

**POPE 01**  
**WP**

**Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan**

**Examination in Public**  
**26 June 2018 – 28 June 2018**

**Proof of Evidence of**

**Cllr. Marion Pope BA (Hons), MA**

**Independent Councillor for the Merley & Bearwood Ward**

**Borough of Poole**

**May 2018**

I was elected in 2015 on a manifesto promise to protect green spaces and the Green Belt from development 'at all costs'. I believe I have a mandate from my constituents to object to the proposed intensification of development of the waste site at Canford Magna. I also object as a resident of the Merley & Bearwood ward.

### **Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development – Inset 8 : Land at Canford Magna, Magna Road, Poole**

#### **History**

There has been waste recycling at this site for a number of years. Given its location on the South East Dorset Green Belt, planning permissions were always granted on a temporary basis with a condition that, when the permission expired, all buildings would be removed from the site and the land returned to agricultural fields. In November 2013, that condition was removed and the waste processing plant allowed to remain in perpetuity. While it is identified as a major developed site in the Green Belt, there are valid reasons for not increasing capacity for residential waste management by 25,000 tpa.

There also exists a temporary permission for White's Pit Inert recycling facility to the south of the site (Plan at Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna) which is due to expire in 2021. Permission was granted originally to produce recycled aggregates, soils etc with which to cap White's Pit landfill site. The permission expired on 31 December 2010 but, as the capping was not complete, recycling continued unabated and without permission until 2014. A trade in the sale of recycled aggregates and soils had developed by this time so that permitted annual tonnage of recycled waste had been exceeded. There have been other breaches of planning conditions.

Is an intensification of waste management on this site justified?

I would argue that it is not because of environmental and transportation concerns. Canford Heath is not only a site of special scientific interest but is an SPA and a Ramsar site. Numerous heathland species enjoy international legal protection. The existing waste processing site is in close proximity to both the Heath and other sites of nature conservation interest. Natural England objected to the White's Pit application in 2014 because of damage to the heathland (Appendix A). In 2014, the renowned expert on lowland heaths, Dr John Underhill Day, gave evidence to the public inquiry into the Magna Business Park appeal that intense development on the southern and eastern fringes of the Heath had caused damage to the soils (APP/Q1255/A/132204098 refers). More recently he has highlighted the very great pressure that is being exerted on the northern fringe of the Heath which is a foraging area for protected species such as the nightjar and woodlark (Habitats Assessment in support of Poole Council's Local Plan refers).

Any intensification of waste management on this site will have an impact on the volume of traffic on the A341 Magna Road/Queen Anne Drive. Those who live in the ward are well aware of the increase in HGV traffic which has resulted from this industrial site. Poole Council's Transportation Policy officers gave evidence to the examination in public of the Local Plan that there had been just a 1% increase in

traffic on this route since 2003! Fortunately, I was able to provide the Inspector with evidence that all volumes recorded up to 2015 were suspect because the equipment was damaged. Once recalibrated, figures for traffic volumes increased five-fold (Appendix B). Neither the County Council nor Poole Council seem to be aware of this.

Over the years there has been a number of breaches of planning conditions and noise and smell pollution (Appendix C). Those of us who live directly to the east have been forced to make numerous complaints to the Environment Agency about noise and smell emanating from the site

Last July, Poole's planning committee was minded to approve a mixed development of 320+ houses on land between the waste processing plant and Wheelers Lane (APP/17/00008/F refers). Negotiation of a S.106 agreement is still ongoing but, when complete, residents of those homes will find themselves in the front line for noise and smell pollution.

For all these reasons, intensification of waste management on this site is not justified; indeed it is contra-indicated.

#### Positively Prepared

I have responded to more than one consultation on the Waste Plan. I was once informed that it was proposed that the intensification should be for the recycling of bulk waste, sofas, beds etc. I raised the problem of transportation using the A341 but was told that no alternative site was available in Dorset. However, there is nothing in this plan to suggest that intensification is for the purpose of bulk waste.

It has also been suggested that the site might be enlarged by enclosing Green Belt land which lies to the south-east. I note that this is now referred to as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna). It is not clear how far the present proposals are based on strategies to seek to meet objectively assessed requirements or whether they are consistent with achieving sustainable development. I find the absence of any cross referencing to Poole's Local Plan rather odd since there are many areas, Green Belt, Transportation, Ecology etc which are common to both that Plan and the Waste Plan.

#### Effective

It is not clear how far local government reorganisation has been factored into the preparation and delivery of the Waste Plan. Bournemouth and Poole will cease to be sovereign authorities in 2019 to be replaced by the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Unitary Authority while a new authority for the remainder of Dorset will come into being. Bournemouth and Poole have been following a programme of joint corporate working for over a year now but there is still work to be done.

#### Consistent with national policy

Because no consideration has been given to the adverse effects that increased traffic will have on the community or the adverse effects on internationally protected heathlands and wildlife species, I do not believe the proposed intensification of waste processing at Canford Magna would be a sustainable development. Although the

Planning Inspectorate has chosen to examine the waste plan and the minerals sites plan separately, in Merley and Bearwood the two plans are inextricably linked. It is very easy to discount the adverse effects of the waste plan without considering the cumulative adverse effects when taken together with those of the Local Plan and the Minerals Sites Plan.

In 2008, the then Secretary of State decided not to call in application 08/31392/019/F but decided instead that the decision on whether or not to grant planning permission for that application should remain with 'Poole Borough Council'. However, he made clear his duties to balance safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment with planning policies to (a) provide adequate facilities for the re-use, recovery and disposal of waste and (b) encourage sensitive waste management practices to preserve or enhance the overall quality of the environment and avoid risks to human health. It seems that, in the ensuing decade, there has been an imbalance which favours policies at (a) at the cost of those at (b) as well as safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Date: 09 May 2014  
Our ref: 112557  
Your ref: APP/14/00120Y

N  
2nd Floor  
Cromwell House  
15 Andover Road  
Winchester,



James Gillilan  
Borough of Poole

JRG 8023

Customer Services  
Hornbeam House  
Crowe Business Park  
Eccra Way  
Crowe  
Cheshire  
CW1 6GJ

BY EMAIL ONLY

12 MAY 21  
ON SYSTEM  
TBT

T 0300 060 3000

Dear Mr Gillilan

**Planning consultation: Permanent retention of an inert recycling facility, to generate recycled aggregates and soils, and installation of washing plant**  
**Location: Whites Pit Inert Recycling, Arrowsmith Road, BH21 3BE**

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 04 March 2014 which was received by Natural England on 04 March 2014.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990**  
**Town and country Planning (General Development Procedure Order) 1995, Article 10**  
**The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, regulation 61**  
**Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Section 28 (G) and (I)**

**Objection**

This application is immediately adjacent to Canford Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Special Protection Area and Special Area of Conservation. Natural England objects to this development on the grounds that the application, as submitted, is likely to prevent appropriate restoration of Canford Heath SSSI or prevent the enhancement of features for which Canford Heath SPA has been protected. Our concerns are set out below.

- 1) **Prevention of restoration of an area of Canford Heath SSSI**  
As a result of the mineral extraction at Whites Pit an area of land which was notified as SSSI and which contained priority biodiversity habitat was lost into the quarry. This proposal is contrary to long term agreed objectives to restore this lost habitat as part of the restoration of the previous uses, mineral extraction and landfill. The proposal indicates an acid grassland habitat which was not present at the time of SSSI notification rather than lowland heathland in the SSSI land. Natural England advise the authority that agreeing loss of this area would be contrary to local plan policy and would require compensation under the NPPF (para 118 see below).
- 2) The previous operators proposal (Biffa), see below made provision for a range of features which are sympathetic to the context of the heathland and which would act to support the protected biodiversity present in the SPA and SAC. The proposal for extensive areas of coppiced woodland and minimal habitat restoration would not act in a manner which would facilitate the maintenance or restoration of favourable condition as would the Biffa plan. The Biffa plan does bring forward measures which are aligned with the European sites



conservation objectives, enclosed. This is a material consideration for your authority as the objectives are to maintain or where not in favourable condition to enhance. The two SPA Annexe 1 birds are both in unfavourable condition at the present time. The BIFFA proposal would have resulted in a sympathetic landscape for nightjar and woodlark particularly, whereas there is little ecological evidence that the proposed coppiced area, sited on a landfill site will be on any more than neutral benefit to the SPA features. Natural England is aware that the applicant would be able to demonstrate that this matter has been secured in other adjacent landholdings through a suitable legal agreement.

3) Impact of the local distinctiveness of the landscape  
Natural England has not been consulted on the new restoration plan submitted with this proposal. Within this plan, Natural England have concerns about the proposal to plant a short rotation coppice on the site down to the boundary of Canford Heath SSSI. This is not consistent with the landscape of the area and would detract from the local distinctiveness associated with heathland. This would contradict PCS 23 of the Poole Core Strategy which states development must maintain the "open heathland character" of Canford Heath SSSI.

4) Limited ecological enhancement resulting from restoration of the site.  
This proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as the restoration and landfill aftercare scheme should provide appropriate biodiversity enhancement. This is encapsulated in paragraph 109 which states "planning should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures".

In addition to this, paragraph 118 states that when determining planning applications "if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused"

In the original applications (03/00663/033/F and 03/27392/011/F), Natural England was consulted, and Natural England had agreed to a restoration plan with the operating company Biffa in 2009 to mitigate against the environmental impact of the development. This plan involved the restoration of a substantial part of the site to heathland and neutral grassland as outlined in the document 'Restoration and Aftercare Scheme'. In relation to the objectives of paragraph 118, that permission for the site was granted and the mitigation proposed with the development would have resulted in a net gain for biodiversity.

The new restoration plan called "A living landscape: proposals for the sustainable restoration and after care of Whites Pit Landfill site" does not provide adequate or appropriate biodiversity enhancement. Natural England do not consider that short rotation coppice provides appropriate restoration because it provides limited biodiversity enhancement and does not compliment the habitats on the European heathland adjacent to the site.

Furthermore, this document proposes the removal of trees from 8ha of woodland within Canford Heath SSSI, SPA, SAC as a form of biodiversity enhancement. Natural England welcomes this proposal by the applicant, however, work that is being undertaken within the SSSI cannot be considered as providing ecological enhancement to mitigate against the development as there are other legal mechanisms for securing such necessary site restoration. The proposal is outwith the area of the application and may require a further permission from the Forestry Commission which means that the proposal would be difficult to secure through the planning system.

Natural England were not consulted during the preparation of this new restoration plan and have not had the opportunity to provide the applicant with advice on this new scheme. Overall, this new scheme does not compliment the landscape of the area and does not provide adequate mitigation to



compensate for the impact of the development.

Therefore, Natural England objects to the proposed development and advises that the local authority that permission for this development should not be granted as it contradicts the authorities obligations under the NERC Act 2006, the NPPF and the LPA's own Local Plan policy.

In Appendix A Natural England have outlined a few initial comments on the applicants restoration plan, outlining some more appropriate restoration measures for the site.

Should the application change, or if the applicant submits further information relating to the impact of this proposal on the SSSI aimed at reducing the damage likely to be caused, Natural England will be happy to consider it, and amend our position as appropriate.

If your Authority is minded to grant consent for this application contrary to the advice relating to Canford Heath SSSI contained in this letter, we refer you to Section 281 (6) of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended), specifically the duty placed upon your authority, requiring that your Authority;

- Provide notice to Natural England of the permission, and of its terms, the notice to include a statement of how (if at all) your authority has taken account of Natural England's advice, and
- Shall not grant a permission which would allow the operations to start before the end of a period of 21 days beginning with the date of that notice.

#### Protected Species

We have not assessed this application and associated documents for impacts on protected species.

Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species. The Standing Advice includes a habitat decision tree which provides advice to planners on deciding if there is a 'reasonable likelihood' of protected species being present. It also provides detailed advice on the protected species most often affected by development, including flow charts for individual species to enable an assessment to be made of a protected species survey and mitigation strategy.

You should apply our Standing Advice to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence may be granted.

If you have any specific questions on aspects that are not covered by our Standing Advice for European Protected Species or have difficulty in applying it to this application please contact us with details at [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service. If the form is not attached, it can also be accessed on our website.

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Emily Smith on 07788224126 or [Emily.smith@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:Emily.smith@naturalengland.org.uk). For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to [consultations@naturalengland.org.uk](mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk).



We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely

Marc Turner  
Senior Adviser  
Sustainable Development and Regulation  
Dorset, Hampshire and Isle of Wight Area Team

#### Appendix A: General observations on the 2012 Restoration Plan

Considering the 2012 restoration plan put forward by the Whites Pit there are several general comments that Natural England would suggest in order to progress with this application

- 1) Although short rotation coppice is not consistent with the landscape of the area and does not provide biodiversity enhancement, there is the potential that this could be acceptable on part of the site. Referring to Figure 1 of in the Appendix of Whites Pits restoration plan, short rotation coppice could be planted in area labelled 1 of the site, and extend into the yellow area indicating the recycling unit. This area is surrounded on its western and northern edge by woodland so would contrast be more complimentary to the landscape.
- 2) Natural England welcomes the proposal by the applicant to remove trees within part of their site that is within the SSSI boundary, and would like to keep this in the restoration scheme.
- 3) Area 3 and 4 of the restoration plan should be restored to heathland and neutral grassland. This will provide biodiversity enhancement and additional habitat that compliments the adjacent SSSI and European sites. This will also provide an appropriate landscape and ecological buffer between the SSSI and the short rotation coppice. Recent observations of the site indicates that the southern slope adjacent to the heathland is beginning to colonise with heathland plant species. Natural England would therefore advice against the application of compost to this slope (area 3) to allow this process to continue.
- 4) Within area 2 between the short rotation coppice and the neutral grassland, mixed acidic woodland as outlined in the Biffa 2009 restoration plan (page 9) could be placed to provide some screening between the neutral grassland and the short rotation coppicing. Suggested species are stated on page 10 and include Pedunculate oak (*Quercus robur*), Silver birch (*Betula pendula* or *B. pubescens*) and Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*). At the woodland edges shrubs such as Hazel (*Corylus avellana*) and Hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) could be used.



marion pope

**From:** "marion pope" <empeepope@btinternet.com>  
**Date:** 21 April 2016 08:49  
**To:** "Steve Dean" <s.dean@poole.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Re: APP/16/00339/Y - Mineral Extraction and restoration work and Change of Use from Golf Course to SANG

Dear Steve,

Thank you for providing this more detailed breakdown for 2015. Because Vectos' figures are only 'A first principles assessment' I think it best to use your Artic/HGV figures only. These give a daily average on a six-day week of between 195 and 214. Vectos gives working as '..... restricted to 07:00 – 18:00 Monday to Saturday, excluding public holidays. This equates to 66 hours a week.' On that basis there will be 110 extra HGV movements a day (660 per working week): a 56.5% increase over 2015 figures.

This presents a much more reasonable assumption of traffic increase on the Magna Road should permission be granted for this application. And accords with James Larson's comments on whether the additional traffic could be accommodated through the Knighton Lane junction.

Steve, thank you once again for this.

Kind Regards

Marion

Clr Marion Pope

Merley and Bearwood Ward

**From:** Steve Dean  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 20, 2016 5:33 PM  
**To:** mailto:empeepope@btinternet.com  
**Subject:** FW: APP/16/00339/Y - Mineral Extraction and restoration work and Change of Use from Golf Course to SANG

Marion

Sorry to keep you waiting for a response here.

I haven't been involved in the planning application and haven't read the applicant's statement so I can't really comment on the terminology of whether an HGV movement is an in and an out, or an in or an out, but I can understand your point.

I also can't really comment on whether the applicant would be operating these vehicles throughout the whole of an 11 hour day ( there would presumably be meal/rest breaks) so I don't know if your 220 HGVs per day estimate is reliable. The remainder of the document might clarify that.

I am responsible for our Traffic Data Collection though, so I can be clearer there:-

We've become quite worried about the results that we've been getting from our Traffic Counter in Magna Road ( you probably know that it is situated between Knighton Lane and Canford Arena). It has suffered some vandalism in the past, and has also been damaged by cars ( presumably parking on the grass adjacent to the counter). I'm afraid we're not confident of the data that we've obtained prior to 2015, and that does seem to tie in with the residents' feelings that their surveys don't agree with the figures that we gave you previously ( which were for 2015)

We recalibrated the machine for 2015 and so we're more confident of the data now (below)

2015 (new counter, correctly set up beginning of January 2015)
--

21/04/2016

Class	Weekday 24h Average	7 Day 24h Average
Motorcycles	115	123
Car and Mini Van	14191	13331
Trailers	65	54
Lorries and Mini Buses	281	220
Artic / HGV	239	184
Bus or Coach	59	49
<b>Total</b>	<b>14950</b>	<b>13961</b>

I would like to explain a few of points though:-

- While an Automatic Traffic Counter, will give a good count of the total number of vehicles, the actual classifications are not always an exact match.
- This is particularly important in the case of the Class 4 (Lorries and Mini Buses), and Class 5 (Artic/HGV). Smaller HGVs are classified as Class 4, but they share this class with large vans and Medium Goods Vehicles. Despite my, personal, frustration, this is a nationally used classification which I can't influence.
- In practice it is actually quite difficult to tell a large van or Medium Goods Vehicle from an HGV when you see them driving down the road. Our enumerators are very practiced in distinguishing them, but I am aware that residents do not always get this classification right.

One final thing, our Traffic Survey reporting software will give reports of weekday average and 7 day average, but doesn't output a 6-day average flow. I hope that the 5 or 7 day averages above will help you to put your summary together.

Steve Dean  
 Transportation Services  
 Borough of Poole  
 Civic Centre  
 Poole  
 01202 262071  
[www.poole.gov.uk](http://www.poole.gov.uk)

**From:** marion pope [mailto:empeepope@btinternet.com]

**Sent:** 18 April 2016 15:07

**To:** Steve Dean

**Subject:** Fw: APP/16/00339/Y - Mineral Extraction and restoration work and Change of Use from Golf Course to SANG

Dear Steve,

Clr Jane Newell and I held a special surgery on Saturday to discuss this application with concerned residents. I used the Council's 2014 figures to demonstrate the huge increase in HGV traffic this proposed development would bring to the Magna Road. The 2014 figures were challenged by some who live on the Magna Road. They say the figure today is much higher from counts they have conducted themselves. I wondered if you were in a position to provide the 2015 figures? If so would it be possible to give a daily average of HGV using a 6 day Average flow so that I can compare

21/04/2016

Mr James Gilfillan  
Borough of Poole  
Development Control  
Municipal Buildings Civic Centre  
Poole  
Dorset  
BH15 2RU

Our ref: WX/2013/123391/02-L01  
Your ref: APP/13/00242/C  
Date: 20 May 2013



Dear Mr Gilfillan

**ERECT EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING MATERIAL RECOVERY FACILITY WITH  
ANCILLARY INFRASTRUCTURE, ACCESSED VIA EXISTING SERVICE ROAD  
CANFORD RECYCLING CENTRE, MAGNA ROAD, WIMBORNE BH21 3AP**

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above mentioned planning application.

Further to the submission of the Technical Note from Atkins, dated 30 April 2013, we **remove our objection** to the proposed development **subject to the condition and informatives** detailed below being attached to any permission granted:-

**Flood Risk  
CONDITION:**

No development shall commence until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, in accordance with the strategy set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (Atkins, 28<sup>th</sup> February 2013) and the Technical Note (Atkins, 30 April 2013), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.

The scheme shall also include details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion.

**REASON:**

To prevent the increased risk of flooding, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

**NOTE TO LPA**

We anticipate the following details will need to be submitted to the LPA when discharging the above condition:

Environment Agency  
Rivers House, Sunrise Business Park, Higher Shaftesbury Road, Blandford, Dorset, DT11 8ST.  
Customer services line: 03708 506 506  
[www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

- A clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing the pipe networks and any attenuation ponds, soakaways and drainage storage tanks. This plan should show any pipe node numbers referred to in the drainage calculations and the invert and cover levels of manholes.
- A manhole schedule.
- Model runs to demonstrate that the critical storm duration is being used.
- Confirmation of the agreed discharge rate, with any flow control devices indicated on the plan with the rate of discharge stated.
- Calculations showing the volume of attenuation provided, demonstrating how the system operates during a 1 in 100 critical duration storm event. If overland flooding occurs, a plan should also be submitted detailing the location of overland flow paths and the likely depths of flooding. An appropriate allowance for climate change should be incorporated into the scheme in accordance with NPPF.
- Where infiltration forms part of the proposed stormwater system such as infiltration trenches and soakaways, soakage test results and test locations are to be submitted in accordance with BRE digest 365.

**INFORMATIVE:**

There must be no interruption to the surface water drainage system of the surrounding land as a result of the operations on the site. Provisions must be made to ensure that all existing drainage systems continue to operate effectively.

**INFORMATIVE:**

Only clean uncontaminated surface water can be discharged to ground via soakaway.

**Environmental Permit**

**INFORMATIVE**

This development will require a variation of the Environmental Permit(s) under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2012. The Environment Agency is required to consider all forms of pollution when issuing an environmental Permit. Odour can be classed as pollution if it causes offences to man's senses. If a permit is issued for this site, it will require the operator to take all appropriate measures to prevent or minimise the emission of offensive odours from the activity. However, this does not mean that there will be no odour from these activities.

**NOTES TO LPA**

There have been complaints of both odour (substantiated) and noise from the existing site, and any intensification may lead to further issues unless addressed.

Appendix 2 suggests that there will be no impact from odour and noise as the nearest property is 550m away. You may feel that it is necessary to require some form of noise monitoring (to include low frequency noise) if the operations are due to be 24 hour. You should seek advice from your Environmental Health Department on this matter.

**Pollution Prevention During Construction**

**INFORMATIVE**

Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution from the development. Such safeguards should cover:

- the use of plant and machinery
- oils/chemicals and materials
- the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles
- the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds
- the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

The applicant should refer to the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidelines at:

<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/topics/pollution/39083.aspx>.

**NOTES TO APPLICANT**

**Waste Management**

Should this proposal be granted planning permission, then in accordance with the waste hierarchy, we wish the applicant to consider reduction, reuse and recovery of waste in preference to offsite incineration and disposal to landfill during site construction.

If any controlled waste is to be removed off site, then site operator must ensure a registered waste carrier is used to convey the waste material off site to a suitably authorised facility.

If the applicant require more specific guidance it is available on our website [www.environment-agency.gov.uk/subjects/waste/](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/subjects/waste/).

In England, it is a legal requirement to have a site waste management plan (SWMP) for all new construction projects worth more than £300,000. The level of detail that your SWMP should contain depends on the estimated build cost, excluding VAT. You must still comply with the duty of care for waste. Because you will need to record all waste movements in one document, having a SWMP will help you to ensure you comply with the duty of care. Further information can be found at <http://www.netregs.co.uk>

**Please send us a copy of the decision notice issued for this application for our records.**

Please contact us if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely

**MR MICHAEL HOLM**

**Planning Advisor - Sustainable Places**

Direct dial 01258 483380

Direct fax 01258 455998

Direct e-mail [michael.holm@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:michael.holm@environment-agency.gov.uk)

cc New Earth Solutions Group Ltd

08/31392/019

IN

James Copy of letter as dismissed

**Dorset County Council** 

**Planning**  
County Hall, Colliton Park  
Dorchester  
Dorset DT1 1XJ

Telephone: 01305 224241  
Minicom: 01305 267933  
We welcome calls via text Relay

Email: p.tomlin@dorsetcc.gov.uk  
DX: DX 8716 Dorchester  
Website: www.dorsetforyou.com

Mr I Mariner  
Commercial Recycling Ltd  
Canford Recycling Centre  
Magna Road  
WIMBORNE  
BH21 3AP

Date: 12 August 2011  
Ask for: Paul Tomlin  
My ref: PT/TD  
SG18  
Your ref: 08/31392/019



Dear Mr Mariner

**Canford Recycling Centre: Operating Hours**

It has been brought to my attention that operations are commencing on site some mornings around 6.00 am. This is a contravention of condition 3 of the relevant planning permission 08/31392/019 which restricts the site hours of use and vehicle movements from 7.00 am to 6.00 pm on Monday to Friday and 7.00 am to 1.00 pm on Saturdays.

Please could you ensure that in future there is compliance with the above operating hours and be aware monitoring checks may be undertaken. For your information Dorset County Council provide a monitoring service for mineral and waste activities to the Borough of Poole, the local planning authority.

Yours sincerely

**Paul Tomlin**  
Monitoring and Enforcement Officer  
Mineral and Waste Disposal Sites

Copy to: Mr J Giffillan, Planning, Borough of Poole