

## Report on comments to the Waste Site Options in Blandford and Purbeck, February 2017 – Updated January 2018

This report provides a summary of the comments made to the Waste site options in Blandford and Purbeck published for consultation in February 2017. For each site option the issues raised have been summarised and an officer response to the issue has been provided. The final column sets out an officer conclusion.

Draft 'Development Considerations' are also included in the final column for the Binnegar proposals as evidence suggests that this site should be considered further for allocation. The development considerations will be refined as appropriate following further assessment work. The Development Considerations are intended to highlight some of the key issues raised by stakeholders that will need to be addressed in any planning application.

**NB:** This version of the response schedule has been updated to provide details of which sites have been included in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan and specific changes made to site allocations to reflect issues raised. See text in bold, underlined in final column.

| <b>WP17 – Land East of Sunrise Business Park (Question 1)</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Facilities proposed</b>   | Household Recycling Centre / Waste Transfer Facility / Waste Vehicle Depot  |
| <b>Summary of issue and officer response</b>   |   |
| <b>Officer conclusion</b>  |   |
| <p><b>Issue 1:</b> Traffic/access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build up on the A350 and roundabout. The need for creation of a safe access of the C13 – a fast road</li> <li>• Cumulative traffic impacts with new Lidl store opening.</li> <li>• Lower category highway than for WP06.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The development of a waste management facility in this location would inevitably increase traffic locally. It is the view of the DCC highways team that this location is acceptable in principle. They are aware of the opening of the new supermarket. Safe access from the C13 should be achievable subject to satisfactory design and provision of suitable visibility splays.</p> | <p><b><u>Initial officer comments following consultation</u></b></p> <p><b>It is not recommended to take this site forward for allocation in the final Waste Plan. There are considered to be alternative sites within the AONB that would have a lesser impact.</b></p> <p><b><u>Further officer comments at publication (December 2017)</u></b></p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Issue 2:</b> Impact on AONB/Landscape/Visibility from Pimperne. Mitigation of effects more difficult than WP06.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b><br/>It is acknowledged that development could have a significant adverse impact on the landscape, and on the AONB, at this location. Advice from DCC landscape officer suggests there are limited options for mitigating the impact, particularly due to its exposed location on a high point of the plateau. It is considered that there are alternative sites within the AONB that would have a lesser impact.</p> <p><b>Issue 3:</b> Proximity of food manufacturing/retail businesses</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Modern waste management centres should not risk contamination or give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.</p> <p><b>Issue 4:</b> Appropriateness of development within a rural Parish</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Waste facilities should be located in accessible locations close to centres of population in order to minimise the distance travelled by waste. Although the site is rural in nature, it adjoins the Sunrise Business Park and is located on the outskirts of Blandford. Impacts on landscape are however likely to be difficult to mitigate.</p> <p><b>Issue 5:</b> Development would reduce the open gap between Pimperne and Blandford (contrary to Pimperne Neighbourhood Plan); site could be seen as piecemeal development.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The site adjoins the Sunrise Business Park and is located on the outskirts of Blandford in a relatively accessible location. However, the site is exposed and impacts on landscape are likely to be difficult to mitigate.</p> <p><b>Issue 6:</b> Impact on nearby sensitive receptors, including residential properties, children’s nursery, business park employees – noise/odour/dust etc</p> | <p><b>This site has not been allocated in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. Land south of Sunrise Business Park has been allocated for a waste management centre. For further information see Inset 2: Land south of Sunrise Business park, Blandford.</b></p> |
|---|---|

**Officer response:** The impacts on the quality of life of residents and/or other sensitive receptors will depend on the access, precise location and design of the waste facility. Further consideration will need to be given to mitigation, such as screening and landscaping, which will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. Waste managed at modern Waste Management Centres is generally stored within a building which should address any odour/litter issues. If a site were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.

**Issue 7:** Impact on adjacent business park/loss of business (inc nursery)

**Officer response:** Waste facilities are considered appropriate on allocated employment land – although this site is not on the existing business park and allocated employment land, it could form an extension to it. Consideration will need to be given to the design and layout of any waste facility to ensure impacts or perceived impacts are mitigated to an appropriate level. Any actual impacts should be able to be mitigated, as stated above.

**Issue 8:** Vermin

**Officer response:** Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.

**Issue 9:** Windblown litter

**Officer response:** Modern waste management facilities will ensure all wastes are enclosed within a building and screening around the site should ensure that no litter is blown off the site.

**Issue 10:** Flytipping

**Officer response:** The existing waste management centre at Hollands Way has poor access and limited space for expansion to make the necessary improvements. The development of a new modern waste facility to meet the needs of a growing population will be required during the

plan period. There is no evidence to suggest that moving the existing facility will increase fly tipping in the long term.

**Issue 11:** Toxic gas/fumes

**Officer response:** The proposed facility is a waste management centre, which would include the storage, bulking up and onward transfer of waste. There would be no treatment of the waste on site and so no emissions produced.

**Issue 12:** Impact on historic environment – the site is ½ mile south of an Pimperne Iron Age farmstead

**Officer response:** It is noted that Historic England consider WP18 less intrusive than WP17 from an historic environment perspective. The county archaeologist states that there is archaeological potential in the area and that pre-determination archaeological evaluation may be appropriate

**Issue 13:** Ecological surveys necessary at application stage, retention of hedgerows desirable

**Officer response:** Advice from DCC’s County Ecologist is that a Phase 1 habitat survey would be required before development were to take place, to identify any potential receptors such as bats and reptiles. This would be at the planning application stage. The retention of hedgerows unaffected by the access can be included as a development consideration.

**Supporting/positive comments**

**Issue 1: Impacts on AONB/landscape** could be mitigated through building into landscape and given the existing visual impact of Sunrise Business Park in the foreground.

**Officer response:** Our landscape assessment work indicates that the opportunities for mitigation are limited. This is particularly due to the site’s exposed location on a high point of the plateau in an open landscape.

**Issue 2:** Good access/transport links (better than options available for WP06, away from roundabout)

**Officer response:** DCC Highways Authority state that a safe and appropriate form of access should be achievable from the C13 for this site. However, they also have no in principle objection to the alternative site on land south of Sunrise Business Park (WP06).

**Issue 3:** Site is larger than WP06 and would provide more scope for growth and screening/development of a well-designed site.

**Officer response:** Although a larger site is available, our assessment indicates that the opportunities for mitigation, including screening, are more limited than for WP06 – Land to the south of Sunrise Business Park. This is particularly due to the site's exposed location on a high point of the plateau.

**Issue 4:** Away from residential areas

**Officer response:** The site is located further from residential properties than other options

**Issue 5:** Site preferable to WP06 from an archaeological perspective

**Officer response:** The county archaeologist states that there is archaeological potential in the area and that pre-determination archaeological evaluation may be appropriate. It has been highlighted that there is a possible prehistoric enclosure that was seen as a cropmark within site WP06 and that pre-determination archaeological evaluation would be appropriate for that site.

**Issue 5:** If school is built to the east of site WP06 there is a risk of airborne pollution across the school site as the prevailing wind is westerly. Use of WP17 may alleviate this risk.

**Officer response:** The proposed facility is a waste management centre, which would include the storage, bulking up and onward transfer of waste. There would be no treatment of the waste on site and so no emissions produced.

**Issues 6:** Extension to existing industrial estate, preferable to development of a rural area

**Officer response:** It is agreed that an extension to an existing industrial estate could provide benefits over development in a completely rural area. However, in this instance our assessment indicates that the opportunities for mitigating landscape and visual impacts are limited, particularly due to the site's exposed location on a high point of the plateau.

| <b>WP18 – Langton Lodge Farm (Question 2)</b>   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Facilities proposed</b>  | Household Recycling Centre / Waste Transfer Facility / Waste Vehicle Depot   |
| <b>Summary of issue and officer response</b>  | <b>Officer conclusion</b>  |
| <p><b>Issue 1:</b> Traffic impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact from additional traffic</li> <li>• congestion on an already heavily congested Black Lane</li> <li>• noise and dust from lorries</li> <li>• increased likelihood of traffic accidents and road rage</li> <li>• traffic impacts cumulatively with school, adult education centre and Blandford Camp</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The development of a waste management centre will create additional traffic. Dorset County Council Highways Authority have no in principle objection to additional vehicles on Black Lane, however it is acknowledged that the site is less favourable in this respect than the other options due to the increased traffic past the school. The local impacts would need to be considered further within a Transport Assessment (TA). This would be carried out at the planning application stage and would serve to confirm the impact of the proposal upon the local highway network and identify and particular mitigation measures that would be required in order for it to be acceptable, in highway safety terms. An initial highways feasibility study suggests that HGVs should not access/leave the site at school drop off and pick up times given safety concerns. This would have implications for the efficient operation of the facility.</p> <p>HGVs would have to follow speed limits, which would help to ensure noise levels are not unacceptable. A wheel wash facility could be put in place at the proposed waste management centre to minimise dirt and dust on the HGVs.</p> <p><b>Issue 2:</b> Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access to site due to the junction and narrow road, and on street parking/congestion.</li> <li>• Pavement on Black Lane has recently been changed to a combined cycle/footpath.</li> </ul> | <p><b><u>Initial officer comments following consultation</u></b></p> <p><b>It is not recommended to take this site forward for allocation in the final Waste Plan.</b></p> <p><b>There are concerns related to amenity from increased traffic travelling through a residential area, particularly past the entrance to a school. There is a risk of contamination to the public water supply from development. There is also concern that the viability of the site will be impacted due to the cost of diverting the strategic water main.</b></p> <p><b><u>Further officer comments at publication (December 2017)</u></b></p> <p><b>This site has not been allocated in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. Land south of Sunrise Business Park has been allocated for a waste management centre. For further information see Inset 2: Land south of Sunrise Business park, Blandford.</b></p> |

- An alternative access must be investigated – slip road off the bypass or a service road joining the Wimborne Rd onto Black Lane
- Concern that access to Black Lane will be via Bayfran Way

**Officer response:** Dorset County Council highways authority consider that the junction off Black Lane with Wimborne Road is suitable for the additional traffic generation. It would be possible to direct HGV traffic associated with the waste management facility along Black Lane. This could be secured through any planning permission granted.

**Issue 3:** Safety of pedestrians and use of school crossing

**Officer response:** It is acknowledged that the road is heavily used by pedestrians and that there is a crossing for the school on Black Lane which could be impacted by the proposal. The safety of the crossing is of concern and would need to be specifically assessed as part of the Transport Assessment, which would be necessary for any planning application.

Assessment of the feasibility of the site in terms of highways has indicated that operating times for HGVs should avoid school pick up and drop off times. Alternatively, it may be possible to provide a formal crossing in close proximity to the school as part of offsite works to mitigate the impacts of the proposal.

**Issue 4:** Site more remote than other options resulting in greater travel distances

**Officer response:** The site is not considered to be at too great a distance from Blandford to serve the population. Access issues are considered separately (above).

**Issue 4:** Impact on the school/children's centre/nursery/residential areas, including noise, odour and dust

**Officer response:** The impacts on the quality of life of residents and on the school and other sensitive receptors will depend on the access and design of the waste facility. Further consideration will need to be given to mitigation, such as screening and landscaping, which will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. Waste managed at modern Waste Management Centres



is generally stored within a building which should address any odour/litter issues. If a site were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels. Traffic issues are considered separately (above).

**Issue 5:** Presence of water mains, proximity to water treatment facility

**Officer response:** Existing water supply pipelines cross the site and no construction would be possible within a minimum of 3 metres of these mains. The Waste Planning Authority has liaised with Wessex Water and it is likely that the strategic water main would require diversion before the development of a waste facility. This would be of substantial cost and would affect the viability of the site. The site will only be able to be taken forward with agreement from Wessex Water that there would be no unacceptable impact on the public water system.

Wessex Water has not raised any concern in relation to the water treatment facility situated nearby.

**Issue 6:** Impact on groundwater and public water supply

- Within Source Protection Zone 1
- Close to strategically important public water supply boreholes and a private licensed potable supply - risk of contamination to the public water supply
- Pimperne Brook
- Designated safeguard zone for nitrate; groundwater vulnerable to pollution

**Officer response:** The site falls within a groundwater source protection zone and is close to public and private water supplies. The location is also designated a safeguard zone for nitrate. The Waste Planning Authority would need to further liaise with the Environment Agency and consider the viability of the site given these issues.

Risk of contamination to the public water supply will need to be considered further if this site were to be taken forward. The Environment Agency has advised that a hydrogeological risk

assessment will need to demonstrate that contaminants can be prevented from polluting the groundwater source, as well as the watercourse, if the site were to be taken forward. The Environment Agency will also need to be satisfied that appropriate risks and mitigation measures are considered in any operating permits.

**Issue 7:** Impact on AONB/landscape/greater visual impact than other options

**Officer response:** It is acknowledged that the site is situated in the AONB. However, development of this site could be justified if it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest and there is no better alternative. There is a need to develop a new site to meet the needs of Blandford and surrounding areas.

Our landscape assessment work indicates that the site is relatively well concealed and screened from views. Conversely the transport and operational implications of the proposal may have a greater impact than alternatives due to increased noise and disturbance in a more tranquil location. Further work will be needed to ensure that any impacts from this development can be satisfactorily mitigated. The development of a comprehensive Landscape and Ecological Masterplan for the site is essential if this site is brought forward.

**Issue 8:** Impact on air quality from queuing traffic and emissions, impact on health and global warming

**Officer response:** Impacts would depend on the specific design of proposals, however for any new waste facility, it would be the intention to design the facility in such a way to ensure that queuing traffic is reduced wherever possible. This would reduce emissions from traffic to acceptable levels.

**Issue 9:** Windblown litter

**Officer response:** Modern waste management facilities will ensure all wastes are enclosed within a building and screening around the site should ensure that no litter is blown off the site.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Issue 10:</b> Fly tipping due to moving the site and the distance users would have to travel</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The existing waste management centre at Hollands Way has poor access and limited space for expansion to make the necessary improvements. The development of a new modern waste facility to meet the needs of a growing population will be required during the plan period. There is no evidence to suggest that moving the existing facility will increase fly tipping in the long term.</p> <p><b>Issue 11:</b> Impact on public right of way which provides wide ranging views over surrounding open countryside</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Although there would no direct impact on the public footpath that runs along the eastern boundary of the site, it is acknowledged that there would be a visual impact. A landscape mitigation and enhancement plan would consider appropriate mitigation of this impact, such as screening. Dorset County Council's senior ranger suggests that the current route on the east side of the hedge boundary will have less of a visual impact than a route on the western side (which is shown on the definitive map).</p> <p><b>Issue 12:</b> Loss of agricultural land/impact on farm</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The land is mainly grade 3 agricultural land and therefore classified as 'best and most versatile' land. The western sector of the site is grade 4, therefore classified as poor quality agricultural land. Any development will need to balance the economic and other benefits of the agricultural land against the need for the waste facility and the availability of poorer quality land for development. The land is farmed by a tenant farmer and the landowner is supportive of the development.</p> <p><b>Issue 13:</b> Loss of countryside</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Although there would be a loss of 'countryside', the site is not open access and is relatively well concealed from view.</p> |  |
|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Issue 14:</b> Impact on habitats and ecology, retention of hedgerows desirable</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Advice from DCC’s County Ecologist is that a Phase 1 habitat survey would be required before development were to take place, to identify any potential receptors such as bats and reptiles. This would be at the planning application stage. The retention of hedgerows unaffected by the access can be included as a development consideration.</p> <p><b>Issue 15:</b> Loss of trees</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The existing tree belts would be maintained if the site were to be taken forward.</p> <p><b>Issue 16:</b> Potential for increased community taxes to fund the facility</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The site would be funded by the developer, Dorset Waste Partnership. Council tax would not increase as a direct result of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Issue 17:</b> Site too small for a recycling facility</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The site is over 7ha which would provide sufficient space for the development of a waste management centre.</p> <p><b>Supporting/positive comments</b></p> <p><b>Issue 1:</b> There is a need for a new facility to manage Blandford’s waste and support recycling</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> It is agreed that there is a need for a new modern waste management centre to serve Blandford and the surrounding area. The Waste Plan will aim to identify the most suitable site for the development of such a facility.</p> <p><b>Issue 2:</b> Traffic flow – site preferable to WP06 (Land south of Sunrise Business Park) as this site would increase traffic on A350 and hinder the flow around the town</p> |  |
|--|--|

**Officer response:** It is the view of DCC highways authority that the location of the site south of Sunrise Business Park is acceptable in principle but that further consideration should be given to the most appropriate access to the site. Options include a new access directly from the A350 or the provision of a fifth arm to the roundabout.

**Issue 3:** Site considered to have least adverse impact on the AONB of the three options

**Officer response:** Following our landscape assessment work, it is considered that site option WP17 would have a more significant landscape impact than both this site and site WP06. Our assessment work indicates that, from a landscape point of view, either this site or site WP06 could potentially be brought forward, subject to appropriate mitigation. The potential impacts of both sites will need to be carefully considered and weighed up.

**Issue 4:** School will only be impacted at two specific times of day. Access from the B3082 has already been improved and should be able to accommodate large vehicles.

**Officer Response:** Any restrictions placed on waste vehicle movements to avoid the school pick up and drop off times would affect the efficiency of the facility.

**Issue 5:** No archaeological issues (this will also make it cheaper to develop)

**Officer Response:** No specific archaeological issues have been highlighted for this site.

**Issue 6:** Away from food manufacturing/retail businesses/ in the right location with regards to prevailing winds

**Officer Response:** The site is located further from businesses than the other options. However, modern waste management centres should not risk contamination. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.

**Issue 7:** Location is good if a slip road from the bypass to access the site is created to ease congestion locally

**Officer response:** This access is not considered a viable option. Access to the site would be from Black Lane.

**Issue 8:** Developing a facility here would result in less litter in the town

**Officer response:** The development of a new waste management centre would mean the closure of the existing site at Hollands Way Industrial Estate, located within the bypass. Modern waste management facilities will ensure all wastes are enclosed within a building and screening around the site should ensure that no litter is blown off the site.

| <b>WP19 – Binnegar (Question 3)</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Facilities proposed</b>  | Waste treatment facility  |
| <b>Representations*</b><br><i>all numbers of approx.</i><br>*NB some comments were agreeing to our view of not taking the site forward... others agreed that this site was appropriate  | Agree 5<br>Disagree 3<br>Comment 6  |
| <b>Summary of issue and officer response</b>  |   |
| <p><b>Issue 1:</b> Impact on ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site adjacent to SPA, SAC and SSSI and within 2km of other internationally important heathland sites</li> <li>• Risks to protected sites from emissions, dust, elevated local populations of predators</li> <li>• Likely significant effects on protected sites cannot be ruled out</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The Waste Planning Authority's Conservation Regulations Assessment Screening Report concludes that significant effects on European protected habitats are uncertain at this stage. It is acknowledged that further assessment of impacts from the proposals in terms of emissions of nitrates would be necessary to determine whether likely significant effects can be ruled out. The Waste Plan will contain sufficient safeguards within its Policies to ensure that there are no significant effects from waste proposals.</p> <p><b>Issue 2:</b> Impact of emissions on surrounding environment, nearby Scout camp, Sandford residential area and school (particularly due to westerly wind direction).</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> The development of a residual waste treatment facility would involve strict air pollution/emission and odour controls from the Environment Agency, who would need to issue a waste management licence. Once operational the site would be monitored on a regular basis.</p> | <p><b>Officer conclusion</b></p> <p><b><u>Initial officer comments following consultation</u></b></p> <p><b>Evidence would indicate that this site remains an option for the management of residual waste. However, there are concerns related to emissions from any treatment facility and impacts on nearby European Sites.</b></p> <p><b><u>Draft development considerations</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate assessment in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Studies must demonstrate that emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European sites. If it is shown that the development</li> </ul> |

**Issue 2:** Traffic impacts

- Unacceptable additional level of traffic along narrow, rural road.
- Vehicle movements would be further increased if waste not fully treated onsite.
- HGV traffic through Broadmayne.
- Access to the A352 not suitable for HGVs.

**Officer response:** There is already existing planning permission for the Environmental Park, comprising a number of different waste management facilities. As the proposals would be a replacement for what is already permitted, it is understood that there would be no increase in HGV movements on permitted levels. It is acknowledged that should a facility produce RDF/SRF but not treat it on site, i.e. send it to facilities elsewhere for final treatment, then HGV movements would be higher than if waste were treated on site. However, the local highways authority are content that HGV numbers and routes would remain the same as currently with only a minor variation in destination to this site as opposed to the two existing landfill sites. No concern has been raised regarding access from Puddletown Road to the A352.

**Issue 3:** Litter/dust

**Officer response:** Modern waste management facilities will ensure all wastes are enclosed within a building. Additionally, the facility would be located within the quarry void. This should ensure that no litter or dust is blown off the site. Nevertheless, the potential for dust deposition on surrounding heathlands will need further consideration. Vehicles transporting waste to facilities would be enclosed or covered to ensure no waste escapes during transportation.

**Issue 4:** Facility should be able to process a greater tonnage of waste

**Officer response:** This site has been considered on the basis of it managing up to 100,000tpa of waste as proposed by the site operator. If a proposal came forward to manage a greater tonnage of waste further consideration and assessment would be required to ensure that any impacts would be acceptable.

proposals would have a significant effect on the critical pollutant load/level of the European sites then avoidance/mitigation to reduce this to non-significant levels must be designed in to any development. Phase 2 surveys for species typical of the European sites (in particular nightjar, woodlark and Dartford warbler) must assess the effects of development on the populations on site and in surrounding areas. If it is shown that the development proposals would have a significant effect on species listed in Annex I of the Birds Directive (those for which SPAs may be designated) then mitigation to reduce this to non-significant levels must be designed in to any development.

- The site should be subject to a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment and preparation of a comprehensive Landscape and Ecological Masterplan for the site. This should demonstrate how impacts will be minimised, particularly from any stack by its design, formation level, colour, texture and overall height. This should also give regard to how lighting on the site will be minimised. Proposals should also incorporate appropriate screening to ensure protection of adjacent public right of way.



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Issue 5:</b> Black bag waste should be further sorted with only the residual being used for energy recovery.</p> <p><b>Officer Response:</b> It is agreed that pre-sorting of black bag waste prior to treatment should be encouraged wherever practicable in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p> <p><b>Issue 6:</b> Visual impact of the chimney</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> Initial assessment by the council's landscape officer suggests that the site should be subject to a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment at the planning application stage. It is suggested that the impact of any stack should be minimised by its design, formation level, colour, texture and overall height.</p> <p><b>Issue 7:</b> Impact on public right of way, including from site access. The public right of way (RoW) is a bridleway not a footpath.</p> <p><b>Officer Response:</b> The Plan will be updated to correctly identify the RoW as a bridleway. If this site were to be allocated, development considerations would need to refer to the need to protect the RoW, through for example appropriate hedge screening.</p> <p><b>Issue 8:</b> Location too far from waste arisings, increasing waste mileage</p> <p><b>Officer Response:</b> It should be noted that until recently, most of the waste arising from Dorset was sent to landfill sites situated near Binnegar. However, the management of waste is changing from landfill to treatment and there is in theory a greater choice over location. Binnegar would be in a good location for managing waste from western Dorset and coupled with capacity in SE Dorset could provide a good solution for the management of Dorset's waste.</p> <p><b>Issue 9:</b> Pollution of the water courses, impact on fish farm</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of appropriate HGV routes should be built into any proposals.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Further officer comments at publication (December 2017)</u></b></p> <p><b>Land at Binnegar Environmental Park has been allocated in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan for intensification of the site including the management of non-hazardous waste. For further information see Inset 10: Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke.</b></p> <p><b>The site is an existing waste facility and is being actively promoted by a waste operator.</b></p> |
|---|---|

**Officer response:** The Environment Agency has raised no objection to this site. However, it is advised that further consideration of surface water features is required as part of any planning application.

**Issue 10:** Presence of scheduled monument (prehistoric barrow) to west of site – overall design of site needs to conserve and where appropriate enhance its setting.

**Officer response:** It is agreed that the barrow and its setting should be conserved and that this should be factored in to a masterplan for the development of the site.

**Issue 12:** Cumulative impact with other development in the area/impact on Dorset AONB

**Officer response:** It is acknowledged that there are several other developments along the Puddletown Road, including quarrying, a wind farm and a solar park. The cumulative impact on the setting of the AONB will need further consideration. The council's landscape officer recommends a landscape and ecological masterplan is undertaken to enable a comprehensive mitigation and enhancement approach for the site as part of any planning application. This should include consideration of cumulative impacts on the landscape.

**Supporting/positive comments**

**Issue 1:** Minimising vehicle movements/There would be limited additional vehicles on permitted levels.

**Officer response:** It is agreed that vehicle movements would be similar to what is already permitted for the Binnegar Environmental Park. It is agreed that a number of smaller waste treatment facilities throughout Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole would assist in reducing vehicle miles travelled by our waste.

**Issue 2:** Good Access

**Officer Response:** It is agreed that access is appropriate with no concerns being raised by the local highways authority in this regard.

**Issue 3:** Away from built up areas/residential properties

**Officer Response:** It is agreed that the site is remote from built up areas. Potential impacts on residential amenity for individual properties would need to be mitigated to an acceptable level.

**Issue 4:** Existing waste management facility

**Officer Response:** Binnegar is an existing permitted waste site which provides some advantages.

**Issue 6:** Development unlikely to be visible from the Dorset AONB, due to existing landform and vegetation.

**Officer response:** It is agreed that the site is well screened due to its location within a void. Any chimney would need careful consideration regarding its impact on the landscape and the Dorset AONB. Initial assessment by the council's landscape officer suggests that the site should be subject to a detailed landscape and visual impact assessment at the planning application stage. It is suggested that the impact of any stack should be minimised by its design, formation level, colour, texture and overall height.