

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.1	2016DMSP1	Individual	Comment	I wished to comment regarding the proposals at Moreton. I feel the proposals will have a huge impact on the village in respect of traffic. These are dangerous, narrow little roads, used by traffic, horse riders, walkers and cyclists. Quarry lorries would really pose a safety issue.	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Road safety/Traffic impacts <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Quarry traffic will access B3390 directly Further assessment, including transport modelling, will be carried out to consider potential impacts and how to address these.
1.1	2016DMSP8	Maiden Newton Parish Council	Agree	Maiden Newton Parish Council has review the plan and support the proposals made to ensure the supply of minerals for the future.	Noted.
1.1	2016DMSP12	Individual	Disagree	As a resident of the vicinity of proposed site AS12, Philliol's Farm, this is a lovely community in and around Hyde, with now many young children growing up here, I drive past the proposed site several times a day for the school run to Bere Regis School, it is a beautiful area and would be devastating to the families living there.	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> General amenity <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that the impacts of developing the site are capable of being mitigated. They will be identified at Plan preparation stage, and specifically addressed at the planning application stage

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.1	2016DMSP15	West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Comment	<p>The draft Mineral Sites Plan was put to consultation in summer 2015. The following are West Dorset District Councils observations and comments, which should be read in conjunction with comments made previously .</p> <p>AS-19 Woodsford Quarry Extension; AS-25 Station Road, Moreton; AS-26 Hurst Farm, Moreton sites proposed for sand and gravel extraction</p> <p>The Council remains concerned about the potential impacts, including cumulative impacts of proposed sand and gravel extraction in the Woodsford / Crossways / Moreton area. The Councils main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of the proposed minerals workings around the village especially in relation to the length of time that the area will be worked for minerals; • The volume of traffic and the HGV movements that will result from the quarry workings on top of the growth from proposed housing development; • The potential for impact on the local economy especially the local tourist economy (including Silverlake and Sculpture by the Lakes, Tincleton); • The impact of all of this development on the amenity of the residents of Crossways; and • The impact on the local landscape resulting from the quarry development. • A co-ordinated master planning approach should be developed to ensure that the above impacts are minimised, appropriate infrastructure is provided (including the upgrade of local roads) and that development is appropriately phased. <p>The Council welcomes the commissioning of transport modelling work to examine the potential cumulative traffic impacts arising from housing and minerals developments in the Woodsford / Crossways / Moreton area.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumulative impacts – of quarrying alone, and with other built development 2. Extent of quarrying in the area, and length of time scale for quarrying 3. Traffic impacts 4. Impacts on local economy 5. Impacts on amenity 6. Impacts on local landscape 7. Coordinated, master-planning approach required – to minimise impacts and phase development appropriately <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dorset County Council, West Dorset District Council and Purbeck District Council are working together to provide a more united approach 2. Further traffic assessment has been commissioned and carried out. 3. The potential impacts that have been identified are acknowledged, particularly cumulative impacts arising in conjunction with future housing development, but it is considered that impacts can be mitigated. Nothing has been identified at this stage to indicate that these sites should not be included as allocations in the Mineral Sites Plan.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.1	2016DMSP19	Individual	Disagree	<p>I disagree with the site location of land at Horton Heath / Clump Hill for mineral extraction.</p> <p>Important and much needed safe rights of way will be badly effected by mineral extraction on this site. Access for site lorries is poor. The site has important wildlife species that will be lost, ancient woodland will also be effected that supports protected species. In order to protect scheduled monuments and archaeology the site would need to be greatly reduced. This questions the viability and worth of this site for mineral extraction in consideration of the long term effect and loss to the local ecology, the environment and the community, all of which would be effected by noise and air pollution from the site to the wider habitat.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impacts on Rights of Way 2. Poor access for lorries 3. Impacts on biodiversity – wildlife and Ancient Woodland 4. Impacts on cultural heritage 5. Amenity impacts – noise, air pollution <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These comments are noted. If the site is to be included, further assessments will be required to demonstrate that impacts can be mitigated.
1.1	2016DMS P22	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Agree	We fully agree with paragraph 1.1.	Noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.1	2016DMSP213	PRO Vision Planning	Comment	<p>Pro Vision Planning and Design has been instructed by the Charborough Estate to submit representations to the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update 2016. These representations should be considered along with the comments made on behalf of the Charborough Estate to the Draft Mineral Sites Plan, dated 23 September 2015. The representations are made in respect of the following: i, The continued allocation of Tatchell's Quarry Extension (Reference: AS-15); ii, The revised aggregates area of search; and iii, The extraction of Purbeck Ball Clay. The continued allocation of Tatchell's Quarry Extension The Charborough Estate supports the continued inclusion of Tatchell's Quarry Extension, Wareham (Reference: AS-15) as a site for the provision of sand and gravel. The site is owned by the Estate. As set out within Table 2 of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update 2016, an increasing rate of production and a corresponding decline in landbank has occurred since 2012. The new 2014 figures for aggregate provision and supply described in paragraph 2.7 demonstrate that the rate of aggregate consumption is increasing rapidly. The reserve of sand and gravel will continue to contribute to meeting demand and will steadily decline unless new sites, such as Tatchell's Quarry Extension, come forward. The allocation of Tatchell's Quarry Extension will contribute to securing a sufficient supply of material to support sustainable economic growth and quality of life, in line with paragraph 142 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 27-001-20140306). Paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework identifies that Minerals Planning Authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. The forecast delivery rate of 1.57 million tonnes of aggregate per year over the plan period set out in paragraph 2.19 may not be sufficient in view of the increasing rate of aggregate consumption.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for Tatchell's Extension AS-15 2. Policy basis for continued provision of aggregate <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted.
1.1	2016DMSP230	RSPB, South West Regional Office	Comment	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above. The RSPB welcomes the opportunity to present our comments. The RSPB has previously provided comments on the Mineral Sites Plan during earlier consultations in February 2014 and October 2015. Many of the comments made in those responses remain relevant. In preparing this response we have considered the following documents available on the Councils consultation portal. Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update, May 2016 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2015 Comments relating to the proposed site allocations Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole - Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 consultation Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan Conservation Regulations Assessment Screening Report, June 2016 Chapter 1 sets out an introduction and summary of progress with the draft MSP to date, including the rationale for the 2016 update. It also signals the inclusion of a new aggregate site at Gallows Hill, on the Puddletown Road, and the inclusion of an extension to Swanworth quarry. It also confirms the future timescale, including the publication of a pre-submission draft MSP in early 2017.</p>	Noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.1	2016DMSP237	East Dorset Friends of The Earth	Comment	<p>East Dorset Friends of the Earth supplementary response to the 2016 update of the draft minerals sites plan. Editorial points</p> <p>Perhaps an executive summary, with a brief table of all the sites, will be useful. We have suggested before that the current and proposed sites and disused quarries, especially those slated for inert fill, could be included as selectable overlays on the Dorset Explorer map on http://explorer.geowessex.com/ ; and, as a new suggestion, could this map be extended some 8 to 12 miles over the border? This would be useful to those of us who live close to other counties. We accept that site proposals often change and updates to the map would be infrequent but this delay would be acceptable. We have also put this suggestion to the Waste planners.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts The cumulative impact of several disused quarries tripping over each other may be worse than the cumulative impact of traffic, noise, etc. from working quarries near each other. When siting a quarry, we need to know what disused quarries are nearby. All of the main rivers in Hampshire and Dorset are in danger of becoming a series of lakes and pits. Some of these pits still have the bunds left in place.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative impacts of siting current quarries near disused ones <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Quarries will be appropriately restored, not expected to be an issue.
1.1	2016DMSP156	Swanage town council	Comment	<p>Further to Minute No. 7) a) of the Planning and Consultation Committee Meeting held on 9 th May 2016, the Mineral and Waste Sites Planning Policy Consultation documents had now been received and reviewed by Committee Members. A short discussion ensued and comments were made that extensive work had been undertaken on the plans to limit visual and environmental impacts, and that they were lengthy and comprehensive. Members agreed that extended waste facilities were required, and it was confirmed that, in respect of the Additional Waste Site Allocation proposals for the existing Swanworth Quarry site, the proposals related to inert waste only, not household waste, and that some of the inert waste was, in fact, re-processed and re-used. A query was raised as to why the Town Council had been consulted as all sites identified in the plans were outside the parish boundary, and had no direct impact on the parish. It was confirmed that the Council had been consulted as it was a neighbouring authority. Members concurred that they had no further observations to make, and it was therefore</p> <p>AGREED: That a response be submitted to Dorset County Council confirming that the Committee had reviewed and appropriately discussed the consultation documents, and had no further comments to make.</p>	Noted.
1.4	2016DMSP2	Borough Of Poole Councillor	Comment	<p>Although a minerals site below the Canford Magna Golf course was recorded as long ago as May 2014, there was no public proposal to extract the minerals until October 2015. There has been no public consultation on mineral extraction here and in consequence it is disingenuous to describe it as a windfall site. It is difficult to see how extraction of a million tonnes of sand and gravel over a 7 year period can be justified while other recognised sites remain 'mothballed'. Although in the SE Dorset Green Belt this site is very close to the conurbation of Bearwood and the village of Canford Magna whose residents would be subject to unacceptable air, noise and traffic pollution.</p>	Site is not under consideration.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.4	2016DMS p9	Maiden Newton Parish Council	Agree		

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

1.4	2016DMSP89	Highways England	Comment	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Mineral Sites Plan. We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN), which in the Plan area comprises short sections of the A303(T) in the north and the A31(T) and A35(T) in the south. It is on the basis of these responsibilities that the comments that follow in this letter have been made. We are generally concerned that potential traffic impacts of any proposals coming forward through the minerals plan should be fully assessed during the plan-making stage. It is imperative to identify these improvements at this early stage is set out in government policy. Paragraph 15 of DfT Circular 02/2013 states that: In order to develop a robust transport evidence base [for local plans], the Agency (now Highways England) will work with the local authority to understand the transport implications of development options. This will include assessing the cumulative and individual impacts of the Local Plan proposals upon the ability of the road links and junctions affected to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in terms of capacity and safety. Paragraph 18 states that Capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as fresh proposals at the planning application stage. The Highways Agency (now Highways England) will work with strategic delivery bodies to identify infrastructure and access needs at the earliest possible opportunity in order to assess suitability, viability and deliverability of such proposals, including the identification of potential funding arrangements. Undertaking suitable assessment of transport impact at the plan-making stage avoids sites being chosen where: i. the traffic impact of the proposed development on the operation of nearby junctions is not known; or ii. proposals for access or transport mitigation are untested and un-costed.</p> <p>Introduction We understand the stage at which the Mineral Sites Plan is at and its role when adopted in superseding the saved policies of the 1999 Minerals and Waste Plan. We understand that after the previous consultation between December 2013 and September 2015 that the nominated sites have undergone further assessment, including taking on board previous comments. This document therefore indicates the sites which the Mineral Planning Authority currently proposes for future development. Since the previous stage, we understand that the following amendments have been made: - Amendments have been made to the Area of Search and these are shown for consultation and comment - please note that this work is on-going and further changes are likely - The 2015 Draft Mineral Sites Plan included some potential site allocations which were indicated as unlikely to be needed during the life of the Plan it is now considered that some of these may be needed during the life of this Plan, and these are included for consultation and comment - An extension to Swanworth Quarry in Purbeck has been proposed. Amendments have been offered to seek to reduce visual impacts, namely creating a tunnel as part of the linkage between the current quarry and the proposed extension. - A new aggregates site, Gallows Hill on the Puddletown Road, was nominated during the recent consultation and this is presented for consultation and comment. We have previously provided comments in relation to the emerging Mineral Sites Plan, which should be read in conjunction with this letter. A lot of site specific comments were made relating to the previous consultation. Where the sites remain in the plan they are still applicable.</p> <p>Concluding Remarks Thank you for consulting Highways England on the minerals sites plan. You will note that DfT Circular 02/2013, which sets out our involvement in spatial planning matters, emphasises that transport impacts and potential mitigation needs to be understood and agreed at the plan making stage. Whilst some limited information has been provided, no data are available on the distribution, assignment of these trips onto the road network, nor the impact the sites would have on the safe and efficient operation of specific trunk road junctions. We are aware of the relationship between development planning and the transport network, and we are mindful of the effects that planning decisions may have on the operation of the Strategic Road Network and associated junctions. Whilst we cannot be expected to cater for unconstrained traffic growth generated by new developments, we encourage policies and proposals which incorporate measures to reduce traffic generation at source and encourage more sustainable travel behaviour. I trust that you are able to take these comments into account. Please get in touch if you wish to discuss matters further.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic/transport issues potentially may arise – further information required. <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The relevant information will be supplied.
-----	------------	------------------	---------	--	---

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.4	2016DMSP2 35	RSPB, South West Regional Office			
1.6	2016DMSP3	Borough of Poole Councillor	Comment	Please see my comments in 1.4. The Canford Magna Golf course site was not included in the July 2015 consultation. It makes a nonsense of the consultation process if sites just pop up as windfalls after the consultation has finished.	
1.6	2016DMSP4	Portland Town Council	Comment	<p>When the last consultation took place, Portland Town Council's policy on mineral workings was forwarded: That PTC discourages further open cast work but welcomes mining for the extraction of stone. That PTC would like to see the mandatory backfilling of worked out mines relaxed to enable alternative use such as storage and tourism to be considered. Since that consultation the matter of the exhaustion of aggregate for crushing and back filling at Admiralty Quarry has been brought to light.</p> <p>At the Mineral Liaison meeting hosted by Paul Kimber of DCC it was suggested that an ideal place for crushing operations to be continued would be Bowers Quarry due to its isolation from housing, the amount of available materiel there and the sustainability of the transport link along Wide Street and off the Island. All members of PTC at that meeting supported this proposal. There will not be an available meeting of PTC to fully debate the consultation [although an e. copy has been forwarded to all members] before the consultation deadline however as one of the nominated mineral liaison reps I am forwarding the above on behalf of PTC.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bower's Quarry identified as a good location for future crushing of Portland Stone <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The site has not been identified or promoted by a mineral operator. It is generally the case that sites identified are nominated and/or promoted by a developer/owner. The site has not been added to the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

1.6	2016DMSP20	Individual	Comment	<p>Please accept this letter as our objection to your continued inclusion of AS25 Station Road in the minerals plan in response to your interim consultation. Our comments are based on knowledge of the local area and experience and observations of existing local quarrying (both operational and so called restored). In addition, as you know, FRAME has provided you with extensive and detailed objections to your last consultation which we do not believe you have adequately addressed yet.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conservation Zone AS25 is bounded to the north along Station Road (known locally as the Avenue) by the Moreton Village Conservation zone. There has not been any recognition or proper impact assessment on this zone. The change of status to the zone has not been acknowledged in the interim draft document. We strongly urge the DCC to conduct a proper assessment. 2. Dorset Heathland The plan gives scarce recognition that AS25 is within 1 km of Dorset Heathland and impact on wildlife and amenity. It has ignored relevant legislation regarding AS25's proximity. 3. River Frome SSSI The plan does not properly assess the impact on the River Frome SSSI on water levels, wildlife and amenity. Comments regarding farm flow-off is false and misleading. 4. Cumulative Impact The DCC has not assessed the totality of the impact of extended quarrying and the housing developments planned for Crossways, Moreton and Redbridge. The increase of heavy traffic will be unacceptable and highly dangerous to cars, cyclists and in particular pedestrians travelling between Crossways Shops, Surgery, Station and Moreton Village. This includes children getting to the station and buses for school. There are no footpaths or safe verges along the length of Station Road/B3390. 5. Traffic Assessment The level of heavy minerals lorry traffic has been grossly underestimated in the plan. The transport companies only react to customer demand and typically the lorries are not fully laden. This means the level of lorry movements could be double that being predicted. The DCC need to be aware of the dangers around the River Frome Bridges on the B3390. Serious accidents continue to occur. The area needs serious investment to alleviate traffic risks and to those living in the adjacent cottages including recognition of the southern-most bridge being listed. Have the DCC factored in these costs in their impact assessments? Lorries frequently exceed speed limits along the length of the road which is no surprise as the drivers are incentivised to speed between jobs. The quarry companies have no control over contracted lorry companies and traffic rules are frequently flouted. 6. Water Table As has been explained many times before to the DCC, the water levels across AS25 and surrounding areas such as the Common are exceedingly high in winter months. This winter was no exception with frequent surface water flooding. Many cottages in the area are cob and cannot tolerate any risk of increase to water levels. All evidence from the quarrying community suggests quarrying does exacerbate the risks of flooding which the DCC and Landowner have so far ignored. Restoring land to lakes is a high risk strategy which academic research has proved actually damages water run-off and increases the risk of flooding. 7. Minerals Tonnage We do not accept the DCC's justification for planning more river terrace extraction and hence inclusion of high impact sites such as AS25 to meet this fictitious demand. Furthermore, the DCC and Landowner have not proved the level of sand/gravel available to justify the sites continued inclusion in the plan. We remind the DCC that BGS data suggests poor yield and if mitigations involve avoiding ancient hedges and trees and bunding along the Avenue and Redbridge Road the yield will be even lower. Taking all considerations into account is AS25 viable at all? The DCC should also consider the impact of the new political situation regarding the likely impact of a recession and reduced appetite for building and hence aggregates. 8. Wildlife The whole of Moreton Estate is a special place enjoyed by many visitors but more importantly it's a refuge for many species of wildlife. The DCC or its agents have not taken account the impact quarrying will have on wildlife. The devastation along Puddletown Road is witness to the carnage that will result. There 	<p>The issues/impacts identified relate to sites that do not from part of the current consultation. However, issues raised include...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Impacts on amenity of Moreton residents ⇒ Inappropriate to quarry so close to houses • Biodiversity/natural environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Within 1km of Dorset Heathland SPA and SAC – impact on these designations ⇒ Impact on River Frome SSSI not properly evaluated ⇒ Misleading information on run-off from fields to river ⇒ Impacts on biodiversity have not been properly considered – especially Heath lobelia • Economic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Impacts on tourism, which will affect the local economy • Cultural Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Proximity to Moreton Conservation Area – needs to be properly acknowledged ⇒ Proximity to listed buildings along the Avenue ⇒ No response to cultural heritage study submitted ⇒ Whole Estate has historical significance, which has not been properly considered • Cumulative impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Impacts of housing and quarrying not properly considered ⇒ Traffic impacts – dangers to vehicles and pedestrians • Hydrology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Water table is very high, risk of flooding through quarrying – proper assessment needed ⇒ Restoration to lakes increases flood risk • Transport/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Cumulative traffic impacts ⇒ Lorry movements potentially too low ⇒ B3390 is dangerous, e.g. at pinch points on bridges • Other Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Do not accept that these River Terrace sites are needed
-----	------------	------------	---------	---	---

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

				<p>has been no recognition that Blue lobelia is a protected species found in AS25 nor of the red-listed birds that will be compromised.</p> <p>9. Historical Amenity We have not seen a response to our in depth historical study commissioned by FRAME. The whole of the Moreton Estate has great historical Significance as expounded eloquently by the T.E Lawrence Society. The area exhibits ancient field structures as well as ancient drainage systems which will be destroyed forever. The Avenue is a unique approach road to the village which will be severely damaged. Just look at Puddletown and Redbridge Roads to see examples if resulting devastation. The area has become a moonscape with reduced wildlife and complete annihilation of productive farmland.</p> <p>10. Tourism In recent years much effort has been put in by local businesses to increase tourism in the Village. This is paying off. The Village now boasts tearooms, Historic Church, T.E Lawrence Grave, Moreton Gardens, Campsite, Garden cafe, Wedding Venue, River Frome Ford and the new Village Half. All these attractions are drawing large numbers of visitors. As a consequence, it is a common occurrence to see people walking between the village centre and the facilities at Moreton Station (pub, station, shops in Crossways). Many events take place at the new village hall and stables attracting many visitors (100's) and locals to the village. The Village Hall lies within 50m of the North Eastern Boundary of AS25 which once quarried will be no advert for the village. The DCC have not taken into account the very close proximity of AS25 to the village centre and the attractions there. There is no precedence to quarry so close to habitation and a village centre or to Conservation Zones.</p> <p>11. Noise and Disturbance It is totally unacceptable to quarry so close to properties along Station Road most of which are listed. It has already been proven that quarry companies do not (or cannot) adhere to noise limits set (cf Woodsford Quarry). The impact of associated processing sites has not been considered. Combined with the proposed AS26 and AS19 sites the whole area will become overwhelmed by quarries and associated operations. Services Disruption and Cost Many services traverse AS25 (water and electricity), the impact of quarrying to these services has not been considered.</p> <p>12. Process Fundamentally we believe the DCC have not applied proper process to the assessments of impact, have not addressed the objections of residents or FRAME nor engaged with the local population who will be most affected. For information we bring it to your attention that many residents have changed since the last consultations in properties close or on the boundary of AS25. These people are not aware of your plans and in our experience would raise objections if only they knew what the DCC's and landowners intentions are. The DCC continually ignore the fact that the west side of Moreton (The Avenue, Policeman's Lane and the Common) do not have terrestrial broadband and the population are generally ignorant of how to get on line at all. The DCC's Superfast Broadband Programme is a joke in the area. Trying to access Dorset-for-You websites is extremely frustrating even with satellite connectivity. This is not an open consultation and the DCC need to make better efforts to engage with the community. The recent scandal of the lack of housing consultation in Moreton illustrates the point (PDC failings).</p> <p>13. Summary In summary we do not accept that DCC have conducted sufficient professional assessments into all the above issues. Given the severity of digging up large portions of valuable Dorset Countryside and the River Frome Valley how can the DCC justify their flawed policy for mineral extraction and the inclusion of AS25? Further we suggest elected Councillors conduct an investigation into the minerals policy as to why the DCC is interpreting national guidelines to the extent that it is thus compromising our beautiful county.</p>	<p>⇒ Amount of mineral in the ground not proved – is the proposal viable?</p> <p>⇒ Will be quarrying too close to the village – no precedent for this.</p> <p>⇒ Consultation has not been properly carried out – there are residents who are not aware of the proposals</p> <p>⇒ DCC have not carried out proper assessments into this proposal</p> <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These comments are noted and acknowledged. Responses to the issues raised are provided in the summary of site issues, for AS25 Station Road. 2. It is considered that the appropriate assessments for the current stage have been carried out. There are constraints to be addressed, but it is considered that these can be addressed. Nothing has been identified to date that would prevent the site being included in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP51	Individual	Comment	<p>My husband and I would like to restate our very strong opposition to the proposal to allocate sites AS19, AS25 and AS26 for future sand and gravel extraction and would refer you to our previous comments made in response to the consultation exercise of summer 2015 and to those made in the detailed objection submitted by the action group FRAME to the same consultation, all of which still stand.</p> <p>We have read your Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update May 2016 and are particularly disappointed that DCC do not feel it appropriate to separate the tonnages required for Poole Formation sand (PF) and River Terrace gravel (RT), which indicate that the county already has a sufficient land bank of River Terrace gravel for a further 13 years. As it is expected that AS19, 25 and 26 would yield mainly River Terrace gravel, if the tonnages were to be separated, it should no longer be necessary to allocate all these sites in the Minerals Site Plan.</p> <p>As previously emphasised, the Crossways/Moreton area has already provided a very large quantity of sand and gravel for the county over many years, with all the consequent disbenefits that quarrying brings to local residents and visitors and the degradation of the landscape that goes with it. Sites AS19, 25 and 26 proposed in the Minerals Site Plan would continue to degrade the area for many years to come and bring with them even more visual intrusion, noise and dust, as well as additional lorry movements on the unsuitable B3390, which will also be affected by higher traffic volumes from new residential development in the area.</p> <p>In the case of AS25 particularly, the lack of any buffer zone of agricultural land around the site will make working this site very intrusive into the lives of local people and the conservation village of Moreton, which is situated directly downwind of the site, would be particularly exposed to the noise and dust which will inevitably result from any quarrying operations. Tree screens and earth banks will not be sufficient to protect adjoining properties from the effects of the quarrying operations see Highways England's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 10 Part 5 paragraphs 2.15 and 3.19. In addition it is also believed that the quantity of gravel which could be quarried from the site is not likely to be as high as the figures quoted in the site assessment.</p> <p>The effects of quarrying at the three sites, AS19, 25 and 26, on the local water table, the risk of additional flooding, the pollution of streams which run into the nearby River Frome, the likely damage to historical features and the biodiversity of the area are all causes for grave concern as these are areas in which lasting and probably irreparable damage could so easily be caused to the local environment and the River Frome downstream to Poole Harbour. Surely it is not worth taking these risks to obtain an uncertain quantity of River Terrace gravel, of which the county already has sufficient reserves elsewhere. Once again we would ask DCC to withdraw these sites from the draft Minerals Site Plan on the grounds of the cumulative adverse impacts upon the local community, poor transport links via the B3390, the danger of long term damage to the environment of the beautiful Frome valley area and the fact that the existing River Terrace land bank is already sufficient for the next 13 years.</p>	<p>Issues raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dorset already has adequate supply of River Terrace aggregate – sites not needed 2. DCC should be separating the need for River Terrace and Poole Formation aggregate 3. Aggregate has been quarried in the area for many years, and these quarries will mean it continues for many years, with ongoing impacts 4. Visual impacts, noise and dust 5. Traffic impacts on the B3390 6. Lack of a buffer zone will lead to greater impacts on people living close to the site – tree screens and bunds are not adequate 7. Hydrological impacts – risk of flooding, water pollution 8. Cultural heritage – potential for damage to historical features 9. Ecological – potential for impacts on biodiversity of the area 10. Cumulative impacts – of quarrying, and of quarries with built development <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These comments are noted and acknowledged. Responses to the issues raised are provided in the summary of site issues, for AS25 Station Road. 2. It is considered that the appropriate assessments for the current stage have been carried out. There are constraints to be addressed, but it is considered that these can be addressed. Nothing has been identified to date that would prevent the site being included in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP58	Aggregate Industries UK Limited	Comment	<p>On behalf of Aggregate Industries UK Limited, I write in support of the continued inclusion of allocation AS-15 Tatchell's Quarry Extension, Wareham. Whilst extraction from the existing quarry temporarily ceased due to the downturn in the construction market, it is intended that the site will reopen in the next 12 months. Paragraph 142 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods the country needs. The allocation of Tatchell's Quarry extension will contribute to these requirements, and it is held that extraction can be undertaken without any significant impacts on the environment or local amenity.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Tatchell's extension – for continued provision of aggregate in compliance with National Planning Policy Framework <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support noted.
1.6	2016DMSP59	Individual	Disagree	<p>Would you please accept my updated comments on Site AS06 (Great Plantation) of the plan: My comments during previous periods of consultation hold good.</p> <p>I remain concerned about the effect of mineral development at this site, on the environment (biodiversity, endangered species); heritage (barrows and battery bank) and public amenity of Forestry Commission owned land.</p> <p>This small but diverse area of forest provides a rare opportunity for local people to safely walk, run, bring their children, exercise their dogs, study particular subjects of interest, and simply enjoy nature. The Forestry Commission, in their own publications, extol the benefits of such amenities to positive public health .</p> <p>My updated comment is that we now know of proposed developments of 1000 homes in Wool, and 500 in West Wareham (Worgret). Development at Binnegar Hall, East Stoke, is approved, the Binnegar mineral site looks set to go ahead, wind and solar farms are expected at East Stoke . The rural area spanning the A352 between Wool and Wareham looks as if it will change beyond recognition. I suggest the preservation from further development of Hethfelton Wood and the Great Plantation is now of increased importance; the site should be kept as it is not only for the reasons cited above, but for the amenity and health benefit of the foreseen increased local population .</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on biodiversity, cultural heritage, and public amenity Given the amount of new development proposed in the area, places like Great Plantation are needed more than ever. <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Your comment will be taken into consideration. The importance of public access at Great Plantation is acknowledged, and if the site was to be developed an alternative area for public access would have to be provided.
1.6	2016DMSP63	Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	Comment	<p>This is joint representation on the Draft Minerals Plan made on behalf of Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council. The Councils welcome the opportunity to engage with the Minerals Sites Plan.</p> <p>Christchurch Borough Council continues to object to the inclusion of Sand and Gravel extraction sites at Roeshot and Hurn Court Farm for the reasons set out in the Councils representations submitted in relation to the 2015 Draft Minerals Sites Plan. East Dorset District Council also wishes to maintain its objection to the nomination for a Sand and Gravel extraction site at Horton Heath / Redmans Hill.</p> <p>The Council reserves the right to express its detailed comments on the site should it subsequently be included in the Plan.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <p>Maintaining an objection to Roeshot and Hurn Court Farm.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Noted.</p>
1.6	2016DMS P81	Dorset Wildlife Trust		<p>All our comments on minerals sites identified in the 2015 consultation still stand, and we assume will be carried forward to the next stage of the consultation process.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP101	Affpuddle & Turnerspuddle Parish Council	Comment	<p>Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council have considered the issues brought forward in the latest consultation exercise. Group D Mineral Sites (comprising Hurst Farm/Station Road/Woodsford NE extension).</p> <p>The Parish Council has pressed for highway safety improvements to Hurst Bridge and Waddock Cross under current and past traffic conditions. Measurements taken by Highways Engineers at Waddock Cross in May 2015 proved that the minimum requirements for northward visibility along the B3390 for traffic exiting from the C80 was wholly dependent on regular cutting of verges and sides of hedges.</p> <p>With regard to the statement in Paragraph 3.74/page 57 of the Sustainability Appraisal 2016, our experience of the layout of the junction shows that HGVs are equally capable of failing to stop for oncoming traffic travelling south on the B3390 when exiting the C80. With an increase in traffic, it logically follows that the potential for accidents also increases.</p> <p>The traffic assessment for group D within the Sustainability Appraisal 2016 appears not to identify simultaneous traffic generated by requirements for inert waste to be returned to the three sites for the purposes of reinstatement.</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that the report refers to the potential large increases in housing developments earmarked for the Moreton and Crossways areas and considers that an overall Traffic Impact Assessment is undertaken for the B3390 which should also include the section of the B3390 from Waddock Cross to the A35 through Affpuddle, with particular reference to the single carriageway sections and sharp bends. This section carries regular mineral traffic to access the A35.</p> <p>As previously stated, the Parish Council has pressed for improvements to Waddock Cross in particular. A number of schemes have been put forward, in the past but failed to come to fruition. Of particular interest to the council is a scheme drawn up by DCC Highways to change the layout of the junction and the traffic priorities. This involved a realignment of the C80 from Tincton, a stop on the B3390 at the junction as approached from the north and through traffic having priority straight from the B3390 from the south onto the C80 towards Bovington. Further options of a weight and or width limit on the B3390 north from Waddock Cross to the A35 could also be implemented either in tandem with the priority realignment scheme or in isolation. The C80 and subsequently the C6 are built to a higher specification than the B3390 north of Waddock Cross in order to accommodate large military vehicles and are therefore better adapted as a route for access to the A35/A31.</p> <p>We request that a greater degree of communication and co-operation between the Mineral Planning Authority, Local Planning Authority and DCC Highways is required to ensure that once in a lifetime opportunities to provide highway improvements in the locality of mineral and development sites are properly identified at the earliest possible stage and funding contributions set out in the plans.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parish Council has identified problems with traffic accessing the A35 north of Waddock Cross. 2. Potential for making improvements as part of future development is noted, including restrictions through the village and encouraging traffic to access A35 at Bere Regis. 3. District/County Authorities requested to work together to seek to achieve road improvements/traffic restrictions to limit traffic through Affpuddle. <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A reference to this will be made in the 'Development Considerations' section of each site proposal, where appropriate.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP114	Moreton Parish Council	Comment	<p>Document attached addressing numerous issues regarding the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.</p> <p>Synopsis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the Update Consultation period, the owner of the AS26 Hurst Farm, and AS25 Station Road quarry sites informed Moreton Parish Council that the two quarries would be operated sequentially. 2. The Council submitted an extensive graphical analysis of the annual outputs of nominated and allocated quarry sites. As a result Moreton Parish Council recommends that AS26 Hurst Farm quarry only, be operated in the plan period. 3. The sequential operation means that Station Road quarry would not operate during the plan period. The Council recommends that the Station Road quarry proposal should be considered as part of the Masterplan for Moreton and Crossways called for in West Dorset District Councils Local Plan Policy CRS1 and in Purbeck District Councils Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review Consultation. The Station Road quarry would be a matter of yards from current and possible new housing in Moreton and have an unacceptable impact on the area. 4. Moreton Parish Council recommends that the nominated Philliol's Farm, Gallows Hill A (and Gallows Hill B if submitted) and Horton Heath quarry sites be designated as allocated sites in order to provide sufficient aggregate to enable Dorset to come close to achieving its yearly, and plan period government requirement. 6. The area of search is agreed. 	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommends that only Hurst Farm operate during the plan period and Station Road be considered as part of a masterplan for development in the Moreton/Crossways area – particularly due to its proximity to existing/proposed housing 2. Other sites to be allocate in place of Station Road – including Horton Heath, Philliol's Farm and Gallows Hill. 3. Support for the Area of Search <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The master-planning for Moreton idea is good, but it is likely that Station Road and Hurst Farm need to be allocated together, to ensure viability and justify investment in the sites. 2. It is noted that an attempt is being made to identify alternative aggregate sources if Station Road is not to be worked at this time – however, the question is, is Station Road more suitable than some of these other sites suggested? 3. Support for the Area of Search is noted, which includes some of these alternative site suggestions.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP115	Hampshire County Council (Officer Comments)	Comment	<p>Thank you for consulting Hampshire County Council Planning Policy on your Draft Minerals Sites Plan Update and Draft Waste Plan Update documents. In line with previous comments on your plan preparation we have the following comments on the Draft Minerals Sites Plan Update: It is noted that an extension to the Roeshot site allocated in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) is included in the proposed sites in your Draft Minerals Sites Plan. We would like to draw your attention to the development considerations set out in our Plan and the associated evidence base for the Hampshire site area</p> <p>http://documents.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/HMWP101MineralsProposalStudyv5-SubmissionFeb2012.pdf We appreciate consideration of the Hampshire site being mentioned in your Plan in terms of phasing of workings etc. and would encourage future discussions on this as applications arise.</p> <p>We note that the Purple Haze potential extension is no longer part of your area of search but would like to highlight our allocated site at Purple Haze in Hampshire which is considered to be the best option for continuing a local support of soft sand, sharp sand and gravel for this part of west Hampshire. The table below provides some further information on these sites and the approximate time in which applications for development are likely to be submitted.</p> <p>Allocated sites: Site name Proposed land use Comments Purple Haze Potential soft sand and sand and gravel extraction Large 70 hectare site with an expected yield of 7.25 million tonnes of resource. 4.0 million expected to be available within the plan period as a maximum (until 2030). Site is allocated through Policy 20 and Policy 32 of the HMWP. This site is likely to come forward from 2018+. Roeshot Potential sand and gravel extraction Large 87 hectare site expected to produce 3.0 million tonnes of sand and gravel. Site is allocated within Policy 20 of the HMWP. This site has recently come forward: http://www3.hants.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste/application-details.htm?id=17204</p>	<p>Issues raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted Roeshot and Purple Haze sites, on Dorset/Hampshire boundary, in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

1.6	2016DMSP117	FRAME (Frome Residents Against Mineral Extraction)	Comment	<p>FRAME would like to state again our objection to sites AS19, 25 and 26 being included in the Draft Mineral Site Plan. We provided extensive and detailed objections in 2015. We did not receive a response to those objections and none have been addressed in the June/July Draft Mineral Site Plan update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process We believe the MPA have not applied sufficient rigour to the impact assessments. They have not properly addressed the objections of residents, Parish Councils and FRAME, nor have they engaged with the local population who will be most affected. We would like to bring your attention the fact that many residents in properties close to or on the boundary of AS25 have changed since the last consultations. These people are not aware of your plans and in our experience would raise objections if they knew DCCs and landowners intentions. The west side of Moreton (The Avenue, Policeman’s Lane and the Common) do not have terrestrial broadband and the population are generally ignorant of how to get on line at all. The DCCs Superfast Broadband Programme has not yet been rolled out to the area and trying to access Dorsetfor you websites is extremely frustrating even with satellite connectivity. Therefore, this is not an open consultation and the DCC need to make better efforts to engage with the community. The recent lack of housing consultation in Moreton illustrates the point (PDC failings). • Cumulative Impact The increase in heavy traffic will be unacceptable and highly dangerous to cars, cyclists and in particular pedestrians travelling between Crossways Shops, Surgery, Station and Moreton Village. This includes children getting to the station and buses for school. There are no footpaths or safe verges along the length of Station Road/B3390. The seriousness of the cumulative impact of extended quarrying and the housing (and holiday home) developments planned for Crossways, Moreton and Redbridge has been recognised by DCC, WDDC & PDC to the extent that a multi-party group has been set up, but the findings of the group have not been made public. These findings should go to public consultation. • Traffic Assessment The level of heavy minerals lorry traffic has been grossly underestimated in the plan. Transport companies only react to customer demand and typically the lorries are not fully laden. This means the level of lorry movements could be double that being predicted. The DCC MPA need to be aware of the dangers around the River Frome Bridges on the B3390. Serious accidents continue to occur. The area needs serious investment to alleviate traffic risks and the risks to those living in the adjacent cottages. There needs to be recognition that the southern-most bridge is listed, making the more obvious traffic improvements impossible. Lorries frequently exceed speed limits along the length of the road. We have heard that the MPA believe they can manage the direction of traffic movement from various quarries, if this is the case, we would like to see what legislation will be in place to achieve this. In our experience the quarry companies have no control over contracted lorry companies and traffic rules are frequently flouted. • Landbank The interim consultation document continues to claim that landbanks for River Terrace gravel and Poole Formation sand should be combined. This is at odds with the NPPF policy. The Independent Inspector in 2014 also said they should be separated. We do not accept the DCCs justification for planning for more River Terrace extraction. The county already has in excess of 13 years supply. Furthermore, particularly for AS25&26, the DCC and Landowner have not proved the level of sand/gravel available to justify the sites continued inclusion in the plan. We remind the DCC that BGS data suggests poor yield and if mitigations involve avoiding ancient hedges and trees and providing bunding, the yield will be even lower. • Tourism In recent years much effort has been put in by local businesses to increase tourism in the villages of Moreton, Tincleton and Pallington. This is paying off. Moreton now boasts tearooms, an historic church, the T.E Lawrence Grave, Moreton Gardens, campsite, garden cafe, Wedding Venue, the River Frome ford and the new Village Hall. All these attractions are drawing large numbers of visitors. As a consequence, it is a common occurrence to see people walking between the village centre and the facilities at Moreton Station (pub, station, caravan sites, shops in Crossways). Many events take place at the new village hall and stables attracting hundreds of visitors and locals to the village. The Village Hall lies within 50m of the North Eastern Boundary of AS25. The DCC have not taken into account the very close proximity of AS25 to the village centre and its attractions. There is no precedence to quarry so close to habitation and a village centre or to 	<p>The issues/impacts identified relate to sites that do not form part of the current consultation. However, issues raised include...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Impacts on amenity of Moreton residents – noise, disturbance ⇒ Station Road is too close to Moreton • Biodiversity/natural environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Within 1km of Dorset Heathland SPA and SAC – impact on these designations ⇒ Impact on River Frome SSSI not properly evaluated ⇒ Misleading information on run-off from fields to river ⇒ Impacts on biodiversity have not been properly considered – especially Heath lobelia • Economic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Impacts on tourism, which will affect the local economy • Cultural Heritage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Proximity to Moreton Conservation Area – proper assessment and mitigation needed ⇒ Proximity to listed buildings along the Avenue ⇒ Whole Estate has historical significance, which has not been properly considered ⇒ No response to cultural heritage study submitted ⇒ Impacts on The Avenue, historic features of the site • Cumulative impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Impacts of housing and quarrying not properly considered ⇒ Unacceptable increases in traffic, risk to users of the B3390 ⇒ Need for safe public access between Moreton/Crossways • Hydrology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Water table is very high, risk of flooding – proper assessment needed • Transport/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Cumulative traffic impacts ⇒ Lorry movements potentially too low
-----	-------------	--	---------	---	---

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

				<p>Conservation Zones. Similarly, Pallington and Tincton have B&Bs and Sculptures by the Lakes, one of Dorset’s best visitor attractions. Noisy quarrying operations from AS19&26 across the river will destroy their tranquillity and hence their ability to attract tourists. We would remind DCC again that noise from these shallow quarrying operations cannot be effectively mitigated by soil bunds or trees, as stated in BS5228.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moreton Conservation Zone AS25 is bounded to the north along Station Road (known locally as the Avenue) by the Moreton Village Conservation zone. There has not been any recognition or proper impact assessment on this zone. The change of status to the zone has not been acknowledged in the interim draft document. We strongly urge the DCC to conduct a proper assessment. • Historical Amenity We have not seen a response to the in-depth historical study commissioned by FRAME. The whole of the Moreton Estate has great historical significance as expounded eloquently by the T.E Lawrence Society. The proposed quarry sites exhibit ancient field structures as well as ancient drainage systems which will be destroyed forever. The Avenue is a unique approach road to Moreton village which will be severely damaged. Just look at Puddletown and Redbridge Roads to see examples of resulting devastation. The area has become a moonscape with reduced wildlife and complete annihilation of productive farmland. Woodsford quarry has yet to restore any land to productive farmland. • Dorset Heathland The plan gives scarce recognition that AS25 is within 1 km of Dorset Heathland and impact on wildlife and amenity. It has ignored relevant legislation regarding AS25s proximity. • River Frome SSSI The plan does not properly assess the impact on the river Frome (SSSI) water levels, wildlife and amenity. There have been discussions between the AS19 landowner and the EA regarding potentially turning any quarry, should it be given the go ahead, into lakes for cleaning up the river. Details of these plans should be available for public consultation. Similar plans for AS26 should also be made available. • Water Table The water levels across AS19,25 and 26 and surrounding areas such as Moreton Common are exceedingly high in winter months. This winter was no exception with frequent surface water flooding. Many cottages in the area are cob and cannot tolerate any risk of increase to water levels. All evidence from the quarrying community suggests quarrying does exacerbate the risks of flooding which the DCC and Landowners have so far ignored. Restoring land to lakes is a high risk strategy which academic research has proved actually damages water run-off and increases the risk of flooding. • Wildlife The sites along the SSSI river Frome, along the River Frome cycleway and the villages of Woodsford, Tincton, Pallington and Moreton are special places enjoyed by many visitors but additionally it’s a refuge for many species of wildlife. The DCC or its agents have not taken account the impact quarrying will have on wildlife. The devastation along Puddletown Road is witness to the carnage that will result. There has been no recognition that Blue lobelia is a protected species found in AS25&26 nor the red-listed birds and other protected species like water voles that will be compromised. • Noise and Disturbance It is totally unacceptable to quarry so close to houses, many of which are listed. It has already been proven that quarry companies do not (or cannot) adhere to noise limits set (cf Woodsford Quarry). Combined with the proposed AS26 and AS19 sites the whole area will become overwhelmed by quarries and associated operations. • Processing sites and settling pits. The location of the processing site for AS25&26 has not been made available to the public. We know, based on experience at Woodsford, that its location will be known long before any planning application is applied for. We request that the location of the processing plant is made public now so that it can be consulted upon. This information should also include details of the size and location of silt settling lagoons. This is critical information because operations at Woodsford quarry have shown that silt levels are three times higher than planned for resulting in massive silt lagoons that will greatly increase the quarry footprint. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ B3390 is dangerous, e.g. at pinch points on bridges – investment require to make road safer ⇒ Cannot control routes lorries take • Landbank <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Do not accept that these River Terrace sites are needed – River Terrace and Poole Formation aggregate should be treated separately, in which case there is over-supply of River Terrace ⇒ Amount of mineral in the ground not proved – is the proposal viable? ⇒ Will be quarrying too close to the village – no precedent for this. • Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Consultation has not been properly carried out, DCC have not properly engaged with the locals – there are residents who are not aware of the proposals ⇒ DCC have not carried out proper assessments into this proposal • Other Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Would like to know where processing plant/silt ponds will be – location should be consulted on ⇒ Various services run across/near the site – will be disruptions
--	--	--	--	---	--

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services Disruption and Cost Many services traverse AS25 (water and electricity). AS26 has private water supplies that will be affected by quarrying. The impact of quarrying to these services has not been considered. • Summary In summary we do not accept that DCC have conducted sufficient professional assessments into all the above issues. Given the severity of digging up large portions of valuable Dorset Countryside along the River Frome Valley we ask how can the DCC justify their policy for mineral extraction? We request that AS 19,25&26 are removed from the plan. 	
1.6	2016DMSP118	Knightstford Parish Council	Comment	<p>KPC would like to re-state their objections to Sites AS19, 25 & 26. Our objections are described in detail in our 2015 representation. A large majority of parishioners supported the views of KPC. As far as we can see none of the concerns raised has been adequately addressed in this 2016 consultation document. In the individual site folders there are countless statements along the lines of 'this matter will be dealt with at a later stage or by a different authority' but no detailed or meaningful response is given.</p> <p>KPC request that the MPA explain how and when these matters will be addressed. We have very grave concerns that we will again be told that this will be at the planning application stage.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to previous (2015) consultation <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No new objections/comment

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP137	Individual	Comment	<p>Re: Policy MS-1 The Great Plantation AS06 I am very concerned at the proposed development of Hethfelton Wood (The Great Plantation AS06). This is an important recreational resource to the residents of East Stoke, the surrounding area and tourists. It is an ideal place to walk the dog and enjoy a diverse rural environment.</p> <p>The diversity of habitats within the site (conifers, deciduous woodland, heathland, grassland, gorse, marsh and ponds) encourages a rich and varied fauna and flora. It is an important area for reptiles, moths and butterflies, bats, mammals and birds. It is one of the few places to see glow-worms.</p> <p>The site is important for ornithology and I have been particularly impressed by the number of Nightjars that take up residence in the summer months, also Hobbies and the resident Dartford Warblers. It is also an important area for migrating birds and current visitors include all manner of warblers, redstarts, flycatchers and the like. The argument that wildlife will naturally relocate or can be moved is not always applicable, and Dartford Warblers in particular will not survive such inference. This is a bird very much in danger of extinction and at least three pairs live in the north east section of the wood. This is also the area where the nightjars breed and sleep during the daylight hours.</p> <p>Reptiles too are prevalent in this location including smooth snakes along with the more common grass snakes and slow worms. Should a proper wildlife survey be carried out, I would expect that other endangered species would be found.</p> <p>There is no evidence that existing quarried areas have been restored, rather they seem to remain derelict. It seems unlikely that heathland which has had its underlying sand and gravel removed can ever be restored in any meaningful way. Quarrying of heathland equals its destruction. Further quarrying in this area will result in greater fragmentation of precious Dorset heathland.</p> <p>The natural resources of East Stoke are being intensively targeted for development with the solar farm, wind turbines and now the extension of the quarry. I believe that the character of the area will be irrevocably altered and degraded should these developments be permitted. Hethfelton Wood is a particularly valued amenity for the local population and represents a large portion of the public access area available in East Stoke. With the proposed building of 1,000 new homes at Wool and more at Wareham, Hethfelton (The Great Plantation) will be increasingly important in its current form. It is a great pity that the existing quarry already blocks existing long distance rights of way. In walking from Wareham Forest to Stokeford you are forced to walk down the dangerous Puddletown Road because any entrance to the north side of Hethfelton Wood is barred by undeveloped quarry land. In these days of more open access this is disappointing, and the prospect of further quarrying is very disheartening.</p>	<p>Potential issues/impacts include...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity/natural environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Loss of biodiversity - animals and plants, especially birds, reptiles • Restoration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ No evidence that quarried areas can be restored – permanent destruction of heathland • Cumulative impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Other development – solar power, windfarms • Rights of Way <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Further loss of access through the area • Other Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Loss of recreational opportunities ⇒ With other built development proposed in the area, open spaces such as this are needed even more

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.6	2016DMSP190	Bournemouth Airport	Comment	<p>We reiterate the comments relating to Aerodrome Safeguarding as set out in paragraph 2.1 (of the attached letter) as being required to be applied to all site assessments coming forward in any guise of the Minerals Plan. Sites within a 13km radius of the airport should be fully assessed to establish if they present any increased risk of bird-strike hazard both in respect of their operation as an extraction site and of their proposed restoration use. I trust that these comments can be accepted as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>I would alert you to the role of the Safety Regulator and their ability to request to the Secretary of State to call in a Plan or proposal if the concerns of the Statutory Consultee have either not been incorporated or consent has been granted following an objection. I would hope therefore that the concerns outlined above can be incorporated into further iterations of both the Minerals and Waste Plans.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aerodrome safeguarding – sites within 13km of the airport to be fully assessed for possible bird-strike hazard <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This will be done – and referred to in Draft Mineral Sites Plan
1.6	2016DMSP215	PRO Vision Planning	Comment	<p>Purbeck Ball Clay is a nationally important mineral. The Charborough Estate supports the approach to ensuring a steady supply of Purbeck Ball Clay set out within the adopted Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy and in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Importance of maintaining supply of ball clay <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and agreed – covered in Minerals Strategy
1.9	2016DMSP 206	East Dorset Environment Partnership	Comment	<p>EDEPs comments on minerals sites identified in the 2015 consultation still stand and will be reiterated at what we understand will be the appropriate opportunity at the pre-submission consultation stage in February 2017.</p>	Noted.
1.17	2016DMS P10	Maiden Newton Parish Council	Agree		

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
1.17	2016DMSP119	Knightsford Parish Council	Comment	<p>In section 1.18 the MPA states that the Mineral Sites Plan is still in production and that work is still ongoing on all areas of the plan.. But in section 1.19 &1.20 it suggests that the pre-submission DMSP to be submitted in February 2017 will only allow comments restricted to matters of soundness and legal compliance.</p> <p>This is of great concern to KPC as there has not been an opportunity for the public to comment on many important aspects of the DMSP. These include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative impact - The consultation document does not address the cumulative impact of multiple quarries and housing in the Woodsford, Moreton, Crossways area. The importance of this is recognised by the county to the extent that a cross party committee from DCC, WDDC & PDC has been set up to address it. As far as we know there has been no conclusions or recommendations from this initiative. KPC feel strongly that the public should be consulted on the outcome of these meetings before the pre-submission DMSP is submitted. • Quality of impact assessments KPC, other local parish councils, other organisations like the Lawrence of Arabia society, FRAME, Oxford Archaeological Associates, and local residents drew attention to many issues and a significant number of errors in the 25 impact Assessment Criteria. The site consultation summaries referenced in the June/July 2016 DMSP update put out for consultation does not correct or update any of the errors in these assessments and only states, as noted above, that these matters will be dealt with later or by someone else. We do not believe the independent inspector will look kindly on the poor quality of front-end risk assessments. • Location AS25&26 processing plant The location of the processing plant for these sites has not been disclosed. Its siting will have a significant impact on the audio & visual impact of any development. There has been no impact assessment of this. (nb. The siting of the Woodsford quarry processing site was known by the council well before the planning application was submitted. If it had been made public earlier its impact could have been reduced). The footprint of the processing areas will also be significantly larger than normally expected due to high level of chalk in the gravel that must be accommodated in very large silt pits (refer to Woodsford quarry applications to increase the silt pit areas). KPC feel strongly that the public should be consulted on the possible location and size of processing plants at the consultation stage. It is not acceptable that, should the sites be allocated, that the location of the processing plant area is presented as a fait accompli in any subsequent planning application. 	<p>Issues raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumulative impacts of quarries, housing not addressed 2. Errors in site assessment pro-formas – pointed out previously, not addressed 3. Location of processing plant not given – this should be publicised and consulted on <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cumulative issues have been addressed – in the Sustainability Appraisal and in the Traffic Report that has been carried out. 2. Site assessments will be reviewed and if it is considered that there are errors, these will be corrected. 3. A potential location of processing plant has been made public by the Agent of the landowner – however, won't be finalised until the planning application stage.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
2.1	2016DMSP61	Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	Comment	<p>This is joint representation on the Draft Minerals Plan made on behalf of Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council. The Councils welcome the opportunity to engage with the Minerals Sites Plan.</p> <p>The Councils consider that there is inadequate justification for further identification of sites in the River Terrace as there is already a land bank of in excess of 7 years (13.1 years).</p> <p>Paragraph 2.11 of the draft minerals plan also states that the levels of sales of the Poole Formation aggregate are higher than that of the River Terrace. The River Terrace sand and gravel is less likely to travel far and will supply a more local market, resulting in a lower demand.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No need for further River Terrace sites as there is already a large landbank Greater demand for Poole Formation sand, and it travels further – lower demand for River Terrace <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Policy AS1 of the Minerals Strategy is intended to consider River Terrace and Poole Formation together, and all sites are needed The issue of whether a site supplies a local or distant market does not affect its suitability for inclusion as an allocation
2.1	2016DMSP72	Individual	Disagree	<p>We do not need to increase the supply of crushed stone in Dorset by increasing the size of the available stone quarries in Purbeck at the expense of this AONB, other industries, SSI's, residents' life in the Purbeck villages, and overturning previous findings on this subject.</p> <p>There is plenty of crushed stone down the Worgret road, or at Portland, or capable of being moved around the country on our clean efficient expanding national railways (where large amounts of Swanworth Quarry's stone seems to go to as ballast).</p> <p>Why damage an AONB for railway ballast? Surely that can be obtained elsewhere?</p> <p>Looking at economic sustainability, tourism is sustainable and capable of increase (look at what the Pig on the Beach has done) and the future of Purbeck, employment for our youngsters, depends on development of tourism - not destruction of it by increasing the life of mines (Swanworth quarry) which Suttles knew was limited when they bought it from Tarmac.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Crushed rock can be sourced in other locations outside AONBs <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tourism is more sustainable in economic terms, should be developed – not quarrying
2.1	2016DMSP23	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Disagree	<p>Regarding Chapter 2 We fully agree with paragraph 1.1. However, the whole of Chapter 2 and the 2016 update to include additional sites is predicated on a predict and provide model and not a sustainable model.</p> <p>By a sustainable model we mean a model that is viable for many future generations, economically, socially and environmentally.</p> <p>By predict and provide we mean extrapolating past and current trends rather than deciding the minimum quantity that will suffice. We need to ration present supply in order to ensure future supplies of these limited resources.</p> <p>It is not the Councils job to make more supply available to keep the price down; rather the price should naturally increase as the limited resource is used up. All this needs to be applied now, to protect and not damage sensitive sites in the future. See Policy SS1: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposing to supply too much aggregate – need to use a different method to assess how much to provide <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ten-year average of aggregate supply is national standard, and used unless special circumstances indicate otherwise

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
2.1	2016DMSP238	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Comment	<p>Quantities This is to add to our comments on Chapter 2.</p> <p>2.4: The Minerals Planning Authority has a duty to ensure future supplies without the need to raid precious wildlife sites. All of the aggregates and rock extracted in Dorset are in short supply Worldwide. Sand is so hard to get that criminal gangs are stripping remote tropical beaches. Since price is not a land use planning issue, it is not the job of the Waste Planning Authority to ensure that supply meets demand. The supply must be sufficient to meet the genuine needs of Dorset.</p> <p>Obviously, once a site has permission to dig, it sells the product on the open market but material is also imported, as you state in your excellent summary. Taking Policies AS1 and AS2 (landbank) together, we need a landbank sufficient for 7 years supply for Dorset only, at present levels of use, with no increase provided for whether the economy picks up or not.</p> <p>A rolling 10-year average may be commonly used but it is not acceptable in Dorset, although it is permissible to use the last 10 years as a guide. A restricted supply will increase prices to a more realistic level, thus acting as a self-regulating system (and financially benefiting the operators as well). This was the purpose of the aggregate levy, which would not have been needed if operators had restricted supply.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Supply of aggregate should only be planned for to meet the needs of Dorset and not for wider/external markets <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Aggregate supply and demand operates on a wider scale than just the boundaries of the Mineral Planning Authorities – Dorset County Council meets demand from beyond its boundaries, and is in turn supplied from beyond its boundaries

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

2.9	2016DMSP120	Knightsford Parish Council	Comment	<p>Knightsford Parish Council have the following comments on section 2.9 to 2.19 on the DMSP;</p> <p>Section 2.10 of the DMSP refers to Policy AS1 of the 2014 Mineral strategy which does not differentiate between River terrace Gravel and Poole formation sand and asserts that; There was no intention when this policy was drafted of differentiating between River Terrace and Poole formation aggregate and at the Examination into Mineral Strategy there was no indication by the inspector that such a differentiation applied.</p> <p>KPC would like to make the case that Policy AS1 does not interpret NPPF correctly. NPPF para 085 states; Should mineral planning authorities maintain separate landbanks for different types of aggregate? Where there is a distinct market for a specific type or quality of aggregate (such as high specification rock, or sand used for concrete or sand for asphalt), a separate landbank calculation based on provision to that market may be justified for that material or those materials. This is because materials of different physical properties and quality are often needed to meet different end uses, and the scope to substitute one aggregate material for another can be limited. This clearly requires that River Terrace gravel and Poole Formation sand, which nobody can argue do not have different physical properties, qualities and markets, should have separate landbanks. KPC also disagree with the assertion that there was no indication by the inspector that such a differentiation applied.</p> <p>The inspector's December 2013 report is posted on Dorsetforyou here. https://www.dorsetforyou.com/media/191116/BDP-Minerals-Strategy-Inspectors-Report-Final/pdf/BDP_Minerals_Strategy_Inspectors_Report_final.pdf</p> <p>On page 13 it states;</p> <p>67. The Framework advises that separate landbanks should be calculated and maintained for aggregates of a specific type or quality which have a distinct and separate market²⁷. There are various grades of sands and gravel within the Plan area that have separate markets, but to attempt to separate them all out would be over complex and unworkable. In broad terms the market is split between fine sands, which mostly come from the Poole Formation bedrock deposits, and coarse sands and gravels, which principally come from the River Terrace deposits. Consequently, it is convenient and effective to broadly separate the landbanks into Poole Formation sands and River Terrace sands and gravels.</p> <p>68. Plan Policy AS2 commits to the maintenance of at least 7 years supply of both Poole Formation and River Terrace aggregates. However, to take account of the lower annual production figure for aggregates and to accurately reflect the split in the markets, amendments to the calculations and supporting text are required. Therefore, to satisfy national policy and to be deliverable, modifications MM38, MM39, MM40 and MM43 are recommended, which together show a split of 64% for Poole Formation sand and 36% for River Terrace sand and gravels, indicating landbanks of 9.8 years for the former and 13.3 years for the latter.</p> <p>69. By applying the relative proportions of Poole Formation and River Terrace aggregates to estimated reserves on an annual basis as required by the Framework²⁸ and MASS Guidance²⁹, any shortfalls in provision of each category can be identified on an ongoing basis. To make this clear and fully compliant with national policy, modifications MM41, MM42 and MM44 are recommended.</p> <p>KPC cannot see how these three paragraphs can be interpreted in the 2016 DMSP update as “there was no indication by the inspector that such a differentiation applied.”</p> <p>Summary: KPC re-state from our 2015 representation that thorough impact assessments have not been carried out, the MPA are not properly interpreting the NPPF regarding landbanks, and that there is no requirement for additional gravel sites. AS19, AS25 and AS26 should be withdrawn.</p>	<p>Issue Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minerals planning policy/guidance has not been properly interpreted/applied – should plan for and maintain separate landbanks for Poole Formation and River Terrace 2. If this is done, no need for these three River Terrace sites – they should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is considered that Policy AS1 is being interpreted correctly, and the sites are needed to maintain supply of aggregate
-----	-------------	----------------------------	---------	--	--

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
2.9	2016DMSP24	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Disagree	<p>Regarding Chapter 2.9 There is a discrepancy between Policy AS1 Provision of Sand and Gravel that says the seven year landbank is for the requirement of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and paragraph 2.11 which is taking into consideration a regional market, i.e. the requirements of other counties.</p> <p>The figures should be re-worked to eliminate supply to regional markets and therefore be more sustainable.</p>	<p>Issue:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should only provide for local supply <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is not possible to prevent the movement of aggregate beyond MPA area - it is expected that it will travel beyond the administrative area
3.1	2016DMSP82	Dorset Wildlife Trust	Comment	<p>The removal of designated sites (including International Sites, NNRs, SSSIs, SNCIs and Country Parks), from the map showing the extent of the Area of Search for potential further sites for extraction of aggregates is welcomed.</p> <p>We appreciate that, as mentioned, this is still a work in progress. However, the scale of the map is such that it is impossible to tell accurately if all the appropriate sites have been removed. For example, there are two fairly small SNCIs within the area shown close to the River Stour running south from Charlton Marshall towards Sturminster Marshall, and it is not clear whether these have been removed, as well as a number of other small sites.</p> <p>Since this map is intended to inform landowners and those in the aggregates business of sites and areas which they may put forward in the reasonable expectation that they may be considered favourably for allocation as proposed minerals sites, or at least that they will have avoided the obviously sensitive environmentally designated sites, it would be helpful to all concerned if much larger scale and more detailed maps could be included in the Updated Minerals Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need a larger scale map, and more detailed maps, of the Area of Search <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – these will be prepared...

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
3.1	2016DMSP105	Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Comment	<p>We write on behalf of our client, The Fairfield Partnership, which has land interests in Dorset.</p> <p>The Fairfield Partnership acknowledges the need to ensure that there is sufficient provision of aggregate in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole to meet future requirements and notes that the revised Area of Search (Figure 3) excludes a number of designated sites.</p> <p>In addition to environmental designations there are a number of other factors that would affect the suitability of individual areas of land for minerals extraction, including potential impacts on drainage. Such factors should also be given full and proper consideration prior to finalising the Areas of Search plan. The need for aggregates must also be considered in the context of wider development needs in the area, specifically with regard to the provision of housing to meet future requirements, as established within the Eastern Dorset Strategic Housing Market Assessment (dated October 2015, published December 2015).</p> <p>The identification of land within an Area of Search should not stifle the ability or timescales associated with developing a site without significant justification e.g. a complete lack of other available sites suitable for a type of aggregate of local and national importance. While acknowledged that section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the importance of minerals in supporting economic development paragraph 47 emphasises the need to boost significantly the supply of housing. The Area of Search and its associated policy should not hinder this. To do so would be contrary to the NPPF and the key objectives of the government.</p> <p>We trust that these comments will be given full and proper consideration during preparation of the next stage of the plan. Please contact us if you have any queries regarding the comments made.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The aggregates Area of Search should not be allowed to prevent sites being developed for housing <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are recognised protocols in place for dealing with such situations. If the mineral is safeguarded and housing is proposed on safeguarded land, opportunities for prior extraction will be investigated. This addresses the responsibilities of both the Mineral Planning Authority and the Local Planning Authority.
3.1	2016DMSP106	Mike Gee Town Planning Services Ltd	Comment	<p>I note the work on this is still in progress. However, I am concerned by the spatial extent of the proposed area of Search in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliol's Farm in the Piddle valley to the south east of Bere Regis.</p> <p>This is a landscape area between the heaths and woodlands to the north and south that is attractive and composed of open meadows in the valley floor. This is a landscape that would be highly sensitive to change and should be excluded from the search area, i.e. the area around the two farms to the north of the River Piddle.</p> <p>The area of search should follow recognisable and defensible boundaries associated with the areas of woodland and heath to the north and south of the farms should be adopted</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Area of Search should exclude the area around Philliol's and Lower Stockley Farms, on landscape grounds. Area of Search should follow recognisable and defensible boundaries <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Area of Search indicates where there is likely to be economically viable mineral deposits in the ground – and takes into account landscape and biodiversity constraints. Location in the Area of Search does not mean any given area will be developed as a quarry – all proposals are considered on their merits.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
3.1	2016DMSP88	Highways England	Comment	<p>Amendments to the Area of Search and Additional Sites</p> <p>During the 2015 Consultation, the Mineral Planning Authority set out proposals for an aggregates Area of Search, intended to provide additional flexibility in the provision of aggregate in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole, particularly if demand increased and/or a shortfall developed.</p> <p>We have reviewed the relevant background documents and consider that sites, particularly those in close proximity to the SRN, could cause potential transport implications on the SRN, notably with regard to traffic generation associated with employment, and HGV movements associated with both the construction of sites and extraction of minerals.</p> <p>In consideration of the wide area of coverage of the Emerging Minerals Local Plan, Highways England's concern is over the impact of proposed sites along stretches of the SRN including: - A303(T) in the north; - A31(T) in the south; and - A35(T) in the south. The potential traffic impacts of any proposed sites not previously identified should be assessed on an individual basis, and as appropriate, also a cumulative basis. This assessment should be undertaken through Transport Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment processes and consider the need for mitigation of any potential for adverse effects on the SRN.</p> <p>We note that the potential for significant traffic flows arising from the allocation of additional minerals sites will have cumulative and interlinked transport impacts upon the SRN with that traffic arising from development considered within the Local Plan process. In this regards both adopted and emerging Local Plans within Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset are relevant.</p> <p>In light of the above we would recommend that work is undertaken, in conjunction with Highways England, to assess the cumulative impact of any newly proposed minerals allocations or any cluster of smaller sites arising from the Minerals Plan to enable the consideration of potential cumulative transport impacts upon the SRN.</p> <p>We would also welcome the requirement for any subsequent planning applications submitted within an area of search to include a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement. Any infrastructure needs arising from this assessment should be discussed and agreed with Highways England prior to adoption of the Minerals Local Plan.</p>	<p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sites have potential to impact on the SRN – including cumulative impacts, with traffic associated with minerals related development combining with traffic from built development coming through local planning authority plans <p>Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of cumulative impacts on some sites has already been carried out. Mineral Sites Plan will note requirement for planning applications to include Transport Assessment or Transport Statement.
3.1	2016DMSP62	Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	Comment	<p>This is joint representation on the Draft Minerals Plan is made on behalf of Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council. The Councils welcome the opportunity to engage with the Minerals Sites Plan.</p> <p>The Area of Search has been revised in Figure 1 but the scale of the map and poor map resolution make it difficult to determine the precise areas. In accordance with the Minerals Core Strategy this area of search will need to exclude Bournemouth Airport and Business Parks.</p> <p>The Area of Search will also need to ensure that it excludes all of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy strategic housing sites. The councils are happy to provide all the relevant mapping data for the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Area of Search should exclude Bournemouth Airport and Business Parks Should also exclude Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy strategic housing sites <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AOS does exclude airport and business parks. Strategic housing sites can be excluded from the AOS, but if the mineral is safeguarded, it will continue to show as safeguarded mineral.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
3.1	2016DMSP159	Natural England	Comment	We welcome the continuing work on amending the AOS. However, we would direct you to our previous comments and point out that the work so far only goes so far in addressing these. We are therefore pleased that the MPA intend to continue working to refine the AOS and we are happy to provide continuing input.	Noted.
3.1	2016DMSP182	Purbeck District Council	Comment	<p>It is difficult to decipher individual sites, owing to the scale of the map in figure 1, but it appears that land at Lytchett Minster, Moreton and Wool could be affected. Land in these locations features in the Councils current options consultation on the Partial Review of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1, for 650, 350 and 1,000 homes respectively.</p> <p>The Council has concerns that the area of search could lead to these sites becoming sterilised or delayed in coming forward. This could have serious implications for the Councils five-year supply of housing.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council would welcome early discussions with the Minerals and Waste Authority to better understand the extent of the area of search, potential phasing and how the policy wording (when prepared) would affect both strategic development sites and existing homeowners.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Land in the AOS may be part of Purbeck District Council's housing options – would like to discuss further with the Mineral Planning Authority how the Area of Search will be applied/interpreted etc. <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Further discussion with Purbeck District Council is welcomed
3.1	2016DMSP207	East Dorset Environment Partnership	Comment	<p>EDEP welcomes the revision of mapping to exclude biodiversity constraints including country parks.</p> <p>On the constraints maps supplied, not all of the SSSI designation of the R Crane/Moors River is shown (light purple). This may be due to limitations of the scaling. This should be checked and if necessary corrected as some of the broad areas of search appear to be adjacent to it.</p> <p>Similarly, it would be wise to exclude all SANGs throughout Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole including potential SANGs that have been identified in Local Plans to ensure the delivery of housing allocations.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Check Moors River SSSI to ensure its correctly shown Exclude all SANGs including potential SANGs <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England are advising on removal of nature conservation designations.
3.1	2016DMSP214	PRO Vision Planning	Comment	<p>The revised area of search and the Minerals Planning Authority's approach to site identification described within paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update 2016 are also supported by the Charborough Estate.</p> <p>The area of search focusses on relatively unconstrained sites, such as Tatchell's Quarry, which is outside the more sensitive areas in Dorset, including Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar site, and Poole Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar site.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support for AOS Support for Tatchell's as a site <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Your support is noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
3.1	2016DMSP231	RSPB, South West Regional Office	Comment	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above. The RSPB welcomes the opportunity to present our comments. The RSPB has previously provided comments on the Mineral Sites Plan during earlier consultations in February 2014 and October 2015. Many of the comments made in those responses remain relevant.</p> <p>In preparing this response we have considered the following documents available on the Councils consultation portal - Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update, May 2016; Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2015 Comments relating to the proposed site allocations Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole; Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan – 2015 consultation; Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan Conservation Regulations Assessment Screening Report, June 2016</p> <p>Chapter 3 concerns an area of search intended to provide additional flexibility in the provision of aggregate if demand increased and/or a shortfall developed. The presentation and context of the policy and map supporting this drew criticism during the 2015 consultation. We note that the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) continues to work on both the policy wording and spatial extent of the area of search with relevant bodies including Natural England.</p> <p>Natural England in their criticism of the area of search (pages 37/8 of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole - Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 consultation) made a number of important points about the possible consequences of the policy as drafted which need to be addressed.</p> <p>Our position is that any area of search policy should be explicit in what it is providing, spatially should exclude environmentally sensitive areas, and be clear as to the tests to be addressed if speculative proposals are brought forward. It should be consistent with other policies in the MSP and in the adopted Minerals Strategy. We will comment further upon sight of the revised policy and spatial extent.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> RSPB set out views on how AOS should be set up/out, what it should in/exclude and tests to be addressed if speculative proposals come forward <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
Figure 1	2016DMSP16	West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Comment	<p>The Area of Search (for Sand and Gravel)</p> <p>The Council notes that the extent of the Sand and Gravel Area of Search has still to be determined and considers that the issue of the prior extraction of minerals could be overcome by changes to the wording of draft Policy MS-2 to permit the prior extraction of minerals from allocated development sites.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> WDDC have concerns regarding the word and application of the AOS policy, and how this might affect housing sites identified in their Plan. They suggest a change in the wording to avoid the issue. <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment is noted - it is expected that the policy will be amended, as suggested. Your previous comment is set out as a footnote¹.

¹ Policy MS-2, which sets out the circumstances where the extraction of sand and gravel from unallocated sites may be permitted, needs to be amended to ensure that the timely implementation of strategically important non-mineral development (in particular urban extensions) is not prejudiced.

In West Dorset there is a particular concern that Policy MS-2 may potentially prejudice the bringing forward of non-mineral development at Crossways, which lies entirely within the sand and gravel 'area of search'. In his report - <https://www.dorsetforyou.com/InspectorsReport/West/Weymouth> the Inspector for the West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Joint Local Plan identified Crossways as a sustainable location for growth. The current allocation in the Local Plan is centred on the site south of B3390 and will include 500 homes and 3.5 hectares of employment land.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
Figure 1	2016DMS P25	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Agree	<p>3.4 Draft Area of Search</p> <p>We appreciate taking into consideration sites of conservation interest, e.g. SSSIs, SACs, SNCl, etc. Please continue to revise this area of search.</p>	Your support is noted.
4.1	2016DMSP6	Individual	Comment	<p>4.2 It should be noted that the area south of the A352 is an AONB. This is not marked on Figure 2 or recognised in this document. They are marked up in Figure 4 though.</p> <p>4.3 It should be noted that the ONLY Grade 2 listed property (17th century cob cottage) is on the south side of the A352. This is not marked on Figure 2. Others are marked in Figure 6/8 for example. It is not mentioned either in the Heritage section as they are in Section 5.5. It is important this heritage property is marked as the hydrology/excavations can have an effect on water tables, ground water etc. for such a property.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a planning application for 26 homes is now being considered by Purbeck District Council for Binnegar Hall. The Hall is close to the extraction areas.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Constraints, including AONB and Listed Building, are not shown on the map, and should be identified. <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Puddletown Road Policy Area is not an area proposed for quarrying development, therefore not considered necessary to identify constraints such as AONB and historic buildings. There are other policies, such as the Development Management policies of the 2014 Minerals Strategy, that control impacts of development on features such as landscape and heritage designations.

The Inspector requires an early review of the Local Plan, which will make provision for growth to 2036, to be in place by 2021. He recognised the potential for Crossways to accommodate further growth in addition to the allocated site both in West Dorset and in Purbeck, where further growth has been identified as an option in the Partial Review of the Purbeck Local Plan. The Inspector notes that prior extraction will be required on sites at Crossways to enable the sand and gravel to be extracted prior to non-mineral development taking place. This reflects the requirement of the supporting text to Policy SG1 in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy (paragraph 14.13). The supporting text (paragraph 14.16) also indicates that in considering proposals for prior extraction, 'the scale and timescale of the proposed built development' will be taken into consideration.

The main concern with Policy MS-2 is that the circumstances in which the bringing forward of non-allocated sand and gravel would be permitted are too limited (i.e. to cases where: there is a demonstrable shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel: or the development of the unallocated site offers net environmental benefits). Since the benefits of bringing forward the allocation at Crossways (or further development in the area) would largely be of a social and economic rather than environmental nature, proposals for prior extraction on such sites could be considered to be contrary to Policy MS-2 unless there is a demonstrable shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel. It appears that under this policy, Unlike Policy SG1, 'the scale and timescale of the proposed built development' will not be taken into consideration.

Policy MS-2 could, therefore, potentially prejudice the timely implementation of strategically important non-mineral development (in particular urban extensions), even in circumstances where prior extraction in accordance with Policy SG1 of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy would be acceptable. There is also a concern that it may be something of a challenge to demonstrate a shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel in the Crossways area given that the anticipated yield of the proposed allocations at: Woodford Quarry (AS-19); Station Road, Moreton (AS-25); and Hurst Farm, Moreton (AS-26) is in the order of 7.1 million tonnes. There are two potential remedies to this problem:

Firstly, the Sand and Gravel Area of Search could be amended to exclude: allocations for growth; sites with the potential for future growth (typically adjacent to existing urban areas, which may come forward through the review of local plans); key infrastructure: and important landscape / biodiversity sites; or

Secondly, an additional criterion could be added to Policy MS-2 to indicate that proposals for the prior extraction of minerals to allow strategically important non-mineral development to come forward (in accordance with Policy SG1 of the Minerals Strategy) would be one of the circumstances where the bringing forward of an unallocated site within the Sand and Gravel Area of Search would be acceptable. Further detail on allocated and potential future development sites can be provided to inform the amendment of the area of search, if that is considered to be the most appropriate way forward.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

4.1	2016DMSP70	Miss Elizabeth Maidment	East Stoke Parish Council	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>East Stoke Parish Council know that the proposal originally submitted will not be accepted in its entirety. However, we have not seen a revised proposal upon which we can comment. As things stand, the original proposal remains in the plan; therefore, our comments of 12th October 2015 in response to the last round of consultation remain valid.</p> <p>We would add that with the likely increase in development around Wool, Worgret and now Binnegar Hall, and the planning approval for the Binnegar site, Hethfelton Wood provides an increasingly important haven for nature and an amenity which can only be of benefit to local people.</p> <p>2015 comments:</p> <p>East Stoke has numerous sites that have been shortlisted within the plan. The Parish Council is aware that there is an acute shortage of minerals and it is essential that they are extracted. But, consideration must be taken into account the amount of excessive overdevelopment that has either taken place or is at the planning stage within the Parish to the north of the A352. The urbanisation includes a solar farm and one that has just submitted planning permission, wind turbines that have had the planning approved as well as these two potential mineral sites at Binnegar and Hethfelton Woods. With these proposed plans the area will irrevocably change from a rural agricultural landscape to an industrialised zone. This will not only impact East Stoke but the blot on the landscape would destroy the panoramic view from the Purbeck Hills, which is greatly admired by both locals and visitors alike.</p> <p>Hethfelton Woods (The Great Plantation)</p> <p>It is difficult for the Parish Council to comment on this site as the size of the proposed land has not yet been formally agreed by Dorset CC as discussions with the relevant parties have not taken place yet. The Parish Council agrees with Natural England that the original proposal is too large.</p> <p>The “Magic Map” that is managed by Natural England shows that it contains three SSSIs which is part of the larger Stokeford Heath SSSI and four ancient monuments which includes a section of the Battery Bank and two bowl barrow sites. The bowl barrows date from the Late Neolithic period to the Late Bronze Age and Battery bank is likely to be of Romano-British or Dark Age date.</p> <p>Stokeford Heaths is one of a collection of sites which together comprise the Dorset heathlands. Although these heathlands have declined dramatically and now only make up 14% of their original area they show a high degree of ecological cohesion and clear ecological trends and patterns. This complex is one of the major lowland heathland areas in Britain and is of international importance for its plant and animal communities. The site supports important populations of two endangered and protected reptiles; sand lizard <i>Lacerta agilis</i> which like isolated sites within conifer plantations and smooth snake <i>Coronella austriaca</i>. Within the Stokeford Heath as a whole it supports 3 to 4% of the national population of sand lizards. It is an important breeding ground for nightjars and other rare birds as well as a proliferation of butterflies. As a whole Dorset has a large number of visitors, especially during the summer months.</p> <p>Hethfelton Wood is a rare area in Dorset which even in the height of the holiday season is a tranquil location which provides a valued amenity for the discerning visitor. The preservation of such a location is vital so it maintains an ideal habitat for these rare species.</p> <p>Due to the dispersed locations of both the ecological and historical sites, it would be impossible to excavate without damaging these protected areas. Also, the works carried out would include removal of trees this would potentially increase the already high level of flooding, a recurrent problem along the A352.</p> <p>The Parish Council are not confident that a satisfactory restoration will take place in the future even with conditions being imposed. After the excavation work there will be huge voids in the ground where it was once previously flat and it would be impractical to fill them back in.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Previous comments still stand, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative impacts of other minerals and non-minerals development north of A352 Great Plantation: impacts on biodiversity designations; archaeology; impacts on Stokeford Heaths, and so the wider heathland complex; impacts on wildlife, protected species; tranquil recreation/leisure; risk of flooding; not confident of proper restoration <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Issues are noted; it is agreed that it is a very sensitive site, which would need to be very carefully protected if it is ever worked. The Mineral Planning Authority, Natural England and developer are continuing to investigate options for developing the site. Officer responses to these issues are included in the Great Plantation section of the 2015 and 2016 sites issues and responses document.
-----	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	--	--

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent		Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
4.1	2016DMSP83	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	Comment	<p>We agree that the revised boundary for the Policy Area is more logical, using the A352 as the southern boundary than that proposed in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>It is not so clear that it is desirable to make the north-east boundary run along the course of the River Piddle, since the previous boundary appeared to follow the edge of the flood plain of the river, largely following along a higher contour, and this would seem to be logical, even if a little more difficult to distinguish on the ground.</p> <p>There should always be a sufficient buffer to the river such that no minerals extraction is possible within the flood plain area anyway, and therefore there should probably be no need for this area to be included within the Policy Area.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreeing with amendment to southern boundary 2. Course of Piddle not preferred option for northern boundary – previous boundary, following contour delimiting edge of floodplain was better. 3. Ensure always buffer ensuring no minerals extraction within floodplain area <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Points are noted and will be considered. 2. Limits of mineral extraction will be determined, taking consideration all comments made.
4.1	2016DMSP131	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	Comment	<p>We wish to reiterate the comments we made for the July 2015 minerals plan consultation in relation to the Puddletown Road Policy Area.</p> <p>Provided our comments are taken on board, we would have no additional comments to make on Chapter 4 of this May 2016 document.</p> <p>Our previous comments provided in September 2015 were: <i>'The southern boundary of the area appears to come close to the River Frome, it is vital that any proposals do not impact the integrity of the River Frome SSSI and its floodplain.'</i></p> <p><i>Proposals should also take into account the objectives of the Frome Restoration Plan and any other plans relevant to this area.</i></p> <p><i>The north eastern boundary runs along the River Piddle. Any proposals should also not impact on this watercourse and its associated floodplain and habitats The Frome Restoration Plan and any other relevant plans for this area should also be referred to in Policy MS-8.'</i></p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No further issues raised. Want to ensure no impacts on Frome or Piddle watercourses or their floodplains. 2. Should refer to Frome Restoration Plan in policy MS-8, and proposals should take into account this Plan. <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted – will consider further whether north-eastern boundary should be pulled back from Piddle. 2. Request for reference to Frome Restoration Plan is also noted.
4.1	2016DMSP160	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	Comment	<p>We do not have a problem with the proposed re-alignment of boundaries.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No issues/comments <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None
4.1	2016DMSP183	Mr Steve Tapscott	Purbeck District	Agree	<p>The Council agrees that the revised boundary alignment to recognisable landlines is pragmatic.</p> <p>The Council supports the holistic approach to treating the Puddletown Road area and would welcome early engagement with the Minerals Planning Authority with regard to the proposed policy wording, when it is redrafted.</p>	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No particularly issues, boundary realignment supported. <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2016 Consultation

Comments Made on Non-Site Policies and Proposals, with Preliminary Officer Responses

Reference Point in Plan	Comment ID	Respondent		Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Respondent Comment	Issues Identified and Officer Response
4.1	2016DMSP232	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South	Comment	Chapter 4 provides an update on the Puddletown Road policy. We warmly welcomed the ambition and the approach to this policy in our comments on the 2015 consultation. This remains the case. We support the minor amendments being proposed in the MSP update.	<p>Issues Raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support for policy and policy approach. <p>Responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> None