1. Background

1.1 We are now preparing the new Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan to provide up to date minerals and waste planning policies for the period up to 2031.

1.2 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan is in two parts: Part 1 – Core Strategy; Part 2 – Site Allocations. It will replace the existing Minerals and Waste Local Plan which was adopted in 1997 and will guide all future minerals and waste development across the County.

1.3 The Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Core Strategy was adopted on 12th September 2017. This sets out the vision, objectives, spatial planning strategy and policies for meeting development requirements for the supply of minerals and the management of waste in Oxfordshire. It also provides a policy framework for identifying sites for new minerals and waste development in Part 2 of the Plan – the site allocations document and for making decisions on planning applications.

1.3 We commenced work on Part 2 Site Allocations in early 2018. The main purpose of Part 2-Sites Plan is to allocate the sites required to provide the additional capacity for minerals supply and waste management.

1.5 We published the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 Site Allocations Issues and Options for consultation on Wednesday 8th August. The eight-week consultation ended on Wednesday 3rd October.

1.6 The Issues and Options consultation invited views on:
- What the Sites Plan should cover?
- What issues the Sites Plan should address?
- What options should be considered? – in particular, which sites should be considered for allocation for minerals and waste development?
- What information will assist in the assessment of these options?

1.7 We published the Issues and Options paper in accordance with our adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2015).

1.8 All those on our Minerals and Waste Local Plan consultation database were notified of the consultation. Copies of the document were placed at the following libraries across the County and at County Hall, Oxford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abingdon</th>
<th>Berinsfield</th>
<th>Didcot</th>
<th>Kennington</th>
<th>Wallingford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bampton</td>
<td>Bicester</td>
<td>Eynsham</td>
<td>Kidlington</td>
<td>Wantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td>Burford</td>
<td>Faringdon</td>
<td>Oxford County</td>
<td>Witney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson</td>
<td>Carterton</td>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>Sonning Common</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.9 This report provides an overview of the key issues arising from the responses received to the Issues and Options Consultation with a summary response.
2. Overview of Responses

2.1 Oxfordshire County Council received 158 responses. These generated nearly 1300 comments to the consultation document.

2.2 The types of respondents can be broken down into the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent for Landowner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Waste Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant/Agent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County/Unitary</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/City</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Developer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Org</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Org/Parish Councils</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Industry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals/Waste Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish/Town Council</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Industry</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents
2.3 111 respondents made representations to the questions (not including Question 2) or made general comments, generating over 800 comments.

2.4 126 respondents made representations specifically on the sites (Question 2), generating over 400 individual comments.

2.5 Method of Response
   - 149 Emails (including forms returned via email)
   - 7 Post
   - 1 Online Consultation portal

2.6 For a full list of respondents, please see Appendix 1.

2  Next Steps

2.1 This document is a summary of the responses received to the consultation. The full responses have been used in preparing this summary and were used as we prepared the Preferred Options draft of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2- Site Allocations Plan.

2.2 If you wish to be kept informed of the preparation of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Part 2 – Site Allocations Plan please contact the Minerals and Waste Policy Team.

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

   Minerals.WastePlan@Oxfordshire.gov.uk
Overview of Responses

4. Question 1

4.1 Question 1 – selection of site options

Taking into account the need for certainty about delivery of sites in order that the Sites Plan will meet the test of soundness that it is “effective”:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Should site allocations in the Sites Plan be drawn only from those sites that have been nominated by landowners or mineral/waste operators?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Should other sites, in addition to those nominated, be considered for possible allocation in the Sites Plan and, if so, how should they be selected?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 47 respondents made representation to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in the Figure 2 below.

![Figure 2 Type of Respondents](image)

4.3 35% of respondents commented specifically that A) Site Allocations in the Site Plan should only be drawn from those sites that have been nominated by landowners or mineral/waste operators. The main given reasons were:

- Deliverability
- Plan soundness
- Timings
- Extensions priority
- Impact of extensions vs impact of new sites
- Sufficient sites identified

---

1 This question is particularly relevant to sites for recycled and secondary aggregate and waste management facilities, for which relatively few site nominations have been received.
4.4 19% of respondents commented B) That other sites, in addition to those nominated, should be considered for possible allocation in the Sites Plan and gave ways in which they should be selected.

4.5 Those 19% gave suggestions for ways to identify these sites. These include:
- Locational criteria
- Policy utilisation
- Consideration of all historical sites identified
- Existing sites
- Local knowledge
- OCC to approach landowners directly
- Industrial Estate and Employment Land Review

4.6 46% of respondents to this question did not specify A or B and instead made comments to the question on how sites should or shouldn’t be identified within the Site Allocations Plan. These comments include:
- Absence of demonstrable need
- Reasonable alternatives considered (SA/SEA)
- Rigorous selection process required against environmental criteria required
- Stringent Planning Application/Approval process required
- Industrial/Employment Land Review if insufficient sites identified
- Potential impact on historic environment must be considered
- Weight must be given to AONB
- OCC must support and encourage sustainable building technologies

Summary Response

4.7 46% of respondents did not specify either way and 35% specified Option A - Sites should only be drawn from those sites that have been nominated by landowners or mineral/waste operators.

4.8 As we have sufficient nominated sites to meet the Plan requirements, we do not feel we need to look at other sites. We also have a criteria based policy within the Core Strategy if other sites were to come forward.
5. Question 2

5.1

Question 2 – issues relating to nominated sites

In respect of each nominated site:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>What would be the impacts of the proposed minerals or waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development at this site (including environmental, economic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social impacts, both negative and positive)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>How could any negative impacts be mitigated to make the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development acceptable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Are there any other planning issues that affect this site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>What are the potential opportunities for restoration of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>site? How should the site be restored and what benefits could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be gained through restoration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(this question is for mineral working and landfill sites only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 For a summary of the main issues raised to all the sites please refer to Appendix 2 Waste Sites and Appendix 3 Minerals Sites. The Appendices are brief summaries of the issues raised to each site. The full responses will be used when we undertake the site analysis and next stage of the Plan preparation.

5.3 127 respondents made comments regarding the individual sites. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 3 below.

![Figure 3 Type of respondents to Question 2](image)

Summary Response

5.4 See responses to each site in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.
Question 3

6.1

Question 3 – other potential sites

| Are there any other sites that the County Council should consider and assess for possible allocation for minerals or waste development in the Sites Plan? |

6.2 16 respondents commented on this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 4 below.

![Q3. Type of respondents](image)

*Figure 4 Type of respondents to Question 3*

6.3 A further four waste sites have been proposed

- Ardley Fields - Viridor
- Culham Science Centre - Carter Jonas on behalf of UKAEA
- Overthorpe Industrial Estate – Grundon Waste Management
- Brize Norton Road - B&E Transport Ltd (Witney) Ltd

6.4 Withdrawal of site

- CR20 – Land at Burford Road

6.5 Planning application submitted

- SG60 – White Cross Farm
- SS08 – Shellingford Quarry Western Extension

6.6 Sites since received permission

- SG33 – Land south of Wallingford, New Barn Farm
- SG19 - Bridge Farm, Appleford
6.7 A submission from the agent on behalf of H Tuckwell & Sons Ltd regarding the Thrupp Farm ROMP site has also been received.

6.8 A Site near Millets Farm has been suggested by an individual.

6.9 A number of operators/agents confirmed that they have no new sites to promote.

6.10 Other comments include no further mineral sites are required as the total capacity of the sites listed is in excess of that required.

6.11 Two neighbouring authorities comment that given the lack of waste sites nominated for allocation, it is recommended that an Industrial Estate and Employment Land Review be undertaken to determine the suitability of these sites for waste uses. This would demonstrate that all options have been explored to ensure the delivery of sites.

**Summary Response**

6.12 The four further waste sites that were nominated for possible inclusion within the Plan have been subject to site assessment.

6.13 The suggestion of Millets Farm was not by the landowner/agent and therefore we will not be taking forward at this stage.

6.14 We do not feel that insufficient waste sites have been nomination for the projected waste arisings in Oxfordshire as suggested. Therefore, we do not consider an Industrial Estate and Employment Land Review necessary at this stage.
7. **Question 4**

7.1 Questions on other issues about allocations of sites

7.2 Issue 1 – Level of provision and contingency for mineral working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4 – level of mineral working site provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should the Sites Plan make only the arithmetic minimum provision in site allocations that is required to meet the additional requirements for mineral working in Annex 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should provision in allocations also take into account the need to ensure there is sufficient production capacity available throughout the plan period to enable an adequate level of supply (recognising that reserves are not equally distributed between quarries and quarries have differing levels of output)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 36 respondents made comments to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 5 below.

![Q4. Respondents](image)

*Figure 5 Type of respondents to Question 4*

7.4 Two of the key messages that came out of a majority of responses to this question are that the Site Allocations Plan needs to be in accordance with the NPPF and that we should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates over the plan period.

7.5 25% of respondents commented that the Sites Plan should only make the arithmetic minimum provision in Site Allocations that is required to meet the additional requirements for Mineral working. The reasons included:
7.6 39% of respondents commented that the Sites Plan should also take into account the
need to ensure there is sufficient production capacity available throughout the plan
period to enable an adequate supply choice. The reasons included:

- To allow flexibility
- Ensures sufficient provision for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates
- Deliverability
- Change in quantities at Planning application stage
- NPPF 10-year average and “other relevant information”
- 10-year figures based during a recession
- Impact of large developments and infrastructure projects
- Supporting other Local Authorities provision
- Dormant sites
- Production capacity limitations

7.7 36% of respondents did not clearly define which option they were commenting on and
had general comments to this question. These include:

- Flexibility is required
- Should follow NPPF
- Only proven reserves that can be realistically worked in next 10-15 years
  should be taken into account
- Should already have been considered
- A is based on excessive and unjustifiable need
- Production capacity within B is unreliable indicator
- Locals need certainty
- Consider need outside of the County
- Plan should make provision for best scenario within available production
capacity
- Do not understand the question
- No comment

**Summary Response**

7.8 We have taken the production capacities into account, as included in our
calculations, to ensure the mineral requirements are met through the site allocations
Plan. For example, if a mineral site is proposed as an extension to an existing site,
and the existing site does not complete until 2028, we have considered the
nomination after this date and its contribution to the mineral requirements over the
Plan period.
8. **Question 5**

8.1 **Question 5 – contingency provision for mineral working**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should some contingency be added to the additional requirements for mineral working site provision to give flexibility in case sites cannot be brought forward or prove not able to deliver the expected yield?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What level of contingency provision would it be appropriate to add: 10%, 20%, 25%, other?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 50 respondents made comments on this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 6 below.

![Q5. Respondents](image)

**Figure 6 Type of respondents to Question 5**

8.3 40% number of respondents commented that some contingency should be added to the additional requirements for mineral working site provision, to give flexibility in case sites cannot be brought forward or prove not able to deliver the expected yield. They gave the following reasons for their response:

- Provides flexibility
- Ensures provision if sites do not come forward
- Lead in times
8.4 35% respondents who commented that some contingency should be added, then identified their chosen contingency:

- 10% - 7 respondents
- 20% - 2 respondents
- 25% - 3 respondents
- 30% - 1 respondent

8.5 A Consultant/Agent commented that the decision should be based on the size of allocated reserves compared to the calculated provision. For example, if one site will provide 50% of the provision and it doesn’t come forward, for whatever reason, then a further 50% will need to be found.

8.6 However 38% of respondents did not believe that there should be contingency applied. The reasons include:

- Already have sufficient for identified need
- Landbank
- Not justified in Policy terms
- Already in accordance with National Policy
- Would allow operators timetables to slip
- Environmental and community impact of sites
- Would lead to neglect of sites
- Need ‘future permissions’
- Brexit impact
- Wrong location for a site (SS17)
- Too sensitive area (SS17)
- Reserve sites should be identified instead

8.7 One respondent from the Minerals Industry commented that there needs to be policies that allow new mineral sites to come forward when a clear need is identified and that the productive capacity of the County is providing the required amount of mineral into the local construction market.

8.8 A County Council commented that the Plan needs to ensure that a steady and adequate supply is available throughout the Plan Period.

8.9 An individual commented that they don’t know the typical risk of under-production, but this could be solved by awarding ‘future permissions’, which would become active only when the permissions ahead in the order of award have been consumed (whether above or below initial estimates).

8.10 16% of respondents to this question commented that if SS17 is considered inappropriate for site selection, it should not be safeguarded for potential future mineral use. No contingency or flexibility should be allowed. A decision needs to be made so the local community and other stakeholders have certainty over the position.

Summary Response

8.11 Although the responses to this question show a slight lean towards no contingency, it has been decided to include a 5% contingency for sharp sand and gravel and 10% for soft sand and crushed rock. This will ensure flexibility and deliverability of the Plan.
9. **Question 6**

9.1 **Provision for soft sand and crushed rock**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6 – allocation of sites for soft sand and crushed rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should specific sites be allocated for soft sand and crushed rock?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should provision be made in some other way, such as by broader areas of search? And, if yes to B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which areas should be included as areas of search?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 44 respondents made comment to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 7 below.

9.1 The majority of people did not give specific answers to each of these questions. Instead they commented on how they believed the provision for soft sand and crushed rock should or should not be made.

9.2 34% of respondents commented that specific sites should be allocated for soft sand and crushed rock. The reasons that were given include:

- To help meet for the wider needs of the South East
- Meet commitments to Central Government
- LAA Guidance
- Soft sand shortage in the South East
- Provide certainty for other Authorities
- Provide specific products to the market
- Sites that have been nominated and are deliverable
- NPPF

9.3 A District/City Council commented that in case the identified sites don’t come forward it may be an idea to identify reserve sites and these could be ranked.

9.4 6% commented specifically no, specific sites should not be allocated for soft sand and crushed rock and gave the reasons for this as:
   - No identified need for further soft sand and crushed rock
   - Mineral workings bring environmental and community impacts
   - Sufficient sites as extensions
   - No new sites required

9.5 Around 50% of respondents commented specifically that in line with the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, there is “currently zero additional requirement for soft sand and crushed rock” and therefore no further need to search or source new sites as there is capacity in pre-existing sites. All of these comments were specifically relating to Site SS17.

9.6 A respondent from the Waste Industry commented that the areas should reflect the Strategic Resource Areas (SRA).

9.7 A District/City Council and a Parish Council did not agree with broad areas of search as they considered it would result in less certainty for areas and that communities need more certainty for the future.

9.8 One respondent from the Minerals/Waste Industry commented that later sites will still need to be assessed against the Site Assessment Methodology

**Summary Response**

9.10 The majority of respondents, not objecting to an individual site, supported the identification of sites for soft sand and crushed rock.

9.11 We do identify Strategic Resource Areas, as areas of search should additional areas be required.

9.12 However, having the designated sites within the Plan provided greater certainty for communities.
10. **Question 7**

10.1 **Site size and extensions or new sites for mineral working**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7 – size of sites for mineral working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should a minimum site size (by mineral yield) be applied in the allocation of sites for mineral working?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and, if so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What size threshold or thresholds should be used?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 **25 respondents made representation to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 8 below.**

![Q7. Respondents](image)

*Figure 8 Type of respondents to Question 7*

10.3 **There is significant support that there should not be a minimum size (by minimum yield) applied in the allocation of sites for mineral working**

- 84% of respondents do not believe there should be a minimum size of site
- 8% responded Yes
- 8% responded that they have no specific comments on this question

10.4 **The main reasons why minimum site size must not be applied:**

- Mineral Type
- Economics and financial viability
- Extension or existing operation
- Does not seem necessary
- Not the role of the LPA
- Sites should be based on suitability
10.5 Those that supported having a minimum site size (by mineral yield) agreed for the following reasons:
  - Sustainable
  - Accessibility
  - For new sites

10.6 One respondent from the Mineral Industry commented that there should be a minimum threshold for sharp sand and gravel of 500,000 tonnes, whilst another respondent from the Minerals/Waste Industry commented that the minimum site by mineral yield should be of the order of 2.5mt.

Summary Response

10.7 We agree with the majority of respondents who do comment that there should not be a minimum site size, therefore a minimum site size has not been applied to the allocation of sites for mineral working.

10.8 However, site reserve is a consideration in the allocation of sites, in ensuring mineral requirements are met over the Plan Period.
11. Question 8

11.1

**Question 8 – priority for extensions over new quarries**

To what extent should the priority for extensions in Core Strategy policy M4 be applied in relation to other factors in the allocation of sites for: sharp sand and gravel; soft sand; and crushed rock?

11.2 43 respondents each made representation to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 9 below.

![Q8. Respondents](image)

*Figure 9 Type of respondents to Question 8*

11.3 38% of respondents supported a stronger priority for extensions. The reasons they gave for supporting extensions included:

- In accordance with adopted Policy (M1, M2)
- Sufficient reserves identified
- Efficient use of existing plant, infrastructure, plant, access and workforce
- Reduced environmental impact
- Reduced community impact/less contentious
- Existing sites already have mitigation measures in place.
- Not use greenfield sites
- Less challenging than a new site
- Cumulative impact should be considered
- Larger sites offer better long-term potential to enhance biodiversity
11.4 21% of respondents commented that less priority should be given to extensions. The reasons these respondents gave include:

- Sites should be assessed for their own merits
- Should not preclude sites that meet M4 criteria coming forward
- New sites deliver longer term capacity
- Allow geographical spread of production
- Large reserves at a few sites is not good for competition
- A well planned new site may have benefits for the environment
- This could prejudice new sites coming forward

11.5 11% of respondents made general comments to this question. These comments include:

- Plan should take account of ‘wind down’ of sites towards the end of sites productive life
- Timescales for site delivery should be included.
- Flexibility must be maintained
- Sites that impact on the Chiltern AONB cannot be justified
- Some sites can be stand alone or an extension

11.6 30% of respondents commented that no new sites are needed for the following reasons. These respondents all made representation to SS17

- In line with Policy M2, sufficient productive capacity of soft sand to be sourced from existing channels
- The pre-existing estimated requirement of 2.55Mt of soft sand until 2031
- Yield could come from six pre-existing soft sand quarries
- No further need to search or source new sites
- New sites are a greater challenge
- Existing sites already have infrastructure.

Summary Response

11.7 Extensions to sites were considered in the site assessment process in accordance with Policy M3 and Policy M4. Further detail of how these have been taken into consideration can be seen in Section 2 Mineral Context and Section 6 Mineral Site Assessments, as well as the site assessments undertaken by Adams Hendry.
12. Question 9

12.1 Issue 4 – Restoration of mineral working sites

**Question 9 – weight given to restoration objectives**

What weight should be given to the achievement of the restoration objectives of the Core Strategy relative to other factors in the allocation of sites for mineral working?

12.2 36 respondents made a response to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 10 below.

12.3 66% of respondents commented that considerable weight should be given to restoration achievements. Their reasons included:

- Policy M10 identifies restoration requirements
- Disused quarries are potentially dangerous
- Affects the long-term outcome for the locality
- In accordance with Policy M10 and the NPPF
- Provide local satisfaction
- Mitigates long term impacts of mineral workings

12.4 14% of respondents commented that equal or little weight should be given to restoration achievements. The reasons included:
• Proposals should be submitted as part of an application
• Many factors such as ancient, historic, bioenvironmental and biodiversity cannot be restored
• Equal weight alongside other factors should be given
• Restoration is a consequence of mitigating the harmful effects from the development in the first place
• Too far in the future

12.5 20% of respondents gave general comments to this question. These included:

• Restoration should allow creative restoration
• Must be enforced

Summary Response

12.6 Many of the site proposals do not contain restoration details at this stage and we believe that Policy M10 provides sufficient information at this stage. Restoration should be determined as part of the planning application.
13 Question 10

13.1 Question 10 – specification of restoration requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Should the Sites Plan specify how sites allocated for mineral working are to be restored?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>and, if yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>How detailed should the specified restoration requirements be?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.2 41 respondents commented on this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 11 below.

![Q10. Respondents](image)

Figure 11 Type of respondents to Question 10

13.3 68% of respondents commented that the Sites Plan should specify how sites allocated for mineral working are to be restored. The reasons included:

- Provides clarity for communities
- Ensures net gain for biodiversity
- Ensures objectives in M10 are delivered
- Avoids sites being left unrestored
- Ensures site owners are responsible
- Sets out timings
- Should state what wouldn’t be acceptable
• Restoration schemes should be keeping the overall objectives and policies and that is considered “sustainable development”
• Should ensure OCC can enforce when restoration doesn’t happen
• Restoration plans must accord with District and Neighbourhood Plans
• Sufficiently detailed to provide confidence and that sufficient funding can be secured
• Should specify net environmental gain linked to Conservation Target Area and Landscape Character Area.
• Restored to nature reserves with public recreational access.
• Must accord with District Planning Policies and any neighbourhood plan policies
• Time frames required

13.4 Not all of those respondents who agreed that the Sites Plan should specify how the sites allocated for mineral working should be restored, went on to comment on the second part of the question. Of those 68% that did, 33% responded that it should be broad restoration details.

13.5 The comments supporting broad restoration details included:
• In ‘principle’ terms.
• Restoration concept
• Indications
• Wider planning policy aspirations
• The details should be at application stage
• Provide confidence
• Ensures sufficient funds can be secured
• Set out restoration targets
• Suggestions for habitat types in order that strategic landscape scale objectives are met
• Set out how net biodiversity gain to be delivered
• Helpful for community to have indication of restoration

13.6 51% of those that agreed that the Plan should specify how the sites should be restored (85% of these related specifically to site SS17) commented that very detailed restoration plans must be produced.
• Local communities can assess the long-term impact
• Ensures commercial businesses fulfil their commitment
• Plans for monitoring and managing
• Guaranteed budget
• Timescales set out
• Set out end objectives
• Before permission is granted there must be a detailed restoration plan in consultation with stakeholders.

13.7 2 County/Unitary Authorities and 1 District/City Council responded with the following
• Detailed enough to know intended specific after use
• Useful for some indication of sites likely restoration
• Set out ‘unsuitable’ uses and reasons why
• Must allow flexibility

23
13.8 However, 20% of respondents commented that the Sites Plan should not specify how sites should be restore all commented that the Sites Allocations Plan should not set out restoration details. The reasons they gave included:

- Should be at planning application stage
- Policy M10 is sufficient
- Too complicated at this stage
- Restorations may not be deliverable
- Restoration requirements change over time
- Premature as detailed environmental work is not likely to have been undertaken
- Land ownership could cause issues

13.9 12% of respondents did not specifically comment that the Plan should or should not include restoration requirements (individuals and local businesses)
All these respondents object to site SS17 and as part of their representation they made comments to this question. The comments included

- If allowed to exploit this resource, they should be bound to restore to existing state
- Too many areas simply cannot be restored
- Greenfield site
- OCC should not be bribed by commercial interests but consider the health and well being of the community
- No footpaths compromised
- No wildlife effected
- No water life effected
- No ‘bomb site’ left to mar the landscape.

**Summary Response**

13.10 Most nominations did not contain detailed restoration proposals.

13.11 Following the identification of Preferred Options and consultation responses, the restoration will be looked at following this consultation

13.12 In assessing the sites, progressive restoration was assumed, however the specific type of restoration was not always available
14.1 Issue 5 – Sites already identified for mineral working

**Question 11 – allocation of sites already permitted for mineral working**

Should areas of land that already have planning permission for mineral working be included as site allocations in the Sites Plan?

14.2 46 respondents made comments to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 12 below.

![Q11. Respondents](image)

*Figure 12 Type of respondents to Question 11*

14.3 24% of respondents commented that areas of land that already have planning permission for mineral working should not be included as site allocations in the Sites Plan. Their reasons included:
- Already permitted
- No benefit in doing so
- Already ‘reserves’
- Already ‘commitments’
- Implies the availability of consultation
Site allocations are to inform on the suitability in principle of specified use(s) on specified site(s)
Should be identified as existing and clearly differentiated
Should be safeguarded instead
ROMPS are an exception
Plan should be for suitable news sites and reserves to be developed in future.

14.4 39% of respondents commented that areas of land that already have planning permission for mineral working should be included as site allocations in the Sites Plan. The reasons they supported this approach included:
- Avoids delay, social and environmental harm
- Potential extensions for existing sites could be identified
- To avoid duplication of effort and maximise efficiency
- Extensions and pre-existing sites preferable
- Shows how requirements of Core Strategy are to be met
- Allow the consideration of cumulative effects of sites in close vicinity to AONB
- Contribute to the total supply of minerals
- Only to identify the amount site already forms as part of landbank
- Include all working and non-operational sites and ROMP
- Provide full picture
- Shows site proximity to each other

14.5 35% of respondents did not comment specifically on whether the Site Allocations Plan should or should not include areas of land that already have planning permission for mineral working be included as site allocations in the Sites Plan. 81% of these respondents made representation to Site SS17
These comments included
- Sufficient capacity for soft sand
- Pre existing soft sands have capacity
- New quarries have greater significant challenges
- Pre existing sites should be presumed
- Only reserves that are likely to be worked during the plan should be included
- Future assessment of need should not include permitted reserves that extend beyond the end of the Plan period
- Sites with substantial reserves but low outputs can distort the mineral plan and prevent new allocations.

14.6 1 Landowner commented that SS07 is a proven reserve of soft sand and there is often good reason why a site with an extant permission has not come on stream.

Summary Response

14.7 We do include sites already permitted within the calculations for mineral requirements over the Plan Period. However, it is not felt allocating the permitted sites within the Plan is necessary at this stage.
15. Question 12

15.1 Issue 6 – Provision for recycled & Secondary Aggregates and Waste Management Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12 – size of sites for recycled &amp; secondary aggregates and waste management facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Should there be a size threshold for sites for recycling / secondary aggregates and waste management facilities allocated in the Sites Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Should the Sites Plan only allocate sites for strategic and non-strategic facilities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.2 24 respondents made comments to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 13 below.

![Q12. Respondents](image)

*Figure 13 Type of respondents to Question 12*

15.3 The majority of respondents did not separate their answers to the question A or B and instead commented on the question as a whole.

15.4 71% of respondents to this question commented no, there should not be a size threshold for sites for recycling / secondary aggregates and waste management facilities allocated in the Sites Plan. The reasons included:

- Suitability and deliverability
- Viability
- Should be flexible
- Should be for landowner/operator to determine
- All sites should be included
- Prevent the development of new technologies
- Plan should maximise opportunities for recovery and recycling
- Effective distribution is better
- Smaller sites together could make same contribution
- Small sites could have lower overall impact
- Planning application process should determine
- Waste Operations are too varied
- 'Least worst' should be chosen to meet recognised need

15.5 A Parish/Town Council supported 12A on the grounds that sites should not negatively impact on housing settlements.

15.6 In addition to responding to 12A, 29% also responded to Question 12B. There was an equal split between those that said yes, and those that said no. One respondent commented no, on the grounds that W3 only refers to strategic and non-strategic waste management facilities being allocated, however if there is an identified need for other facilities it would seem sensible to take the opportunity to allocate these through the sites plan to provide a greater deal of certainty. One respondent commented yes, with CS policies M1, W4 and W5 provide for consideration of smaller facilities.

15.7 25% of respondents made general comments to this question. An organisation commented that relatively few site nominations have been received for recycled or secondary aggregates and waste management facilities. This may mean that there may not be enough sites available to meet the requirements in the Core Strategy. Such a shortfall could be addressed by other sites which have not been nominated being identified and assesses. However, sites that do not have landowner and/or operator support will lack certainty of delivery. Strategic waste streams for radioactive waste, hazardous waste etc. will require strategic provision. The Circular Economy requires that we segregate more materials and strive to maintain high quality and reduce contamination levels. In such circumstances, it would be reasonable to think that some activities/operations would require a larger footprint for equivalent quantities of material. Moving waste up the hierarchy (as above) requires greater footprint, but may require less industrial/technological treatment techniques, thus reducing environmental and bad neighbour impacts.

15.9 A further respondent from the Waste Industry comments that it is necessary to understand the potential total waste management capacity that all the Site Plan Allocations can provide over the Plan period. Each site allocation should indicate annual capacity figure.

15.10 A local business commented that these are questions for the specialists in the mining of building materials.

15.11 A business commented that the site SS17 is unsuitable and they will strongly resist its proposed development

15.12 An individual commented that they had no specific comment on this question, whilst another commented that the question regarding strategic and non strategic sites was confusing.

Summary Response

5.13 It is not felt that there should be size threshold for recycling/secondary aggregates and waste management facilities allocated in the Sites Plan. It is considered that the waste industry is best placed to know which sites are deliverable. To restrict the size of site could restrict the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy.
16. **Question 13**

16.1

**Question 13 – identification of other sites**

| Should the County Council seek to identify other sites for recycling / secondary aggregate and waste management facilities for assessment (in addition to those that have been nominated)? |

16.2 25 responses were received to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 14 below.

![Figure 14 Type of respondents to Question 13](image)

**Q13. Respondents**

- Business
- Consultant/Agent
- County/Unitary Authority
- District/City
- Individual
- Minerals Industry
- Org
- Parish/Town Council
- Waste Industry

16.3 36% of respondents commented yes, the County Council should seek to identify other sites for recycling/secondary aggregate and waste management facilities for assessment. They did so on the following grounds:

- Sensible if insufficient sites identified
- Within Industrial Estates
- Vacant units on employment land
- Will ensure best possible sites are identified
- Existing minerals and waste sites could be considered
- Policy support for new sites coming forward
- Out of range of housing settlements
- Provides certainty
- Sufficient capacity in suitable locations is required
- Ardley fields should be identified
- OCC should take a strategic viewpoint across the County
- Should plan for sufficient site/capacity even if unsure of delivery
- Best possible sites, not just those nominated
- If capacity gap identified
- Must ensure sites are available and deliverable
• Initiatives for avoiding, reusing and recycling with a view to reduce the demand for sites

16.4 However, 36% of respondents did not support this approach. They commented so on the following grounds:
• Sufficient already identified
• Drawn from nominated sites
• Only identify sites with landowner/operator agreement/support
• Lack of certainty and deliverability
• Demand will deliver sites
• Core Strategy Policy will allow sites to come forward
• Any other sites that come forward must be on robust evidence and have landowner support

16.5 28% of respondents made general comments to this question. Their comments were:
• Sites other than SS17 must be considered
• Plan must retain flexibility
• ‘Windfall sites’
• Depends on identified need
• Identification of suitable areas may be more appropriate

Summary Response

16.6 At this stage, we do not feel it necessary to identify any further sites to those already nominated. There have been sufficient sites nominated to meet the requirements over the Plan Period.
17. Question 14

17.1 Question 14 – allocation of industrial estates and employment areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Should the Sites Plan allocate industrial estates and other broad areas of employment land where waste management facilities could potentially be located?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Should this be as well as or instead of the allocation of specific sites?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17.2 23 respondents made comments to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 15 below.

![Figure 15 Type of respondents to Question 14](image)

17.3 43% of respondents commented, no, the Sites Plan should not allocate industrial estates and other broad areas of employment land where waste management facilities could potentially be located. The reasons included:

- Sites are required to provide identified need
- Would give insufficient degree of certainty
- Needs to be as far away from residential and industrial areas as possible
- Will not result in realistic deliverable sites
- Not in place of allocated sites
- Areas should be for housing or industry instead
- Policy W5 already identifies industrial land as an area where waste management facilities could be located
- Employment land generally promoted for high tech uses
- Impact on volumes of employment land for other business uses
- Compromise Local Plan employment strategies
- Relying on land without availability would not provide the certainty that the waste management strategy is viable and can be delivered
• May not be deliverable
• Should not be undertaken in place of the allocation of specific sites promoted by operators
• Policy W4 provides adequate level of support
• Should focus on brownfield and existing and former waste sites, where built infrastructure is in place
• Rarely deliver
• Restrictive covenants on sites
• Should be considered against criteria-based policies
• Only considered after suitable allocations have been ruled out

17.4 35% respondents did support this approach. The reasons they gave included:
• Another Authority has identified ‘Industrial Land Areas of Search” alongside specific sites
• Consistent with NPPF
• Could have a criteria-based policy within the plan, setting out where waste management facilities will, in principle be considered appropriate
• Identifications of broad areas could be appropriate
• Preferable to greenfield sites
• Can help meet the County’s needs
• Demonstrates flexibility of the Plan
• Could supplement the Plans requirements if all the suitable specific sites are identified
• ‘As well as’ not ‘instead of’

17.5 22% of respondents made other comments. Their comments included
• Appropriateness comes down to waste use, site constraints, design and mitigation and neighbouring uses. These should be considered at the planning application stage
• Preferable than identifying in green field sites
• Definition of Waste: Code of Practice should be referred to.

Summary Response

17.6 As we have sufficient waste sites nominated at this stage, it is not felt that additional areas need to be identified within the Sites Plan. It is considered that Policy W4 and W5 provide sufficient support for industrial estates and broad areas to come forward.
18. Question 15

18.1 Issue 7 – Provision for inert waste deposit or disposal

18.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15 – sites for inert waste deposit or disposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.3 35 respondents made comment to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 16 below.

![Q15. Respondents](image)

Figure 16 Type of respondents to Question 15

18.4 43% of those that responded gave a specific response to 15A, which asks whether the Site Plan should only allocate active or unrestored quarries as sites for deposit or disposal of inert waste.

18.5 Of these respondents, 40% commented yes to Question 15 A. Their comments were
- Should be priority
- Must accord with Policy M6
- Only where it will result in overall environmental benefit
- Should be viewed as recovery
- Inert waste should not go on good arable land
- Option B would put active and unrestored quarries at risk

18.6 60% of those that responded to Question 15A commented no, the sites Plan should not only allocate active or unrestored quarries as sites for deposit or disposal of inert waste. Their comments included:
- Previously restored sites/old mineral workings and other damaged land may require further restoration or deposit of inert waste for improvement or to achieve appropriate after use
- Only allocating active or unrestored sites is restrictive
- SS17 Grade 2 BMV land needs to be restored appropriately
- Filling SS17 with inert waste and building rubble not appropriate
- Ardley fields would provide opportunities for the deposition of inert waste
- Allocations should focus on existing sites where void space exists and where appropriate infrastructure is in place

18.7 46% of the total respondents commented on 15B. 75% of these respondents said yes and the other 25% had general comments. The reasons included:
- Given the lack of sites nominated
- All opportunities should be considered
- Sites plan should not be restrictive.
- Provides wider scope of options for allocation
- Ensures local satisfaction
- Compliance with National Policy
- Difficult to implement and identify
- Important Grade 2 BMV versatile land is restored appropriately
- Should also include existing waste sites
- National Planning Policy for Waste
- In order to be effective, deposit or disposal at other locations should not be discounted
- Important that overall environmental benefit is achieved without causing detrimental effect on one contributing aspect
- Appropriate allocation criteria and assessment process need to be clearly outlined

18.8 A Minerals Industry respondent commented that where it delivers an environmental benefit it should be encouraged however it might be difficult to identify such sites as these may not be waste or mineral related development. It would not seem possible or appropriate to identify these in a Site Allocation Document.

18.9 40% of respondents commented on the Question 15 generally. They did not specify Yes/No or A/B. 64% of these respondents made representation to site nomination SS17. A summary of the comments received included:
- Plan should be flexible
- Should allow for windfall sites
- How will OCC know whether an allocation will result in overall environmental benefit without specific details of the proposal
- Should recognise that ‘waste’ can be ‘suitable for a range of uses’
- Plan should seek to allocate the most suitable sites for waste deposit and disposal
- Only sites which result in an overall environmental benefit should be allocated
- Should accord with W6
- Active or unrestored quarries in first instance. If there is an identified need above and beyond other sites could be allocated – only if there is an overall environmental benefit.
- Active or restored sites should be priority, sites with environmental benefits secondary
- Active or unrestored sites may be better candidates but no need to tie own hands
- SS17 Grade 2 BMV Arable land should be restored like for like.
- SS17 should not be desecrated and virgin farmland ruined
- No waste should be deposited on SS17
- Inert waste on SS17 would cause irreparable damage.
- Should also include 'amenity benefit'
- Clear methodology required

Summary Response

18.10 No sites have been identified for deposit or disposal of inert waste over the plan period.

18.11 In accordance with Policy W6, it is felt that with the number of mineral sites identified for extraction to meet mineral requirements over the plan period, it is not considered necessary to identify further inert landfill sites based on current inert waste projections over the plan period.

18.12 This also aims to encourage waste up the waste hierarchy.
19. Question 16

19.1 Issue 7 – Mineral Safeguarding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 16 – mineral safeguarding areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.2 39 responses were received to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 17 below.

![Figure 17 Type of respondents to Question 16](image)

19.3 28% of respondents commented that the mineral safeguarding areas should be reviewed and, if appropriate, amended to include other areas of mineral resource. The reasons included:

- Published geological maps shows further areas to those already identified
- Should be reviewed using the most up to date information
- If evidence suggests so
- Prevent sterilisation
- Should cover any resources of National and Local importance
- To distinguish between MSA sites that could be worked and those that have no viable or future use for extraction
- To provide certainty for long term planning

19.4 10% of respondents commented that mineral safeguarding areas should not be reviewed and, if appropriate, amended to include other areas of mineral resource. The reasons included:

Q16. Respondents

- Business
- County/Unitary Authority
- District/City
- Individual
- Landowner
- Local Org/Parish Councils
- Minerals Industry
- Minerals/Waste Industry
- Org
- Parish/Town Council
Appropriate considerations are already within Section 4 and Policy M8 of the adopted Core Strategy
Sites should be named, so door not left open for future sites
The Plan for mineral working is already excessive

19.5 62% of respondents made other comments to this question. 62% of these responses were specifically related to Site SS17. The comments included:
- SS17 should not be safeguarded
- If sites are not identified, then they shouldn't be safeguarded
- Impact on the rerouting of the A420
- MSA designation on land to the north of Wallingford should be removed as it cannot be depended on for future extraction purposes or the requirements of Policy M8 and does not contain commercially viable mineral (Geological report included by respondent)
- If SS17 found unsuitable now, it will be unsuitable in the future and therefore should not be safeguarded
- Decisions should be taken so that the local community and other stakeholders have certainty over the position
- No inclination either way. Only if significant (real term) gain could be achieved
- Should be checked against areas emerging or proposed in District Council Plans for large residential and/or commercial built developments to ensure that known mineral resources are not compromised.

Summary Response

19.6 To provide further evidence and information on this question and to inform the submission Plan, we have asked this question again within the Draft Sites Plan, following the identification of the Preferred sites.
20. Question 17

20.1 Question 17 – safeguarding mineral infrastructure

Which mineral infrastructure sites in Oxfordshire (in addition to the specified rail depot sites) should be defined in the Sites Plan to be safeguarded?

20.2 10 respondents made comments to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 18 below.

![Figure 18 Type of respondents to Question 17](image)

20.3 60% of respondents to this question either commented that they did not know or had no specific view. The 40% that did comment had the following suggestions for which mineral sites in Oxfordshire should or should not be defined for safeguarding in the Sites Plan:

- Mineral infrastructure with permanent planning permission
- Should follow NPPF para 204 criteria E
- Every location with mineral infrastructure
- Ensure provision is safeguarded for the future
- Any sites that bulk minerals for transport that are not rail depots should be safeguarded
- Sites that manufacture concrete and concrete products
- No soft sand sites
- Only existing sites should be extended as their combined yield will provide soft sand well beyond 2031

Summary Response

20.4 To provide further evidence and information on this question, due to the limited response and to inform the submission Plan, we have asked this question again within the Draft Sites plan, following the identification of the Preferred sites.
21. **Question 18**

21.1 **Issue 9 – Waste management site safeguarding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 18 – safeguarding waste management sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Are there any waste management sites in Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy that should not be safeguarded in the Sites Plan and, if so, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Are there any waste management sites not included in Appendix 2 of the Core Strategy that should be safeguarded in the Sites Plan and, if so, why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.2 21 respondents made comments to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 19 below.

![Q18. Respondents](image)

*Figure 19 Type of respondents to Question 18*

21.3 Chilterns Conservation Board commented that the following waste management sites should be restored to natural habitats and for public recreation, and no further future waste development sited:

- 013 Ewelme No.2 (Glundon)
- 024 Oakley Wood (W&S Recycling)
- 138 Woodside (Mains Motors)
- 152 Ewelme No.1 (Glundon)
- 184 Rumbolds Pit (R Hazell)
- 256 Hundridge Farm (Onsyany Skips) Ipsden

21.4 An individual commented that Site 248 should not be safeguarded.

21.5 A Local Org/Parish Council commented that 217 Culham No.4 Site, Clifton Hampden should not be safeguarded.

21.6 24% of respondents said no.

21.7 33% of respondents commented on other issues. The issues included:
• Sites that are already safeguarded should continue
• Consistent with Policy W11
• Ardley Fields should be safeguarded
• Anglian Water sites wish their sites to be safeguarded in the Site Allocations Plan.
• Overthorpe Industrial Estate to be safeguarded
• Sutton Courtenay Landfill
• Dix Pit
• Site at Wally Corner
• Land within the nuclear licensed site at Harwell Campus
• Appendix 2 is sufficient
• A Parish Council that the question is not applicable to Longworth Village.

21.8 19% had no specific views on this question and 10% commented that they did not understand the question.

Summary Response

21.9 It is not felt necessary to remove any of the current safeguarded sites within the safeguarded waste sites list within the Core Strategy. The list will be updated to reflect the current operational waste sites in accordance with W11 of the Core Strategy.
22. **Question 19**

22.1 Issue 10 – Any other matters the plan should cover

22.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 19 – any other matters the plan should cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else, not covered above in this consultation document, that the proposed Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Site Allocations Plan should contain?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.3 35 responses were received to this question. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 20 below.

![Figure 20 Type of respondents to Question 19](image)

22.4 23% of respondents made specific comments to this question. These comments included:

- HS2
- Safe and efficient operation of the SRN (A34 and M40)
- Existing Einig site in Thame
- Resources required over the Plan Period
- Requirements for soft sand and crushed rock
- Landbank
- Calculations within the Plan
- Policy Guidance on Site Assessment criteria
- Local businesses
- Cross boundary effects
• Guidance to applicants to the criteria
• Unrealistic housing growth targets
• Safeguarding of waste capacity/infrastructure or replacement sites identified
• Sites for extraction of materials which can be substituted for aggregates, although they are not traditional construction aggregate materials should be included in the Plan
• Extensions if need is identified

22.4 Highways Agency have no comments at this time.

22.5 17% of respondents have no specific view or are not aware of any further issues.

22.6 2 Individuals commented on the complexity of response form and the lack of democratic process.

22.7 4 respondents commented and provided further detail on their sites.
• Sheehans Recycled Aggregate Plant nominated to become a strategic waste management plant.
• Further information in relation to SG60 – Planning application for a marina has now been submitted
• Anglian Water ask to exclude any existing water recycling assets from the proposed working area for mineral extraction.
• PFA-01 proposes substituting 1 million tonnes of scarce sand for 1 million tonnes of pulvarised fuel ash and the Sites Plan should confirm provision for this.

22.8 A Parish Council commented that if SG59 and SG09 are used, that a Section 106 agreement should be entered into to improve the roads around Drayton St Leonard.

22.9 34% of respondents used this question to make further objections on site inclusions.
• SS04 Pinewoods Road, Longworth
• 248 – Tuckwells Yard
• 279 - Einigs Rycote Lane site
• SS17
• Legality of site promotors being allowed to promote SS17
• PFA01 due to access, area not industrial in nature, part of the Radley Lakes strategy and it would compromise the Neighbourhood Plan

22.10 An organisation comments that it would be beneficial to understand why the three sewage treatment works were highlighted to receive waste and not a longer list.

Summary Response

22.11 All the comments and issues raised within this section have been considered in the assessment of the sites and the Plan preparation
23. General Comments

23.1 A number of respondents made general comments to the Plan consultation that either did not relate to a specific question, or were included in addition to their question response.

23.2 39 respondents made a general comment. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 21 below.

![General Comments](image)

*Figure 21 Type of respondents that made general comments to the consultation*

23.3 The list below summarises the issues raised within those comments:

- Identified need/requirement over Plan Period
- Consistency with adopted Local Plan
- Government Policy
- LAA figures and calculations used
- Resource requirement
- County wide strategy required
- Welcome accordance with Local and Neighbourhood Plans.
- Importance of Plan
- Mineral Safeguarding Areas (M8)
- Commitment to working together
- Support for the consultation
- Reiterate objections to specific sites
- Reiterate support for specific sites
- Restoration of sites
- Protected and preserved holes to be left for stunning wildlife
- Buffer zones.
- Amendments to Site Assessment Methodology
• Waste Movements and Duty to Cooperate
• Hazardous waste movements
• Note provision being made for some of low level radioactive waste arising within Oxfordshire
• Reference to other relevant Plans
• Development plan policies welcomed
• Importance of Plan to the overall Development Plan of the District
• Reference to County Wide Strategy required
• Importance of sufficient supply
• Importance of secondary and recycled aggregate
• Importance of safeguarding
• Robust site assessment
• Consultation must take comments into account with relevant case law and other relevant legal and regulatory requirements.
• Deliverability
• Impact of sites
• Waste sites proximity to source of waste arising
• Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation
• Growth Agenda
• Proximity to new housing developments
• Proximity to Eynsham village
• Oxfordshire Cotswold Garden Village
• Kilkenny Farm development
• Land at South Witney development
• Land to the north of Wilding Road and east of Wantage Road, Wallingford
• Land to the North East of Benson
• Impact on Abingdon and road infrastructure
• Environmental Evidence
• Environment Impacts
• Habitats Regulation Assessment
• Complexity of Document
• Community Engagement
• Sustainability Appraisal
• Historic England remit
• National Grid Asset Guidance
• Background to PAGE
• Background to the Woodland Trust
• Background to Friends of Radley Lakes
• Background to Natural England.
• Natural England
  o Air Pollution
  o Priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legal protected species populations
  o Soils
  o Sites of Least Environmental Value
• Natural England Categories of Assessment

23.4 The following Parish Councils wrote to support and endorse the Parishes Against Gravel Extraction (PAGE) response
• Drayton St Leonard Parish Council
• Berrick Salome Parish Council
• Benson Parish Council
• Warborough Parish Council
• Stadhampton Parish Council
• Dorchester on Thames Parish Council
• Newington Parish Council

23.5 A number respond that they have no comments
• Charney Bassett Parish Council
• South Gloucestershire Council
• Peterborough City Council
• The Canal and River Trust
• Wycombe District Council
• Doncaster Council

Summary Response

23.11 All the comments and issues raised within this section have been considered in the assessment of the sites and the Plan preparation
Comments regarding the Site Assessment Methodology and Sustainability Appraisal

24.1 14 respondents made comments on the Sustainability Appraisal and/or the Site Assessment methodology. The types of respondents are highlighted in Figure 22 below.

Figure 22 Type of respondents who made comment to the Sustainability Appraisal/Site Assessment Methodology.

24.2 Three respondents clearly give their support to the Site Assessment Methodology. However, the majority of respondents to these two documents make overall comments in relation to the two documents.

24.3 The issues raised within the comments have been summarised below

- SAM appears comprehensive and robust
- Needs a robust evidence base
- Need to update the Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SRFA).
- Flood 2 SFRA required for sites.
- 25/75% proportional split across the County to be maintained
- Inclusion of M1, M2 and C1
- Additional weighting for proportional distribution, extensions to existing quarries and cumulative impact should be given
- Extensions
- Suitability of road access
- Road issues
- Most up to date route planner required
- Consideration of local populations
- Proximity to residential and business properties should be quantified
- Mitigation measures for communities
- Commitment to communities
- Clarity required on what is major development
• Impact on existing settlements (this applies to large new sites, not just to 'cumulative impact')
• Local opinion should be considered as a criteria
• Pollution impacts – Air quality
• Elaborated on Green Belt criteria
• Satisfied it addresses potential impacts on the Chilterns AONB
• Pleased contains consideration of the setting of the AONB
• Whole of the Chiltern Hills, including that outside the AONB should be assessed in a similar way
• Support amendments to Green Belt from previous consultation
• Needs to decide what is considered to be major development
• Allocate Tubney as AQMA
• Pollution impacts on air quality, not just AQMA should be considered
• Oxford Lorry Network Route – lack of accessible information
• Impact on A420
• Neighbouring roads to sites should be assessed for volume, and nature of current traffic and then additional site traffic.
• Transport Criterion unclear – suggests alternative approach
• Preference for extensions should be added to Compliance with Minerals Strategy
• Co – location of waste management facilities
• Additional positive criteria for existing waste management sites or directly adjacent to sites.
• Cumulative impacts needs adjustment, addition or replacement
• Criterion C1 is considered rather negatively weighted and ignores potential opportunities for co-location.
• Clarification required for what distance is considered close proximity
• Transport criterion clarification
• Lack of weighting of the factors
• Weighting is required
• Stage 3b (detailed technical assessment) Seems to cover similar ground.
• Colour system gives some welcome structure
• Subjective element of the colour system
• Respondents have assessed some sites against the SAM (Report submitted)
• Impacts on sensitive receptors
• Complicated document for many people in a public consultation.

24.4 A respondent from the Mineral Industry comments that they will supply the required information for their site nomination as and when requested by the Council.

25.5 All these comments will be considered as we move forward with the Plans preparation.

Summary Response

25.6 All the comments and issues raised within this section have been considered in the assessment of the sites and the Plan preparation.

25.7 The methodology for the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment as set out within the Issues and Options consultation was used, however there were a number of changes, due to the complexity of the Assessments. These can be seen within the Preliminary Draft Sustainability Appraisal for Sites.
Appendix 1

List of Respondents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agent for Landowner</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK Symes Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Business</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford PharmaGenesis Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemans Healthcare Ltd, MR Magnet Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMP Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMP Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMP Creative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Business/Waste Industry</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKAEA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Consultant/Agent</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everything is Somewhere Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMKC Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>County/Unitary Authorities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Berkshire Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside and Halton Waste Planning Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downs National Park Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Berkshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wokingham Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District/City Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherwell District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Oxfordshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale of White Horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oxon District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycombe District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Developer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson Homes (Southern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson Homes (Southern) &amp; Bloombridge Development Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blenheim Estate &amp; TD Henman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners of the Sarsden House Registered Park and Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. Sharp &amp; Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dean and Chapter of Christ Church, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Organisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Radley Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Flood Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees of Tubney Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Organisation/Parish Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Hampden Parish Council and BACHPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE (Parishes against Gravel Extraction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerals Industry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Tuckwell &amp; Sons Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson Aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Quarry Products Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Rock Supplies Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Product Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Sons (Bletchington) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerals/Waste Industry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT Contracting and Plant Hire Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr E. Vaizey MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglian Water Services Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBOWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilterns Conservation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS2 Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Canal and River Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish/Town Councils</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston, Cote, Shifford and Chimney Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berinsfield Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrick Salome Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Bourton Environment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charney Bassett Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill and Sarsden Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester on Thames Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton St Leonard Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eynsham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Haseley Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanborough Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longworth Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radley Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellingford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadhampton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Courtenay Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thame Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warborough Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waste Industry**

- B&E Transport (Witney) Ltd
- FCC Environment
- Grundon Waste Management Ltd
- J James Ltd
- M&M Skip Hire Ltd
- McKenna Environmental Ltd
- Sheehan Haulage & Plant Hire Ltd.
- The NDA and Magnox Ltd
- Viridor Waste Management Ltd
Appendix 2

Summary of Responses to Waste Sites
Waste Sites

This section sets out very briefly the main issues raised to each of the waste sites. Full copies of the representations are available, and the full responses will be considered when preparing the next stage of the Plan.

All sites

National Grid have commented that all the sites must consider high voltage electricity transmissions overhead lines and underground high-pressure gas pipelines.

The Environment Agency comment they are not resourced to undertake a detailed screening of all the sites and comment OCC should employ ecological personnel to screen sites. They give broad advice on biodiversity and watercourses. They also strongly urge that the design of schemes takes into consideration the existing body of opportunity mapping such as: Conservation Target Areas; Oxfordshire Wildlife & Landscape Strategy, and mapping data from The Wetland Vision.

The Woodland Trust highlight importance of ancient woodlands and ancient trees and suggests buffer zones.

Historic England comment that they have not visited any of the sites, nor does lack of objection/comment mean they believe a site is suitable.

Natural England comments regarding the three AONBs within the Plan area and advises the LPA to take account of Management Plans.

BBOWT have not been able to review all sites in detail. Other than those sites that BBOWT have commented on, they have not been able to review any of the other nominations. Lack of BBOWT comment on these sites does not indicate our endorsement. Many nominated sites appear to be in close proximity to some designated sites such as Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), Ancient Woodlands (AWs) or priority habitats, and quarrying might potentially directly or indirectly adversely affect the conservation interest of these sites. Detailed ecological assessments will be required. A large number of nominated sites are also within or adjacent to a Conservation Target Areas (CTA). BBOWT have commented on a number of sites but state that the list is not exhaustive and does not suggest that other sites, which are not mentioned in these comments, are endorsed by BBOWT. BBOWT also commented that potential environmental impact and restoration opportunities should be assessed in accordance with Core Strategy policies and NPPF. Avoid significant adverse ecological impacts on designated sites and habitats in line with the mitigation hierarchy and to deliver a net gain in biodiversity. As such site nominations that are likely to cause significant adverse effects on designated sites or habitats (individually or in combination with other developments) should not be further considered for selection. Where sites are found to be acceptable (subject to further assessments) consideration should be given to the restoration of mineral working sites for biodiversity. Restoration of sites offer significant opportunities for ecological enhancements and opportunities for large scale habitat restoration should be maximised to create continuous, more resilient ecological networks.

Hampshire County Council and Hampshire County Council on behalf of Central and Eastern Berkshire provided their WDI 2017 figures

Some of the site operators have submitted further information, others comment they are uncertain how much to provide and they are happy to provide upon request.
Site by Site Summary

Site No. 2. Prospect Farm, Chilton

Responses: 2
- West Berkshire Council
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Traffic Impact
Chilterns AONB
Adjacent to Wildlife site

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 3. Dix Pit (Area 1 & 2), Stanton Harcourt

Responses: 2
- FCC Environment
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Groundwater
AONB
Chiltern Society
Priority Habitat – open mosaic on previously developed land.

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 5. Playhatch Quarry, Playhatch

Responses: 3
- Environment Agency
- Chiltern Society
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Groundwater
Chilterns AONB
Chiltern Society
Priority Habitat – Open Mosaic Habitats on previously developed land and deciduous woodland

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 8. New Wintles Farm, Eynsham

Responses: 3
- West Oxon District Council
- Eynsham Parish Council
- AECOM on behalf of Grosvenor

Issues raised:
Cotswolds Garden Village Boundary
Impact on new residents
Local Plan and emerging AAP conflict
Setting of Listed Buildings
Transport
**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 9. Worton Farm, AreasC**

**Responses:** 1
- M&M Skip Hire Ltd

**Issues Raised:**
Site promotor information

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 10. Sutton Courtenay Landfill Area, Sutton Courtenay/Appleford**

**Responses:** 3
- National Grid
- FCC Environment
- Natural England
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council

**Issues raised:**
Site promotor submitted more information
National Grid Infrastructure
Assess impacts of Air Pollution on Little Wittenham and Cothill Fens SAC’s
Against closing date of 2030
Traffic
Noise
Odours
Detriment of wider area
Impact of hazardous waste on water table
Flooding
Leachate problems
Rubbish
Historical record of operator

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 11. Finmere Quarry, Finmere**

**Responses:** 2
- Natural England
- AECOM

**Issues raised:**
Site recorded as supporting best and most versatile agricultural land
Site operator confirmed nomination
Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 13. Ewelme No.2 Site, Goulds Grove, Ewelme
Responses: 5
- Woodland Trust
- Chiltern Society
- Grundon Waste Management Ltd
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Encompasses part of BAP (Common land) and includes or is close to Veteran Tree Chiltern Society area
Chiltern AONB

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 18. Holloway Farm, Waterstock/Milton Common
Responses: 1
Highways Agency

Issues raised:
Access
SRN impact

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 23. Alkerton Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, Alkerton
Responses: NO COMMENT

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 26. Whitehill Quarry, Burford
Responses: 2
- Environment Agency
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Groundwater
AONB setting

Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan
Site No. 30. Shipton on Cherwell Quarry, Shipton on Cherwell

Responses: 4
- Woodland Trust
- Natural England
- Individual
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
- Boundary close to AW ASNW Bunkershill copse
- Shipton on Cherwell SSSI
- Whitehill Farm Quarries SSSI
- Bunkers Hill Quarry LWS
- Lower Cherwell CTA
- Geology
- Nature Conservation
- Ecological impact
- Restoration suggestion rather than landfill

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 103. Lakeside Industrial Estate, Standlake

Responses: 2
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Natural England

Issues raised:
- Local Plan allocation (B2-B8 Sui Generis)
- Assess impacts of air pollution on Oxford Meadows and Cothill Fen SAC’s

Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No 138. Woodside, Old Henley Road, Ewelme

Responses: 4
- Woodland Trust
- Chiltern Society
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

Issues raised:
- Boundary to AW Mogpits Wood and adjacent to small boundary of AW Oakley Wood.
- Ancient woodland
- AONB
- Chilterns Society area
- Traffic movements
- Assess impacts of air pollution on Shirburn Hill and Aston Rowants SAC

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan
Site No. 152 Ewelme No 1 Site, Goulds Grove, Ewelme

Responses: 4
- Chiltern Society
- Grundon Waste Management Ltd
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

Issues raised
- Chilterns Society Area
- AONB
- Information from Operator

Site No. 180 Elmwood Farm, Black Bourton

Responses: 1
- Black Bourton Environment Committee (attached four documents to the representation, a highways and transport technical review)

Issues raised
- Company alleged no longer trading
- Site nomination no longer valid
- Access
- Noise
- Storage
- Proximity to housing
- Previous application withdrawn

Outcome
- This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 217 Culham No.4 Site, Clifton Hampden

Responses: 7
- National Grid
- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Woodland Trust
- Clifton Hampden Parish Council and BACHPORT
- Historic England
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council
- Natural England

Issues raised
- National Grid Infrastructure
- Local Plan allocation overlap
- Borders some trees
- Green Belt
- Grade 1 Historic Park and Garden setting
- Hi tech employment
- Potential housing
- Traffic
- Impact of effects of air pollution on Little Wittenham and Cothill Fen SAC

Outcome
- This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan
Site No. 222 Land North of Wroxton Fields Quarry, Wroxton

Responses: 1
- Environment Agency

Issues raised
Groundwater

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 224 Ambrose Quarry, Ewelme

Responses: 5
- Environment Agency
- Chiltern Society
- Grundon Waste Management Ltd
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

Issues raised
Groundwater
AONB
Chiltern Society area
Information from Operator

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 225 Cedars Storage, Braze Lane

Responses: 1
- David Wilson Homes (Southern)

Issues raised
Impact on area infrastructure (Relief road)
Neighbourhood Plan policy

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 226 Dewars Farm Quarry, Ardley/Middleton Stoney

Responses: 1
- Natural England

Issues raised
Ardley Trackways SSSI (Dinosaur trackways)
Impact of air pollution on Ardley Quarry and Cutting SSSI

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 229 Shellingford Quarry, Shellingford/Stafford in the Vale

Responses: NO COMMENT

Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan
Site No. 230 Chinham Farm, Standford in the Vale  
**Responses:** NO COMMENT

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 232 Banbury Sewage Treatment Works, Banbury  
**Responses:** 1  
- Historic England

**Issues raised**  
Oxford Canal Conservation Area

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 233 Witney Sewage Treatment Works, Witney  
**Responses:** 1  
- David Wilson Homes and Bloombridge Development Partners

**Issues raised**  
Impact on future and proposed neighbours

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 234 Didcot Sewage Treatment Works, Didcot  
**Responses:** 1  
- National Grid

**Issues raised**  
National Grid infrastructure

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 236 Sheehan Recycled Aggregates Plant, Dix Pit  
**Responses:** 2  
- Land and Mineral Management Ltd  
- Historic England

**Issues raised**  
Information from site operator  
Setting of Devil’s Quoits Scheduled Monument

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 245 Challow Marsh Farm, West Challow  
**Responses:** No comment

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 248 Thrupp Lane, Radley**

**Responses: 6**
- Radley Parish Council
- Vale of the White Horse
- H. Tuckwell and Sons Ltd
- One individual
- Friends of Radley Lakes
- BBOWT

**Issues raised**
Traffic  
Access  
Safety and Amenity  
Impact on residents  
Radley lakes Conservation area  
Green Belt  
Nature conservation and quiet recreation  
Biodiversity
Radley Gravel Pits LWS
Thames Radley to Abingdon CTA
Neighbourhood Plan
Intensification and prolongation of an industrial use
Contrary to restoration plans
Information from Operator
Should be considered cumulatively with PFA-01

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 249A & 249B High Coggs Farm, Witney**

**Responses: 4**
- Natural England
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England

**Issues raised**
Assess impact of air pollution on Ducklington Mead SSSI and Oxford Meadows SAC.
Proximity to residential areas
Odour
Noise
Traffic
Impact on future road improvements
Grade II Listed High Cogges Farmhouse setting

**Outcome**
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 250 Broughton Poggs Business Park, Broughton Poggs**
**Responses:** 1
- Environment Agency

**Issues raised**
Groundwater

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 261 The Marshes, Knightsbridge Farm, Yarnton**

**Responses:** No comment

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 262 Lower Heath Farm, Cottisford**

**Responses:** 1
- Environment Agency

**Issues raised**
Groundwater

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 265 Woodeaton Quarry, Woodeaton**

**Responses:** 3
- Historic England
- Natural England
- McKenna Environmental Ltd

**Issues raised**
Water Eaton Manon Listed Buildings
Woodeaton Quarry SSSI
Site promotor information

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 274 Moor End Lane Farm, Moor End Lane, Thame**

**Responses:** No Comment

**Outcome**
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 276 Oday Hill, Sutton Wick**

**Responses:** 1
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council

**Issues raised**
Proximity to housing
Traffic
Noise
Odour
Leachate to River Thames

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 277 Land adjacent to the B480 near Chalgrove

Responses: No comment

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 278 Land off the B4100 Baynards Green, Ardley

Responses: 2
- Environment Agency
- Highways England

Issues raised
Groundwater
Access
SRN impact

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 279 Rear of Ford Dealership, Rycote Lane Thame

Responses: 3
- Thame Town Council
- An individual
- Historic England

Issues raised
Impact on residents
Capacity size
Traffic
HGV noise
Safety
Lack of parking for employees of site
Listed Buildings at Manor Farm

Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 280 Oxford Shooting School, Enstone Airfield

Responses: No comment

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. 281/020b Faringdon Quarry, Faringdon/Little Coxwell

Responses: 1
- Grundon Waste Management Ltd
**Issues raised**
Information from operator

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 282 Land at Field Barn Farm, North of A417, Wantage**

**Responses** 2
- Natural England
- J James Ltd

**Issues raised**
AONB
Site promotor information

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 283 Hatford Quarry Stanford Extension**

**Responses:** No comment

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 285 (Magnox) Harwell Site, Harwell Campus**

**Responses:** 4
- Vale of the White Horse
- NDA and Magnox Ltd
- West Berkshire Council
- Natural England

**Issues raised**
Within proposed residential site identified in Local Plan
Information from Site Promotor
Traffic
Cross boundary impacts
AONB

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. 286 Wally Corner, Berinsfield**

**Responses:** 2
- South Oxfordshire District Council
- FCC Environment

**Issues raised**
Conflict with proposed site allocation in Local Plan
Information from site promotor

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan
Appendix 3

Summary of Responses to Mineral Sites

Minerals Sites

This section sets out very briefly the main issues raised to each of the proposed mineral sites. Full copies of the representations are available, and the full responses will be considered when preparing the next stage of the Plan.

All sites

National Grid have commented that all the sites must consider high voltage electricity transmissions overhead lines and underground high-pressure gas pipelines.

Environment Agency comment they are not resourced to undertake a detailed screening of all the sites and recommend OCC employ ecological personnel to screen sites. They give broad advice on biodiversity and watercourses. They also strongly urge that the design of schemes takes into consideration the existing body of opportunity mapping such as: Conservation Target Areas; Oxfordshire Wildlife & Landscape Strategy, and mapping data from The Wetland Vision

The Woodland Trust highlight importance of ancient woodlands and ancient trees and suggests buffer zones.

Historic England comment that they have not visited any of the sites, nor does a lack of objection/comment mean they believe a site is suitable.

Natural England comments regarding the three AONBs within the Plan area and advises the LPA to take account of Management Plans. BBOWT have not been able to review all sites in detail. Many nominated sites appear to be in close proximity to some designated sites such as Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), Ancient Woodlands (AWs) or priority habitats, and quarrying might potentially directly or indirectly adversely affect the conservation interest of these sites. Detailed ecological assessments will be required. A large number of nominated sites are also within or adjacent to a Conservation Target Areas (CTA). BBOWT have commented on a number of sites but state that the list is not exhaustive and does not suggest that other sites, which are not mentioned in these comments, are endorsed by BBOWT. BBOWT also commented that potential environmental impact and restoration opportunities should be assessed in accordance with Core Strategy policies and NPPF. Avoid significant adverse ecological impacts on designated sites and habitats in line with the mitigation hierarchy and to deliver a net gain in biodiversity. As such site nominations that are likely to cause significant adverse effects on designated sites or habitats (individually or in combination with other developments) should not be further considered for selection. Where sites are found to be acceptable (subject to further assessments) consideration should be given to the restoration of mineral working sites for biodiversity. Restoration of sites offer significant opportunities for ecological enhancements and opportunities for large scale habitat restoration should be maximised to create continuous, more resilient ecological networks.

Hampshire County Council and Hampshire County Council on behalf of Central and Eastern Berkshire provided their WDI 2017 figures
Some of the site operators have submitted further information, others comment they are uncertain how much to provide and they are happy to provide upon request.
Site No CR03 South Extension to Rollright Quarry

**Responses:** 3
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England

**Issues raised:**
Reserve sites only if required
No additional requirement for crushed rock
Historic England have not had time to assess the site.
AONB

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR07 Adjacent to Whitehill Quarry

**Responses:** 4
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- David Wilson Homes and Bloombridge Development Partners

**Issues raised:**
Reserve sites only if required
No additional requirement for crushed rock
Historic England have not had time to assess the site.
Vehicle movements should be directed north onto A40
Cumulative impacts
Impact on existing land promotions

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR08 Castle Barn Quarry

**Responses:** 7
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Sarsden House Registered Park and Garden (attached a Landscape and Heritage Appraisal)
- Everything is somewhere
- Natural England
- Historic England
- Peter Powell
- Churchill and Sarsden Parish Council
- Councillor N.Owen

**Issues Raised:**
Reserve site only if required
No additional requirement for crushed rock
Marrons assessed it against Site Assessment methodology
Policy assessment
Proximity to demand
Sustainable movement
AONB
Significance of designated heritage impacts.
Historic Environment
Archaeology
Grade II* Sarsden House Registered Park and Garden
Grade II Eynsham Mill
Skew Plantation round barrow scheduled monument
Landscape character
Woodland
Highway impact
Public Rights of Way
Grade II Eynsham Mill
Flooding
Only for building stone
Restoration
Historic England have not had time to assess the site.

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR09 Great Tew Estate Quarry
Responses: 2
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England

Issues raised:
Reserve sites only if required
No additional requirement for crushed rock
Historic England have not had time to assess the site

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR10 Burford Quarry
Responses: 3
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- David Wilson Homes and Bloombridge Development Partners
- Historic England

Issues raised:
Reserve sites only if required
No additional requirement for crushed rock
Cumulative impacts
Proximity to local centres
Transport network
Impact on A40
Landscape
Woodland, copses and tree belts
Landscape value
Historic Environment
Grade II Listed Stonelands
Flood zone 1
Ecology
Building on existing good relationships
Sustainable Drainage Solutions management
Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR11 Hatford Quarry, North Extension
Responses: 4
- Woodland Trust
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Buckland Parish Council

Issues raised:
Site bounds AW and BAP
Historic England have not had time to assess the site
Best and most versatile agricultural land
Woodland
PROW
Watercourses
Ecology
Noise
Dust
Traffic
Access
Views
Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR12 Land at Chinham Farm
Responses: 2
- Woodland Trust
- Historic England

Issues raised:
Close to AW ASNW Chinham Copse
Faringdon Conservation Area
Ewedon Copse Scheduled Monument.
Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. CR13 Dewers Farm Quarry, East Extension
Responses: 3
- Natural England
- Historic England
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
Ardley Quarry and Cutting SSSI
Ardley Trackways SSSI
Trowl Pool LWS
CTA currently being developed
Assess impact of air pollution
Geology
Nature Conservation
Traffic
Dust
Historic England have not had time to assess the site

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No., CR15 Land off B4100, Baynards Green**

**Responses:** 2
- Highways England
- Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Access arrangements
SRN impact
Historic England have not had time to assess the site

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No., CR16 Shellingford Quarry, Western Extension**

**Responses:** 2
- Historic England
- Shellingford Parish Council

**Issues raised:**
Application has already been submitted
Environmental
Noise
Dust
Water Hydrogeological
Social
Historic England have not had time to assess the site

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No., CR17 Hatford Quarry South Extension**

**Responses:** 1
- Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Historic England have not had time to assess the site

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No., CR18 Shipton on Cherwell Quarry**

**Responses:** 2
- Historic England
• BBOWT

**Issues raised:**
Historic England have not had time to assess the site
Shipton on Cherwell SSSI
Whitehill Farm Quarry SSSI
Bunkers Hill Quarry LWS
Lower Cherwell CTA
Geology
Nature Conservation
Biodiversity

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. CR19 Dewers Farm Quarry, South Extension**

**Responses:** 3
• Historic England
• Natural England
• BBOWT

**Issues raised:**
Historic England have not had time to assess the site
Ardley Quarry and Cutting SSSI
Ardley Trackways SSSI
Trowl Pool LWS
Geology
Nature Conservation
Current CTA being developed
Assess impact of air pollution
Traffic
Dust

**Site No. CR20 SITE WITHDRAWN**

**Site No. CR21 Hatford Quarry, Stanford Extension**

**Responses:** 1
Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Not had time to assess the site

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. CR22 Hatford Quarry, West Extension**

**Responses:** 1
Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Not had time to assess the site

**Outcome**
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG03 Land adjacent to Benson Marina**  
**Responses:** 4  
- National grid  
- Gardner Planning on behalf of PAGE (included detailed assessment against SAM and supporting documents)  
- Historic England  
- Natural England

**Issues raised:**  
National Grid Infrastructure  
Non extension  
Size  
Cumulative Impacts  
Suitability measured against SAM  
Flood Zone  
Agricultural Land Value  
Policy  
No heritage assets  
Archaeology  
AONB  
Landscape and Visual

**Outcome**  
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG04 Land at Mead Farm**  
**Responses:** 4  
- Individual  
- Historic England  
- Natural England  
- Hanson Aggregates

**Issues raised:**  
Oxford Meadows SAC  
Hydrological impacts including too much/too little water and contamination  
Ecology and biodiversity  
Grade II Listed Mead Farmhouse  
Assess effects of air pollution  
Dust  
Rushy Meadow SSSI  
Hook Meadow and the Trap Grounds SSSI  
Wytham Ditches and Flushes SSSI  
Site promotor information

**Outcome**  
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG05 Land to the East of Cassington Quarry**  
**Responses:** 5
• Highways England
• Individual
• Historic England
• Natural England
• BBOWT

Issues raised:
Access
Operation details
Impact on SRN (A34/M40)
Oxford Meadows SAC
Hydrological impacts including too much/too little water and contamination
Ecology and biodiversity
Oxford Canal Conservation Area
Grate II Listed Duke’s Cut Lock
Buffer Zones
Rushy Meadow SSSI
Hook Meadow and the Trap Grounds SSSI
Wytham Ditches and Flashes SSSI
Pixey & Yarnton Meads SSSI/SAC
BBOWT Nature reserve
Cassington and Yarnton Gravel Pots LWS
Assess effects of air pollution
Dust
Combined impact with other major development
Combined impact with road improvement schemes
Cumulative impact with SG04 and SG16
HRA Required
Restoration should seek the creation of lowland meadow habitats.

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG08 Lower Road, Church Hanborough
Responses: 11
• Hanborough Parish Council
• West Oxfordshire District Council
• 2 Individuals  (A respondent has included a map as evidence)
• 1 group of individuals
• Eynsham Parish council
• Historic England
• AECOM on behalf of Grosvenor
• Natural England
• Smith & Sons (Bletchington) Ltd & Oxford Aggregates
• BBOWT

Issues raised:
Adopted policy
Mineral requirements
North/South split for sites
Grade II listed Eynsham Mill.
Deciduous woodland and traditional orchard
Wytham Woods and Pinsley Wood
City Farm LWS
South Freeland Meadows LWS
Pinsley Wood and Burleigh Wood
Evenlode Valley
Green Belt
Hydrology
Noise
Atmospheric pollution
Church Hanborough Conservation Area
Proximity to Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village
Buffer (1km)
West Oxfordshire Local Plan allocation
In excess of identified requirement
BMV agricultural land
Environment Agency Flood Warning area
Road Safety
A40 improvements
Bus lane
Science Park
Park and Ride
Housing at west of Eynsham
Traffic congestion and impact (A40)
Road safety
Cumulative impacts
Countryside access
Alternative sustainable building techniques
Physical and mental health
Site promoter response

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG09 and SG59 Land north of Drayton St Leonard and Berinsfield and land at Stadhampton**

**Responses:** 7
- Great Hasley Parish Council
- Berinsfield Parish Council
- Drayton St Leonard Parish Council
- Gardner Planning Ltd on behalf of PAGE (included detailed assessment against SAM and supporting documents)
- Historic England
- D.K Symes Associates
- BBOWT

**Issues raised**
Traffic
Not an extension
Road Safety
Access
Archaeology
Hydrology
River Thame work
Consult River Thame Conservation Trust
Local settlements
Monument equivalent to a scheduled monument
Green Belt
Impact on settlements
Landscape impact
Agricultural Land Value
Suitability measured against SAM
Grade II* Listed Camoys Court
Grade II Listed and scheduled Chiselhampton Bridge
Site promoter submitted further information
Support submission by PAGE

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG11 and SG65 Land north east of Sonning Eye (Caversham phases ‘D’ & ‘E’)

Responses: 8
- Chiltern Society
- Historic England
- Tarmac
- Natural England
- University of Reading
- Central and Eastern Berkshire
- Wokingham Borough Council (Awaiting final approval)
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
Part of Chiltern Society area
Landscape and Visual Assessment
Ecological impact
Shiplake Marsh LWS
Warren Wood LWS
Spanhill Copse AW
Loddon Valley Gravel Pits BOA and TVERC
Ecology
Priority habitat
Deciduous woodland and coastal floodplain grazing marsh
Historic Environment
Transport
Road safety
HGV movements and routing
Impact on bridges between Reading and Henley
Restoration
Sonning Eye Conservation Area
Site promoter submitted further information
Restoration & site improvements
Hydrological sensitivity
Agricultural land value
Export for neighbouring Authority
Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG12 Land south of Chazey Wood

Responses: 7
- Woodland Trust
- Chiltern Society
- Historic England
- West Berkshire Council
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England
- Hampshire County Council on behalf of Central and Eastern Berkshire

Issues raised:
Boundary with AW, ASNW
AONB
Part of Chiltern Society area
Landscape and Visual Assessment
Ecology
Priority habitat
Historic Environment
Grade II* listed Chazey Farmhouse
Grade II Listed barn at Chazey Farm and The Fishery.
Restoration
Unlikely impact on West Berkshire
Export for neighbouring Authority

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG13 Land at Shillingford

Responses: 6
- National Grid
- Gardner Planning Ltd on behalf of PAGE (included detailed assessment against SAM and supporting documents)
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Warsborough Parish Council
- Hanson Aggregate

Issues raised:
National Grid infrastructure
AONB
Archaeology
Contains Scheduled monument
Setting of Warborough Conservation Area and Overy Conservation Area
Setting of other Scheduled monuments and Listed Buildings
Agricultural Land Value
Flood Zone
Impact on Historic settlements
Green Belt (openness and coalescence)
Transport
Landscape
Suitability measured against SAM
Support PAGE submission
Not an extension
Site promotor information

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No . SG14 Stonehenge Farm
This site now has permission. It has a Section 73 outstanding awaiting legal agreement

Responses: 3
- National Grid
- Woodland Trust
- Historic England

Issues raised:
National Grid infrastructure
Magic maps indicates AW but aerial photos show none.
Adjacent to Scheduled monument
Archaeology

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No . SG15 Dairy Farm

Responses: 4
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Hanson Aggregate

Issues raised:
Strategic Resource Area
Not an extension
SG31 - Scheduled Monument
Archaeology
Priority habitat – Coastal floodplain grazing marsh and deciduous woodland.
Site promoter information

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No . SG16 Land at Stonehouse Farm, Yarnton

Responses: 4
- Highways England
- Individual
- Historic England
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Access
Transport
Impact on SRN (A34)
Hydrological impact
Oxford Meadows SAC
Rushy Meadow SSSI
Hook Meadow and Trap Grounds SSSI
Wytham Ditches and Flushes SSSI
Biodiversity
Archaeology
Air pollution
Dust
Priority habitat – deciduous woodland

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No., SG17 Land at Culham**

**Responses:** 8
- CEG
- Clifton Hampden Parish Council and BACHPORT
- Historic England
- UKAEA
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council
- Abington Town Council
- Natural England
- University of Reading.

**Issues raised:**

District Local Plan policy
Local Transport Plan policy
Culham Science Village
Culham to Didcot Thames Crossing Link road
Adjacent to proposed residential area
Adjacent to proposed employment area
Green Belt
Priority Habitat – Deciduous woodland
Hedgerows
Heritage assets
Fullamoor Plantation Scheduled Monument
Archaeological remains
Clifton Hampden Conservation Area
Highways Impact
Traffic
Noise
Air Quality
Environment amenity
Conflict with Science and Technology facilities
Dust
Landscape character
River impact
Planning history

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan
Site No. SG18 Land near Standlake

**Responses:** 4
- National Grid
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Hanson Aggregates

**Issues raised:**
National Grid Infrastructure
Archaeology
Priority habitats- Coastal floodplain grazing marsh
Site promoter information

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG19 Bridge Farm, Appleford

This site now has planning permission

**Responses:** 3
- National Grid
- Historic England
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council

**Issues raised:**
National Grid Infrastructure
Sutton Courtenay Conservation Areas
River crossing to the west of Appleford.
Traffic
Impact on river.

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG20 Land between Eynsham & Cassington

**Responses:** 10
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- 1 individuals
- 1 group of individuals
- 1 couple (PDF included)
- Eynsham Parish Council
- Historic England
- AECOM on behalf of Grosvenor
- Natural England
- Smith & Sons (Bletchington) Ltd & Oxford Aggregates
- Siemans, MR Magnet Technology

**Issues raised:**
Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village
Strategic Development Area
District Local Policy
Core Strategy policy
In excess or identified resource requirement
North/South site allocation
Nearby developments
Traffic impact
Transport network
Dualling of A40
Bus lane, Park and ride.
Eynsham Conservation Area
Oxford Meadows SAC (ancient woodland)
Wytham Woods SSSI
Wytham Ditches and Flushes SSSI
Priority habitat - Coastal Floodplain grazing marsh
Site of European importance
Agricultural land value
Green Belt
Hydrological impact
Local environment
Physical and mental health
Dust
Vibrations
Flood risk
Exacerbating existing problems
High Sensitivity industry
Specialised manufacturing in vicinity.
Local allotments
Local school and cricket ground
Sustainable building technologies
Site promotor information

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG20a Wharf Farm, Cassington
Responses: 9
- Woodland Trust
- 1 individuals
- 1 group of individuals
- 1 couple (PDF included)
- Eynsham Parish Council
- AECOM on behalf of Grosvenor
- Natural England
- Smith & Sons (Bletchington) Ltd & Oxford Aggregates
- Siemans, MR Magnet Technology
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village
Strategic Development Area
District Local Policy
Core Strategy policy
In excess or identified resource requirement
North/South site allocation
Nearby developments
Traffic impact
Transport network
Dualling of A40
Bus lane, Park and ride.
Eynsham Conservation Area
Oxford Meadows SAC (ancient woodland)
Wytham Woods SSSI
Wytham Ditches and Flashes SSSI
Wytham Great Wood
Cassington Meadows SSSI
Pixey and Yarnton Mead SSSI/SAC
Cassington Gravel Pits South LWS
Somerford Mead LWS
River Thames
Site of European importance
Agricultural land value
Green Belt
Hydrological impact
Flood plain
Local environment
Physical and mental health
Dust
Vibrations
Flood risk
Exacerbating existing problems
High Sensitivity industry
Specialised manufacturing in vicinity
Local allotments
Local school
Sustainable building technologies
Use of conveyor to move minerals
Restoration
Area is suitable for opportunities for creating and improving a more resilient ecological network.
HRA Required
Cumulative impact with SG20 and SG20b
Site promoter response

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No .SG20b Land at Eynsham

Responses: 10
- Historic England
- 1 individuals
- 1 group of individuals
- 1 couple (PDF included)
- Eynsham Parish Council
- AECOM on behalf of Grosvenor
- Natural England
- Smith & Sons (Bletchington) Ltd & Oxford Aggregates
- Siemans, MR Magnet Technology
- BBOWT
**Issues raised:**
- Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village
- Strategic Development Area
- District Local Policy
- Core Strategy policy
- In excess or identified resource requirement
- North/South site allocation
- Nearby developments
- Traffic impact
- Transport network
- Dualling of A40
- Bus lane, Park and ride.
- Eynsham Conservation Area
- Oxford Meadows SAC (ancient woodland)
- Wytham Woods SSSI
- Wytham Ditches and Flushes SSSI
- Wytham Great Wood
- Pixey and Yarnton Mead SSSI/SAC
- Cassington Gravel Pits South LWS
- Somerford Mead LWS
- River Thames
- Site of European importance
- Agricultural land value
- Green Belt
- Hydrological impact
- Flood plain
- Local environment
- Physical and mental health
- Dust
- Vibrations
- Flood risk
- Exacerbating existing problems
- High Sensitivity industry
- Specialised manufacturing in vicinity
- Local allotments
- Local school
- Sustainable building technologies
- Use of conveyor to move minerals
- Restoration
- Area is suitable for opportunities for creating and improving a more resilient ecological network.
- HRA Required
- Cumulative impact with SG20 and SG20b
- Site promoter response

**Outcome**
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG23 Windrush North, Gill Mill**

**Responses:** 7
- David Wilson Homes and Bloombridge Development Partners
- Natural England
Issues raised:
Safeguarded for HS2
Local amenity
Character
Setting
Stanton Harcourt and Sutton Conservation Area
Ducklington Mead SSSI
Hydrological issues
Lower Windrush Valley CTA
Air Pollution
Traffic
Bus lanes
Dust
Biodiversity
Environmental impact
Social impact
Recreation
Cumulative impacts
Restoration

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG27 Vicarage Pit, Cogges Lane
Responses: 3
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
North/South allocation
Identified resource requirement
Grade II Listed buildings at Beard Mill
Archaeology
Priority Habitats – Coastal floodplain grazing marsh

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG28 Guy Lakes North adj B4449
Responses: 2
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
North/South allocation
Identified resource requirement
Archaeology

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG29 Sutton Farm
Responses: 3
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Carter Jonas on behalf of Mr and Mrs Sensecall

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
North/South allocation
Identified resource requirement
Stanton Harcourt and Sutton Conservation area
Village Impact
Conservation Area setting
Traffic
Landscape

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG30 Home Farm, Brighthampton
Responses: 2
West Oxfordshire District Council
Historic England

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
North/South allocation
Proximity to residential
Proximity to business
Amenity
Traffic
Archaeology

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG31 Land east of Sutton
Responses: 5
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Mr and Mrs Sensecall
Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
North/South allocation
Identified resource requirement
Stanton Harcourt and Sutton Conservation area
Priority Habitat – Coastal floodplain grazing marsh
Site offers good potential for floodplain habitat creation
Village Impact
Conservation area setting
Traffic
Landscape

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG 33 Land south of Wallingford, New Barn Farm –
This site now has Planning Permission

Responses: 5
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Grundon Waste Management Ltd
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
Non extension
Grade II Listed Barn Farm
Site promoter included commented on application
AONB

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG36 Land at Friars Farm

Responses: 1
- Historic England

Issues raised:
Not had time to assess the site.

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG37 Land at Grandpont and South Hinksey

Responses: 7
- Environment Agency
- Individual
- Historic England
- Oxford Flood Alliance
- Natural England
- National Grid
- BBOWT

**Issues raised:**
National Grid Infrastructure
Oxford Flood Alleviation Scheme (Current application)
HE not had time to assess the impact on historic environment
Priority habitat – Lowland meadow
Oxford Heights West CTA

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No . SG41 N. of Lower Radley**

**Responses:** 4
- Radley Parish Council
- Historic England
- Natural England
- BBOWT

**Issues raised:**
Access
Traffic
Loss of Amenity
Noise
Dust
Oxford CTA
Ecological impact
Impact on residents
PROW
Landscape impact
Oxford Green Belt
Thames Path
Nuneham Courtenay Conservation Area
Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden of Nuneham Courtenay
Priority Habitat – Lowland meadow

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No . SG42 Nuneham Courtenay**

**Responses:** 4
- Woodland Trust
- Historic England
- Natural England
- BBOWT

**Issues raised:**
BAP with very limited tree cover
Setting of Conservation Area
Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden of Nuneham Courtenay
Priority Habitat – Lowland meadow
Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No, SG58 Chestliion Farm, Clanfield
Responses: 3
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Hanson Aggregate

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
Non extension
Not had time to assess impacts on historical environment
Site promoter information

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No, SG58a Manor Farm, Clanfield
Responses: 3
- West Oxfordshire District Council
- Historic England
- Hanson Aggregate

Issues raised:
Core Strategy Policy
Non extension
Not had time to assess impacts on historical environment
Site promoter information

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No, SG59
Responses: 5
- Great Hasley Parish Council
- Berinsfield Parish Council
- Gardner Planning Ltd on behalf of PAGE (included detailed assessment against SAM and supporting documents)
- Historic England
- Drayton St Leonard Parish Council

Issues raised:
Traffic
Safety
Archaeology
Local Settlements
Green Belt
Suitability measured against SAM
Monument equivalent to Scheduled Monument
Grade II* Listed Camoys Court
Grade II Chiselhampton Bridge
Support PAGE Submission

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG60 White Cross Farm**
A Planning Application for this site has now been submitted

**Responses:** 4
- Greenfield Environmental on behalf of London Rock Supplies Ltd
- Historic England
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

**Issues raised:**
Site Operator provided more information
Grade II Listed milestone
AONB
Historic England not had time to assess impacts on historical environment

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG61 Mains Motors**

**Responses:** 5
- Woodland Trust
- Chiltern Society
- Historic England
- Chilterns Conservation Board
- Natural England

**Issues raised:**
AW Mogpits Wood
AW Oakley Wood
AONB
Chiltern Society Area
Historic England not had time to assess impacts on historical environment
Landscape
Restoration
Traffic
Setting

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SG62 Appleford**
Responses: 5
- National Grid
- Historic England
- Sutton Courtenay Parish Council
- University of Reading
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
National Grid infrastructure
Scheduled monument
Archaeology
Sports Development
Ladygrove Housing
Traffic
Didcot Garden Town
Strategic Drainage Improvements
Road Safety
Access
Lorry Route Network
Culham to Didcot Thames river crossing
Community Orchard (TOE2 Funding)

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG63 Finmere Quarry
Responses: 1
- Historic England

Issues raised:
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG11 and SG65 Land north east of Sonning Eye (Caversham phases ‘D’ & ‘E’)
Responses: 8
- Chiltern Society
- Historic England
- Tarmac
- Natural England
- University of Reading
- Central and Eastern Berkshire.
- Woodland Trust
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
Part of Chiltern Society area
AW Spanhill Copse
Landscape and Visual Assessment
Priority habitat - Deciduous woodland and coastal floodplain grazing marsh
Historic Environment
Transport
Road safety
HGV movements
Restoration
Sonning Eye Conservation Area
Site promotor submitted further information
Restoration & site improvements
Hydrological sensitivity
Agricultural land value
Export for neighbouring Authority
Ecological impact
Shiplake Marsh LWS
Warren Wood LWS
Loddon Valley Gravel Pits BOA and TVERC

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SG67 Sutton Wick Quarry Responses:
Responses: 2
  - Historic England
  - Sutton Courtenay Parish Council

Issues raised:
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment
Proximity to village
Noise
Dust
Light pollution

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SS03 Hatford Quarry, South Extension
Responses: 1
  - Historic England

Issues raised:
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SS04 Land at Pinewoods Road
Responses: 6
  - 2 Individuals
  - Vale of White Horse
• Historic England
• Longworth Parish Council
• Hanson Aggregates

**Issues raised:**
Longworth Development Plan Policy
Local Plan policy
No identified need required
AW, BAP, ASNW String copse
Grade II Listed Manor Farmhouse
Grade II Registered Historic Parks and Garden of Hinton Manor
Proximity to village
Noise
Dust
Health, safety and quality of life of residents
Local farm/market garden
Traffic and A420
Road safety
Buffer zone policy
Tranquillity
Visual impact
Great Crested Newts
Protected trees
Mobile phone mast
Precedent
Previous applications refused
Restoration
Site promoter information

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SS05 Land at Kingston Bagpuize**

**Responses:** 1
• Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SS07 Home Farm, Shellingford**

**Responses:** 3
• Geoff White on behalf of R.S Sharp & Partners
• Woodland Trust
• Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Site operator supplied information
AW, ASNW Withybed Copse, ASNW Chaslins Copse
Shellingford Conservation Area
Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SS08 Shellingford Quarry Western extension – APPLICATION SUBMITTED
A Planning Application for this site has now been submitted
Responses: 3
• Shellingford Parish Council
• Natural England
• Historic England

Issues raised:
Environmental
Social
Noise
Dust
Hydrological
Village proximity
Tranquillity
Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SS12 Land at Chinham Farm
Responses: 1
• Historic England

Issues raised:
Faringdon Conservation Area
Ewedown Copse Scheduled Monument

Outcome
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No SS15 Hatford Quarry North Extension
Responses: 3
• Historic England
• Woodland Trust
• Buckland Parish Council

Issues raised:
AW, BAP, ASNW
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment
Tranquillity
PROW
Noise
Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SS16 Hatford Quarry Stanford Extension
Responses: NO COMMENT

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

Site No. SS17 Land north and south of A420 near Fyfield and Tubney
Responses: 62
- Ed Vaizey MP
- WMP
- Oxford PharmaGenesis Ltd
- 53 individuals
- Woodland Trust
- Historic England
- G.G Broughton on behalf of Trustees of Tubney Woods
- Natural England
- Fyfield and Tubney Parish Council
- BBOWT

Issues raised:
Local Policy
No requirement for additional soft sand
Sufficient productive capacity
Proximity to village
Proximity to local businesses
Lack of infrastructure
Traffic
A420 Impact
Access
Road safety
Bus route
Noise
Dust
Vibration
Light pollution
Land instability
Health – cement dust, respirable crystalline silica
Impact on existing buildings
Listed Buildings - Tubney Warren Barns and 28 more within Parish
St Lawrence Church - Pugin building
Ancient woodlands – Appleton Upper Common, Tubney Wood, Church Copse
AW1, AW2 and AW3 BAP
Ancient fishponds
Corallian ridge
Frilford Heath, Ponds and Fens SSSI
Cothill Fen
Fyfield and Netherton Conservation Area
Oxford Heights West CTA
Greenbelt
Best and most versatile agricultural land
Water table
PROW
Amenity
Biodiversity
Bluebell beds
Local Wildlife (Red kites, badgers, bats, birds of prey, deer, foxes, voles, snakes, slow worms, beetles, bees, small tortoiseshell butterfly and lots more)
Wildlife Conservation research centre
Cumulative impacts
Tranquillity
Historical inability by tenant farmers to plough north of A420
Assessment undertaken against methodology
Community Engagement
Employment impact
Social and Economic impact
Compensation request
Restoration
Landfill
Lack of overall strategy for County
Test of appropriateness required

**Outcome**
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. SS18 Hatford Quarry West Extension**
**Responses:** 1
- Historic England

**Issues raised:**
Historic England have not had time to assess this site for potential impacts on the historic environment

**Outcome**
This site has been included as a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan

**Site No. PFA-01**
**Responses:** 5
- Radley Parish Council
- Vale of White Horse Council
- Individual
- Friends of Radley Lakes
- BBOWT

**Issues raised:**
Access
Safety
Restoration
Lack of agreed restoration
Prolonging of quarrying in area
Green Belt
Nature conservation
Recreation & Amenity
Radley Lakes
Radley Gravel Pits LWS
Thames Radley to Abingdon CTA
Lack of Policy for reworking of infill material
Neighbourhood Development Plan
Considered cumulatively with 248

Outcome
This site has not been considered a preferred option within the Draft Sites Plan