management sites or industrial / employment land should be the most preferred type of site. There was concern about prolonging and expanding the use of temporary sites. There was also concern about having a single policy to cover all types and sizes of facility. The impacts of the particular facility proposed would need to be considered before identifying suitable sites. It was agreed that existing waste management sites and industrial / employment land should be preferred to sites in the countryside, and that brownfield sites should be preferred to Greenfield. But consideration also needs to be given to the need for facilities to serve rural communities, to avoid waste having to be transported long distances to facilities in urban areas.
- 15.35 The Forum was concerned about locating waste treatment facilities in the Green Belt but thought that, due to the difficulty in finding sites, Green Belt locations should be considered after other feasible locations have been investigated. A sequential approach should be applied to assessment of Green Belt sites. But the acceptability of sites in the Green Belt would also depend on the type of facility being proposed; some would be more acceptable than others.

Results from Interim Sustainability Appraisal

- 15.36 The appraisal recommended locating waste facilities in or close to urban areas. The disadvantages of this (conflict with potential housing sites, noise and air pollution) are assessed to be relatively minor in relation to the benefits (less distance to travel, potential for combined heat and power and higher likelihood of development on brownfield land).
- 15.37 The appraisal concluded that the suitability of sites depends on factors such as the type of technology, size of facility, size of site and the density of surrounding human population. Each site must be assessed on its own merits. It was highlighted that for all options the impact upon the flood plain must be considered.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 15.38 The main argument for following a strategy of locating facilities in or close to urban areas is that it would enable most waste to be treated close to where it is produced, thereby encouraging more sustainable waste management. Locating waste treatment facilities in more rural locations, away from centres of population will cause waste to be transported further to be treated.
- 15.39 Recognising the fact that it may be difficult to identify sufficient sites, employing a sequential approach to site location will allow flexibility for site identification and provide more opportunity to increase treatment capacity and help meet targets. But it will be necessary to ensure appropriate development at individual locations. Not employing a sequential approach would limit site options, making it more difficult to ensure sufficient capacity to reach targets.
- 15.40 Accepting appropriate development of waste facilities within the Green Belt would increase opportunities to provide waste treatment facilities close to Oxford, especially in view of the likely shortage of suitable sites within the urban area. Therefore waste facilities should not be precluded in the Green Belt where this would be the nearest appropriate location, where there are no alternative sites and where the objectives of the designation will not be harmed. But this approach must accord with national and regional policy for the Green Belt.
- 15.41 The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 11b

Locate waste treatment facilities within or close to urban areas, subject to availability of suitable land.

In view of the difficulty of finding sites for waste facilities, locate waste facilities using the following sequential approach:

- urban areas; close to urban areas; rural areas**

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

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

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 11b

- 15.42 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy expressing the sequential approach to locating sites for waste management facilities in this preferred option;
 - strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for waste management facilities.
- 15.43 Detailed delivery will be through the Waste Sites Document, which will identify sites for waste management facilities and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

16. Issue 12 – Moving up the Waste Hierarchy

Background to Issues

16.1 A key objective of PPS10 is to prepare and deliver planning strategies that help deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy, addressing waste as a resource and looking to disposal as the last option. The waste hierarchy is defined in the Government's Waste Strategy 2000 (amended July 2005) as:

- Reduction;
- Re-use;
- Recycling & Composting;
- Energy Recovery;
- Disposal.

Questions Posed

16.2 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions on setting policies and making provision in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for the sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:

- (i) What can the plan do to help move waste management up the hierarchy?
- (ii) Should disposal (landfill) provision be restricted to encourage waste management methods higher up the hierarchy?
- (iii) Should the plan over-provide for recycling and recovery facilities?
- (iv) Should the plan aim to meet (or exceed) national / regional targets for recycling and diversion from landfill; or should it set local targets?

Response to Consultation

16.3 Respondents thought raising commercial and public awareness through education and advertising to be important and should tie in with the introduction of policies for waste audits and county targets. Locally based small-scale recycling facilities could be installed at new large-scale developments to maximise provision for recycling and recovery in suitable locations. Applications for new developments should be monitored to ensure environmental, social and economic factors are integrated.

16.4 A large majority of respondents supported restricting landfill provision to encourage methods further up the waste hierarchy. But there was recognition that some landfill will always be needed and there should be flexibility of provision.

16.5 A large majority support over-provision for recycling and recovery; but this should be monitored in terms of facility development and

cost. But the view is also expressed that over-provision may result in facilities that are not practical economically, and allocated sites not being developed.

- 16.6 A majority of respondents support meeting or exceeding targets for recycling and diversion from landfill; and some think the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should set higher local targets. There is some concern about the increasing cost of meeting targets.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 16.7 The County Council proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 12a(i), 12a(ii) and 12a(iii)

- 12a(i) Encourage and enable the movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy and ensure there is adequate provision of a range of waste management facilities to meet needs, including suitable facilities for local communities.**
- 12a(ii) Limit landfill provision in line with national and regional policy and landfill targets, whilst recognising there will be a continued need for some landfill.**
- 12a(iii) Make provision for at least the minimum capacity required to meet national and regional policy targets for recycling, recovery and diversion from landfill, through positive policies and identification of sites. Provide a positive policy framework to enable advantage to be taken of any appropriate opportunities that may arise to increase capacity. The regional targets should be used as a guide to the minimum level of provision that is required.**

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 12a(i), 12a(ii) and 12a(iii)

- 16.8 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy that permission will be granted for waste management facilities that are needed in Oxfordshire at appropriate locations to deal with the waste that has to be managed and to enable targets for recycling, recovery and reduction in landfill to be met;
 - policy to encourage provision of facilities higher up the waste management hierarchy, to promote use of waste as a resource rather than disposal;

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

- policy to limit supply of landfill to only what is needed to dispose of waste that is not reused, recycled or recovered;
- the provision required for waste treatment (recycling and recovery) in Oxfordshire over the Core Strategy period;
- strategic criteria to be considered in determining whether locations are appropriate for waste treatment facilities.

16.9 Detailed delivery will be through the Waste Sites Document, which will identify sites for waste management facilities and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

17. Issue 13 – Provision of Facilities and Capacity for Waste Management

Background to Issue

- 17.1 The draft South East Plan promotes regional self-sufficiency in waste management. Policy W3 states that waste management capacity should be provided equivalent to waste arising and requiring management within the region plus a declining amount of waste from London. Policy W4 states that waste planning authorities should plan for net self-sufficiency by making provision for waste management capacity equivalent to the waste arisings within their area plus, where appropriate, some provision for waste from London and adjoining counties.

Questions Posed

- 17.2 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper set out the following questions on how provision should be made in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for waste management facilities:
- (i) Should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework provide only for Oxfordshire's waste?
 - (ii) Should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework provide for net self-sufficiency, to allow local cross county boundary movements?
 - (iii) Should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework make additional provision for waste from elsewhere (in and / or beyond the region), particularly from London? If so, should this be just for landfill or should it be for treatment facilities as well?
 - (iv) How much provision should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework make for landfill, recycling, composting, and other waste treatment facilities?
 - (v) Should the waste management capacity requirements for Oxfordshire in the Regional Spatial Strategy be used, or should local capacity requirements be established?

Response to Consultation

- 17.3 A small majority of respondents think the Minerals and Waste Development Framework should not provide for just Oxfordshire's waste, in line with RPG9 and the draft South East Plan; but an almost equal number believe it should provide only for Oxfordshire's waste. Concerns are raised about implications for the Green Belt. There is strong support for net self-sufficiency. Some respondents note that Oxfordshire exports waste as well as importing it, and that cross-boundary movements are inevitable. Cross-boundary movements are preferred if this is more efficient in terms of transport impacts.

- 17.4 A majority of respondents consider that additional provision should not be made for waste from elsewhere. Concerns are raised about effects on the Green Belt and the environment. The view is expressed that waste should be accepted only if it would be useful as a fuel resource or if the County would benefit.
- 17.5 Landfill should be secondary to recycling, composting and other waste treatment facilities. It is suggested that landfill should be around 30% of the provision, with 70% for other methods. Other views are that there should be flexibility and provision should be responsive to locally gathered data, but that this should accord with the draft South East Plan. There is also a view that using planning policy to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy by restricting landfill will increase transport distances and prices rather than encourage waste treatment. A majority of respondents consider that requirements set in the draft South East Plan should be used but they should be monitored and performance checked. But a significant number favour establishing local capacity requirements

Proposed Preferred Options

- 17.6 A preferred option of providing for net self-sufficiency would allow for realistic development of waste facilities in Oxfordshire while supporting sustainable transport of waste on or near the county boundary. Planning for dealing only with Oxfordshire's waste would be impractical, since some cross boundary movement is inevitable and also helps to reduce transport distances. It would be contrary to one of the key principles of national policy of enabling waste to be disposed at one of the nearest appropriate installations. Oxfordshire has more landfill capacity available and more suitable geology for landfill than most other south east counties. But management of additional waste from elsewhere at sites in Oxfordshire should be limited and should reduce over time, to limit the additional impact on Oxfordshire and long-distance movement of waste, especially from London. Provision should be made only for what is required under regional policy.
- 17.7 The use of the capacity requirements for Oxfordshire in the draft South East Plan would ensure conformity with national and regional policy. Inclusion of policies that support national, regional and county recycling, recovery and landfill diversion targets will help in meeting these targets and promote more sustainable waste management. Local capacity requirements could be established for municipal waste as good information is available, but lack of accurate county level data for commercial and industrial and construction and demolition wastes is currently a barrier to setting realistic local capacity requirements more generally. Local assumptions about waste management requirements for municipal waste are used in the Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Strategy,

but these may not be appropriate for establishing capacity requirements for spatial planning in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. It is important to ensure there will be sufficient capacity to deal with the waste arising. The predictions of waste production in the Municipal Waste Strategy are aspirational and may not give sufficient certainty. Therefore it is proposed to use the capacity requirements in the draft South East Plan. But this should be kept under review.

- 17.8 The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 13(i), 13(ii) and 13(iii)

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 13(i), 13(ii) and 13(iii)

- 17.9 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy that provision will be made and permission granted for waste management facilities at appropriate locations to deal with an amount of waste equivalent to that produced in Oxfordshire, plus a share of the waste from London taken by the South East Region, in line with regional policy;
 - the provision required for waste treatment (recycling and recovery) in Oxfordshire over the Core Strategy period, based on regional policy;
 - policy to encourage and make sufficient provision for recycling, composting and other waste treatment to meet targets in regional policy;

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

- policy to limit supply of landfill to only what is needed to dispose of waste that is not reused, recycled or recovered.

18. Issue 14 – Methodology for Identification and Assessment of Sites for Waste Management Facilities

Background to Issues

- 18.1 The Government's policy on identifying suitable sites and areas for waste management facilities includes criteria defined in PPS10 (Annex E) which lists the following locational factors which should be considered in testing the suitability of sites against those criteria: protection of water resources; land instability; visual intrusion; nature conservation; historic environment and built heritage; traffic and access; air emissions including dust; odours; vermin and birds; noise and vibration; litter; and potential land use conflict. Government policy in PPS10 on location of waste management facilities is also referred to in paragraph 15.25 above.
- 18.2 The draft South East Plan (policy W17) lists characteristics which should form the basis of assessment of the suitability of sites for waste management facilities, as referred to in paragraph 15.26 and 15.27 above. Policies on location of waste management facilities in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 are summarised in paragraph 15.28 above.

Questions Posed

- 18.3 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions about identifying and assessing options for the location of sites for waste management facilities for inclusion in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework:
- (i) What factors or criteria should be used to identify and assess site options?
 - (ii) Should different factors or criteria be weighted differently? If so, how?
 - (iii) What weight should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people?
 - (iv) What weight should be given to access and proximity to waste source?

Response to Consultation

- 18.4 Respondents thought the factors and criteria used for assessing waste management site options should be broadly similar to those used for the assessment of mineral working sites. Transportation and avoiding residential areas are factors of particular concern to many respondents. Locating sites close to waste source will reduce the effects of transportation. There are concerns about locating sites in the countryside, especially in Green Belt or in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Criteria should take into account impact on the environment and local community. There is some support for the criteria in the RPG9 and the draft South East Plan.

- 18.5 Respondents have differing views on the weighting of factors and criteria. Proximity to waste source, protection of water resources, nature conservation areas, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and emissions are put forward for high weightings, and some think the hierarchy of environmental designations should be taken into account. Opinion is divided on the weight that should be given to environmental designations compared with impact on people, but many respondents see no conflict and wish to see equal weighting given. Some are of the view that giving weight to environmental designations can minimise the effect on local populations as well as protect important areas. Some think that weighting depends on local circumstances.
- 18.6 Most respondents think high priority should be given to access and proximity to waste source, provided this is reasonable taking into account other factors. Because of transport impacts, sites should be near urban areas and close to the waste source; this would also avoid the countryside and environmental designations.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 18.7 This issue was recently considered in the preparation of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 in relation to mineral working. The County Council proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 14

Include a policy for identification of appropriate locations for waste management facilities based on principles similar to those included in Structure Plan Policy M2:

In identifying appropriate locations, account will be taken of the existing pattern of waste management facilities; proximity to main sources of waste and destinations for outputs from waste treatment processes; accessibility to the main transport routes; risk of birdstrike (for landfill); restoration and afteruse potential (for landfill); and development plan policies, in particular which seek to safeguard:

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

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 14

- 18.8 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy policy setting out strategic criteria for the location of waste management facilities based on principles similar to those included in Structure Plan Policy M2. These criteria will be used in the assessment of sites for identification in the Waste Sites Document.

19. Issue 15 – Landfill

Background to Issues

- 19.1 Disposal of waste is the management route at the bottom of the waste hierarchy. However, PPS10 points out that, whilst planning strategies should look to disposal as the last option, it is one that must be adequately catered for. There will always be some waste that cannot physically or practicably be re-used, recycled or have resources recovered from it and there will always be some residues from resource recovery processes that will have to be subject to disposal. The main means of waste disposal is landfill.
- 19.2 RPG9 (policy W13) states that waste development plan documents should provide for continuing but declining landfill capacity, and that non-inert landfill capacity should be husbanded for disposal of residual non-inert waste. The draft South East Plan shows a surplus of landfill capacity in Oxfordshire at 2015, even taking into account imports from London; however this position needs to be re-assessed.
- 19.3 Landfill is now classified as inert, non-hazardous or hazardous. What was previously called non-inert landfill is now mainly classified as non-hazardous (landfill that can take municipal waste and most commercial and industrial waste). There is currently no hazardous landfill capacity in Oxfordshire.
- 19.4 On hazardous waste, the Draft South East Plan identifies a need for a sub-regional network of landfill cells for stabilised non-reactive hazardous wastes such as contaminated soils and asbestos.
- 19.5 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 does not specify locational factors for waste management facilities (including landfill) but does state that permission will be granted to ensure sufficient capacity for the management of Oxfordshire's waste (policy WM2). The Structure Plan also states that permission for landfill will be granted only where it is required for the restoration of active or unrestored mineral workings to appropriate after-uses or where there would be an overall environmental benefit (policy WM3).
- 19.6 Compared with most other counties in the South East, Oxfordshire has a large remaining permitted capacity for landfill. This includes significant capacity for non hazardous landfill, which is mostly at four mineral working sites, at Alkerton, Ardley, Stanton Harcourt (Dix Pit) and Sutton Courtenay. The Sutton Courtenay site takes significant quantities of waste from London, transported by rail.

Questions Posed

- 19.7 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions on how provision should be made in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for more sustainable management of waste in Oxfordshire:
- (i) How much provision should be made for further landfill of waste?
 - (ii) Should landfill provision be restricted only to residues from waste treatment processes?
 - (iii) Should landfill provision for inert waste be restricted only to restoration of mineral workings?
 - (iv) Should existing landfill void that is not currently needed be safeguarded for future landfill use, or should such sites should be restored more quickly in some other way?

Response to Consultations

- 19.8 Most respondents do not wish to see any increase in provision for landfill; rather, they favour continued encouragement of recycling to reduce the requirement for landfill. But many respondents recognise that population growth, housing provision and the requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy should be taken into account. A majority of respondents consider that landfill provision should be restricted to residues.
- 19.9 A majority of respondents think landfill of inert waste should be restricted to restoration of mineral workings. But there is some concern that waste management licence restrictions are inhibiting the use of inert waste in restoration and resulting in it going to unlicensed sites.
- 19.10 A majority of respondents think safeguarding of landfill void for future use is important since landfill is decreasing nationally as a resource, but some favour quick restoration of landfill sites.

Proposed Preferred Options

- 19.11 Provision for landfill should be limited and should be in line with national and regional targets for reduction in landfilling of waste. Only the minimum provision required to meet needs should be made. But it should be recognised that there will always be a need for landfill and some flexibility in provision will be needed. Restricting landfill unduly could lead to waste having to be transported outside the County for disposal, involving longer transport distances and being contrary to the principle of net self sufficiency in waste management provision.

- 19.12 Giving priority to use of inert waste for restoration of mineral workings would ensure constructive use of a limited resource and help ensure appropriate and high quality restoration of workings where backfilling is required. Priority for the use of inert waste for quarry restoration would support proposed policy for restoration of mineral workings. In particular it would help secure appropriate restoration in areas where restoration to water bodies is not acceptable, e.g. because of bird strike risk to aircraft within aerodrome safeguarding areas.
- 19.13 Safeguarding existing landfill void for future use would help ensure that waste disposal continues to be an option in Oxfordshire over the long term, supporting the principle of net self sufficiency. Protecting landfill void as a resource for the future would recognise that there will always be a need for landfill and also that landfill void in Oxfordshire is a regional asset. This would be in line with regional policy.
- 19.14 The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred options:

Preferred Options 15(i), 15(ii) and 15(iii)

- 15(i) Make provision for landfill in line with national and regional policy targets; over time this should increasingly limit landfill to waste that has been subject to treatment, whilst recognising the continued need for some landfill capacity.**
- 15(ii) Give priority to use of inert waste for restoration of mineral workings. No provision should be made for other types of inert waste landfill and policy for new landfill should include a strong test of need for use of inert waste other than for restoring mineral workings.**
- 15(iii) Generally safeguard existing landfill void for future use.**

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Options 15(i), 15(ii) and 15(iii)

- 19.15 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy:
- policy to make sufficient provision for landfill in line with national and regional policy, but to limit supply of landfill to what is needed to dispose of waste that is not subject to treatment;
 - the provision required for landfill in Oxfordshire over the Core Strategy period, based on regional policy;

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

- policy for inert waste that is not recycled to be used only in the restoration of mineral workings unless use elsewhere is justified by overriding need or benefit to be gained;
- policy generally to safeguard existing landfill void for future use.

19.16 Detailed delivery will be through the Waste Sites Document, which will identify any appropriate sites for landfill required for the period to at least 2019 and include more detailed criteria for the consideration of planning applications.

20. Issue 16 – Minimising the Environmental Impacts of Waste Management

Background to Issues

- 20.1 PPS10 says planning strategies should help secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health or harming the environment, and should enable waste to be disposed at one of the nearest appropriate installations.
- 20.2 The draft South East Plan (policies W16 and W17) states that development plan document policies should aim to reduce the transport and associated impacts of waste movement and that the suitability of sites for waste management facilities should be assessed on the basis of capability of meeting a range of locally based environmental and amenity criteria.
- 20.3 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 (policy WM2) states that waste management facilities will be permitted having regard to the principle of best practicable environmental option, including the waste hierarchy and proximity principle, and (paragraph 12.15) that other relevant policies of the Plan will be taken into account in considering where waste management facilities should be located, including policies on transport and protecting and enhancing the environment.

Questions Posed

- 20.4 The Issues and Options Consultation Paper posed the following questions about setting policies and proposals in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for the management of waste:
- (i) How should the Minerals and Waste Development Framework ensure that waste management developments will be environmentally acceptable?
 - (ii) How can the Minerals and Waste Development Framework reduce the environmental impact of waste transport?

Response to Consultation

- 20.5 There was a wide range of opinion in consultation responses, including the following different views:
- Green Belt and protected landscapes like Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be given more importance in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework;
 - smaller local sites can reduce the impact of waste management;
 - the impact of developments should be minimised by concentrating on those higher up the waste hierarchy;
 - developments incorporating recycling schemes may help; and
 - local communities should be involved in investigating and assessing proposals and setting standards.

- 20.6 Some respondents thought larger integrated facilities, combining sorting, recycling and recovery, can reduce the impact of transport. Some suggested planning conditions be imposed to ensure alternative transport methods or include routing agreements for road traffic. Some said the “proximity principle” should be applied.

Proposed Preferred Option

- 20.7 The Core Strategy can set a policy framework for provision of protection to local residents and other interests of importance from unacceptable impacts caused by waste management facilities, but the actual measures required to do this at any particular site can only be established when detailed information is available. Setting standards across the board is likely to lead to unnecessary restrictions being imposed in some cases and inadequate protection measures in others. To be effectively addressed, this issue needs to be considered on a case by case basis at the planning application stage, although the Waste Sites Document and the Minerals and Waste Development Code of Practice should also play a role in this. The County Council therefore proposes the following preferred option:

Preferred Option 16

Provide protection for environmental interests and for local residents and others against unacceptable impacts from waste management facilities by:

- (a) establishing the need for mitigation measures on a case by case basis, at the planning application stage; and**
- (b) requiring any necessary mitigation measures when planning permission is granted.**

Proposed Policy to deliver Preferred Option 16

- 20.8 The County Council proposes to include in the Core Strategy general policy for the protection of local residents and others and of environmental and other areas and features of importance from unacceptable impacts and damage from waste management development. More detailed policy will be a matter for the Waste Sites Document and the Minerals and Waste Code of Practice. Implementation will be through consideration of planning applications, attaching conditions to planning applications and, if necessary, legal agreements accompanying planning permissions.

Annex A – Provision Needed for Aggregates Supply

A.1 All Sand and Gravel

Annual level of provision required = 1.82 million tonnes per annum
(RPG9, Policy M3)

Permitted reserves at end 2005 (7.05 million tonnes)
+ resolutions to grant permission subject to legal agreement
(1.84 million tonnes)
= 8.89 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2026:
1.82 million tonnes per annum X 21 years = 38.22 million tonnes
38.22 million tonnes – 8.89 million tonnes = 29.33 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2019:
1.82 million tonnes per annum X 14 years = 25.48 million tonnes
25.48 million tonnes – 8.89 million tonnes = 16.59 million tonnes

A.2 Soft Sand

Annual level of provision required =
1.82 million tonnes per annum X 17% = 0.31 million tonnes per
annum
(Preferred Option 2b)

Permitted reserves at end 2005 (0.98 million tonnes)
+ resolutions to grant permission subject to legal agreement
(0.47 million tonnes)
= 1.45 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2026:
0.31 million tonnes per annum X 21 years = 6.51 million tonnes
6.51 million tonnes – 1.45 million tonnes = 5.06 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2019:
0.31 million tonnes per annum X 14 years = 4.34 million tonnes
4.34 million tonnes – 1.45 million tonnes = 2.89 million tonnes

A.3 Sharp Sand and Gravel

Annual level of provision required =
1.82 million tonnes per annum X 83% = 1.51 million tonnes per annum
(Preferred Option 2b)

Permitted reserves at end 2005 (6.07 million tonnes)
+ resolutions to grant permission subject to legal agreement
(1.37 million tonnes)
= 7.44 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2026:
1.51 million tonnes per annum X 21 years = 31.71 million tonnes
31.71 million tonnes – 7.44 million tonnes = 24.27 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2019:
1.51 million tonnes per annum X 14 years = 21.14 million tonnes
21.14 million tonnes – 7.44 million tonnes = 13.70 million tonnes

A.4 Crushed Rock

Annual level of provision required = 1.0 million tonnes per annum
(RPG9, Policy M3)

Permitted reserves at end 2005 (13.70 million tonnes)
+ resolutions to grant permission subject to legal agreement
(0.54 million tonnes)
= 14.24 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2026:
1.0 million tonnes per annum X 21 years = 21.0 million tonnes
21.0 million tonnes – 14.24 million tonnes = 6.76 million tonnes

Provision required 2006 – 2019:
1.0 million tonnes per annum X 14 years = 14.0 million tonnes
14.0 million tonnes – 14.24 million tonnes = 0 million tonnes

Annex B – Background to Waste Issues for Oxfordshire

European and national policy drivers and targets

- B.1 Planning for waste management in Oxfordshire will be shaped by a number of regulatory instruments and policy measures at European, national and regional levels. The EU Waste Framework Directive sets out general requirements for waste management across the Community, including key objectives for control of waste management and disposal and the promotion of waste prevention, re-use, recycling and recovery. This includes a hierarchy of waste management routes to guide decisions, which is set out in the Government's Waste Strategy 2000 (as amended July 2005) as:
- Reduction;
 - Re-use;
 - Recycling & Composting;
 - Energy Recovery;
 - Disposal.
- B.2 There are also a number of daughter Directives that implement various aspects of the Waste Framework Directive. In particular, the Landfill Directive introduces restrictions on the type and quantities of wastes that may be landfilled. It progressively limits the amount of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) that can be landfilled. This presents what is probably the biggest waste management and planning challenge faced in Oxfordshire, and is expected to be a key driver in moving waste management up the hierarchy. The targets for the UK are:
- by 2010 to reduce BMW landfilled to 75% of that produced in 1995;
 - by 2013 to reduce BMW landfilled to 50% of that produced in 1995; and
 - by 2020 to reduce BMW landfilled to 35% of that produced in 1995.
- B.3 To ensure these targets are met, the Government has introduced the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme. This sets allowances for landfill of biodegradable municipal waste for each waste disposal authority for each year to 2020. (The County Council is the waste disposal authority for Oxfordshire.) The amount of Oxfordshire's biodegradable municipal waste that may be landfilled annually (without fines being incurred) should decrease from the current level of around 143,000 tonnes to no more than about 57,000 tonnes by 2020. This will require higher levels of waste minimisation and recycling and the provision of new waste treatment facilities to divert waste from landfill. This challenge is set in the context of a general trend of increasing arisings of waste.
- B.4 The Landfill Directive also requires landfills to be classified as hazardous, non-hazardous or inert, and only to accept wastes in

the appropriate category. As a result there are now fewer landfills that can take non-hazardous waste (municipal and most commercial & industrial wastes) and far fewer landfill sites that can take hazardous waste. There are currently no hazardous waste landfill sites in Oxfordshire.

- B.5 The Government's Waste Strategy 2000 (as amended July 2005) is a national waste strategy for England and Wales that reflects the requirements of the EU Directives. It includes key waste management principles that should underpin all waste management decisions and sets targets for managing waste in a more sustainable way. These include the following national targets for recovery of resources from municipal waste and for recycling and composting of household waste:
- To recover value from 40% of municipal waste by 2005;
 - To recover value from 45% of municipal waste by 2010; and
 - To recover value from 67% of municipal waste by 2015.
(Recovery includes recycling, composting, other forms of material recovery and energy recovery.)
- To recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005;
- To recycle or compost at least 30% of household waste by 2010; and
- To recycle or compost at least 33% of household waste by 2015.
- B.6 Subsequently the Government has set targets for recycling and composting of household waste for all local authorities. For Oxfordshire a target of 33% was set for 2005/06. This target was met.
- B.7 The only target in Waste Strategy 2000 for other waste streams is:
- By 2005 to reduce the amount of industrial and commercial waste sent to landfill to 85% of that landfilled in 1998.
- B.8 In February 2006 the Government published a consultation document on a Review of England's Waste Strategy, which proposes higher targets. The outcome of that review is currently awaited.
- B.9 Government planning policy for waste management is set out in PPS10 'Planning for Sustainable Waste Management' (July 2005). This sets out key planning objectives and decision making principles, and the Government's policy on how development plans should make provision for waste management facilities. PPS10 is accompanied by 'Planning for Sustainable Waste Management: Companion Guide to Planning Policy Statement 10' (June 2006), which provide information and advice to support the implementation of PPS10.

- B.10 The key planning objectives for planning authorities in PPS10 are to prepare and deliver planning strategies that:
- drive waste management up the waste hierarchy, address waste as a resource and look to disposal as the last option;
 - provide for communities to take more responsibility for their waste and enable provision of waste facilities to meet the needs of communities;
 - help implement the national waste strategy and targets;
 - help secure recovery or disposal of waste without danger to health or harm to the environment and enable waste to be disposed at one of the nearest appropriate installations;
 - reflect the concerns, interests and needs of communities, waste authorities and business and encourage competitiveness;
 - protect green belts but give significant weight to the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities;
 - ensure the design and layout of new development supports sustainable waste management.

Regional policies and targets

- B.11 Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) – Waste and Minerals Alterations, June 2006 sets out policies for provision of waste management facilities in the region. With a few amendments, these policies have been included in the draft South East Plan that was submitted by SEERA to the Government in March 2006 and published for consultation.
- B.12 The draft South East Plan (March 2006) sets regional targets for increased diversion of waste from landfill, and for recycling and composting. Policy W5 says waste planning authorities should put policies and proposals in place to deliver these targets through the following processes, giving priority to those higher up this waste hierarchy.
- re-use;
 - recycling;
 - mechanical and / or biological processing;
 - thermal treatment.
- In addition, sufficient landfill capacity should be provided for waste that cannot practicably be recovered.
- B.13 A key policy thrust of the draft South East Plan is that waste planning authorities should plan for net self-sufficiency, by making provision for waste management capacity equivalent to the amount of waste arising and requiring management within their areas (policy W4). This should include appropriate provision for waste from London and other adjoining areas. The draft South East Plan

Oxfordshire MWDF Core Strategy Preferred Options

sets out the waste management capacity and landfill requirements for each waste planning authority area, for municipal (MSW) and commercial and industrial (C&I) wastes, including for waste from London (policies W3, W7 and W13). The requirements for Oxfordshire are shown in Table 1 below

Table 1: Waste management requirements in Oxfordshire

	Waste Type	2006 - 2010	2011 - 2015	2016 - 2020	2021 - 2025
Waste management capacity requirements for South East waste (annual average in million tonnes per annum)	MSW	0.395 mtpa	0.441 mtpa	0.480 mtpa	0.517 mtpa
	C&I	0.615 mtpa	0.685 mtpa	0.745 mtpa	0.791 mtpa
	Total MSW + C&I	1.01 mtpa	1.126 mtpa	1.225 mtpa	1.308 mtpa
Landfill provision for London waste (total tonnage)	MSW + C&I	2.7 million tonnes (over 10 year period)	2.7 million tonnes (over 10 year period)	1.7 million tonnes (over 10 year period)	1.7 million tonnes (over 10 year period)

Source: Draft South East Plan, March 2006, Policies W3 and W7

- B.14 Policy W13 in the draft South East Plan shows the projected surplus or shortfall of landfill capacity within each county at 2015. For Oxfordshire a surplus of capacity at 2015 is shown, allowing for imports from London.
- B.15 The draft South East Plan (policy M2) also includes figures for the provision that should be made in each county for recycled and secondary aggregates. It proposes that Oxfordshire should make provision for 0.9 million tonnes a year by 2016.

County policy and strategy

- B.16 The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 states that provision will be made for treatment and/or disposal of the amount of waste produced in Oxfordshire plus some waste from London (policy WM1) and that a range of facilities will be permitted to ensure sufficient waste management capacity (policy WM2). On landfill, it states that permission will only be granted for landfill required for the disposal of waste which remains after policies for reduction, re-use, recycling and recovery have been applied (policy WM2) and that landfill will only be permitted for restoration of mineral workings or where overall environmental benefit would be achieved (policy WM3).
- B.17 A new Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy 'No Time to Waste', September 2006, has been agreed by the County Council and the five District Councils, following public consultation.

Annual Waste Arisings in Oxfordshire

- B.18 The most recent survey / assessment figures for waste arising and managed in Oxfordshire are set out in Table 2 below. These figures do not include municipal waste from outside the county (particularly from London) that is managed or disposed in Oxfordshire.
- B.19 Most construction and demolition waste is recycled (36%) or recovered (32) (mainly for use in restoration of mineral workings and landfills, land improvement and engineering works), and about 32% is disposed to landfill. About 32% of commercial and industrial waste is recycled, with 47% being disposed to landfill and a further 21% being treated in some other way. Of the 311,000 tonnes of municipal waste produced in Oxfordshire in 2005/06, 32% was recycled (20.7%) or composted (11.2%), with 68% being disposed, almost all by landfill. For household waste only, the rate of recycling or composting in 2005/06 was 33.4%.
- B.20 The assessed capacity of waste management facilities in Oxfordshire is shown in Table 3 below.

Table 2: Annual Arisings / Management of Waste in Oxfordshire (tonnes)

Waste Type	Total Waste Arising / Managed	Landfilled	Recycled or Composted	Recovered	Other Treatment
Construction & Demolition	874,640	275,940	317,520	281,700	–
Commercial & Industrial	901,000	422,000	287,000	5,000	192,000
Municipal	311,152	211,727	99,414	–	–
All Waste	2,086,792	909,667	703,934	281,700	192,000

Figures for construction & demolition waste are for 2003; commercial & industrial waste figures are for 2002/03; figures for municipal waste are for 2005/06.
 (Source: DCLG – construction & demolition waste survey 2003; Environment Agency – commercial & industrial waste; Oxfordshire County Council, Waste Management Group – municipal waste)

Table 3: Capacity of Waste Management Facilities in Oxfordshire March 2006

Type of Facility	Capacity
Landfill	
Inert Landfill	2,137,783 tonnes*
Non-Hazardous Landfill	11,675,255 tonnes*
Total Landfill	13,813,038 tonnes*
Recycling, Composting	
MSW and C&I Recycling	712,780 tonnes per annum*
C&D Recycling	385,999 tonnes per annum**
MSW and C&I Composting	100,044 tonnes per annum**
Recovery	
MSW and C&I Incineration	0 tonnes per annum**
MSW and C&I Treatment	150,000 tonnes per annum*
Others	
Vehicle Dismantling & Other Metal Recovery	226,743 tonnes per annum*
Total Waste Treatment Capacity	1,575,566 tonnes per annum
MSW and C&I transfer	107,499 tonnes per annum*

* Source: Draft Regional Waste Management Capacity, ERM, October 2006

**Source: Oxfordshire County Council – information from planning applications and decisions

- B.22 Work is currently being carried out by the County Council to establish how much provision needs to be made in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework for new waste management facilities. Further work will be done to translate the regional targets and requirements in the draft South East Plan into more specific requirements for capacity for recycling and composting, other recovery of resources from waste, and landfill, for the different waste streams in Oxfordshire. The results from the 2006 regional survey of waste management capacity will be taken into account. In addition, the Oxfordshire Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (September 2006) will be an important input to establishing the provision that needs to be made in the Minerals and Waste Development Framework.

“Formate alternative te ketij publikimi ofrohen me kerkese. Kjo perfshin dhe gjuhe te tjera, me shkronja te medhaja, shkronja per te verberit, kasete degjimi, disk kompjuteri ose email.”

Albanian

আপনি যদি অনুরোধ করেন তাহলে এই পুস্তিকাটি বিকল্প ছাঁদে, যেমন, অন্য কোনও ভাষায়, বড় হরফে, ব্রেইলে, অডিও-ক্যাসেটে, কমপিউটারের ডিস্কে বা ইমেলের মাধ্যমে পেতে পারেন।

Bengali

“本刊物備有其他的格式可供索取。這些包括有其他語言版，大字版，盲人用版，錄音帶版，電腦磁碟版或電子郵件版。”

Chinese

प्रार्थना करने पर यह प्रकाशन दूसरे रूपों में प्राप्त किया जा सकता है। जिस में सम्मिलित है, दूसरी भाषाओं में, बड़े छापे में, ब्रेअल, सुनने की टेप पर, कम्प्यूटर की डिस्क पर या ई-मेल द्वारा।

Hindi

“ਇਹ ਪੁਸਤਕ ਬੇਨਤੀ ਕਰਨ ਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਰੂਪਾਂ ਵਿਚ ਵੀ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਹੈ। ਜਿਵੇਂ ਕਿ ਹੋਰ ਭਾਸ਼ਾਵਾਂ ਵਿਚ, ਵੱਡੇ ਛਾਪੇ ਤੇ, ਬ੍ਰੇਲ ਵਿਚ, ਸੁਣਨ ਵਾਲੀ ਟੇਪ ਤੇ, ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰ ਡਿਸਕ ਜਾਂ ਈ ਮੇਲ ਤੇ।”

Punjabi

“اس اشاعت کو متبادل اشکال میں درخواست کرنے پر حاصل کیا جاسکتا ہے۔ اس میں دوسری زبانیں، بڑا پرنٹ، بریل (جسے اندھے چھو کر پڑھ سکیں)، آڈیو کیسٹ، کمپیوٹر ڈسک یا ای میل شامل ہیں۔”

Urdu

Alternative Formats of this publication can be made available on request. These include other languages, large print, Braille, audio cassette, compute disk or e-mail

Minerals & Waste Policy Team (SPED)
Environment and Economy
Oxfordshire County Council
Speedwell House
Oxford
OX1 1NE

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk

