

Waste Plan Hearing Sessions – Agenda Questions

Responses by Dorset County Council

NB: This document was prepared before the publication of the revised NPPF. References to the NPPF within this document refer to the 2012 version.

A LEGAL COMPLIANCE

Matter 1 - Duty to Co-operate & Legal Issues

DCC Statement No(s): WPHD01

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations

1. Does the BDPWP meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations having regard to recent case law?

Yes, the Waste Plan meets the requirements of the Habitats Regulations having regard to recent case law. An addendum to the October 2017 Screening Assessment has been prepared (WPSD07a), to be read alongside the Screening Assessment. This addendum contains an Appropriate Assessment, prepared in consultation with Natural England and considering all the agreed mitigation which had previously formed part of the Screening Assessment.

2. Should policies 7 to 11 include criteria requiring no adverse effect on the integrity of European or Ramsar sites, similarly to policies 3 to 6? If not, please explain the reasons for the different approach of those policies.

See Q64 of DCC Statement Matter 5 (WPHD05)

Policies 7-11 allow applications for waste to be brought forward and these will be subject to Policy 18, which contains the necessary safeguards.

The scale of effect is potentially greater for policies 3-6, therefore the Habitats Regulations Assessment recommended policy wording to provide an additional safeguard.

This is because (from HRA):

- Policy 3 relates to allocated waste sites. Several of these required site specific wording within the policy. However, it is prudent to retain the more general wording as well, to apply to all other sites within this policy.
- Policy 4 relates to unallocated sites which will not have been assessed through the production of the Waste Plan. It is therefore considered necessary to include wording safeguarding the European sites in the policy rather than the accompanying text, to provide the required level of certainty specified in current Habitats Regulations Assessment guidance.
- Policies 5 and 6 are likely to result in larger scale developments than the other policies dealing with new facilities. Now and at earlier assessment stages, it is not known which sites would be allocated to meet the needs for all these types of facilities. A precautionary approach is adopted.

B SOUNDNESS

Matter 2 - Spatial Strategy & Allocations

DCC Statement No: **WPHD02**

3. How does the BDPWP overall support the movement of waste management up the waste hierarchy?[15]
4. How does the BDPWP reflect the proximity principle? [16]

See Q15 and Q16 of DCC Statement Matter 2 (WPHD 02)

5. How does the spatial strategy relate to planned geographic areas of growth?[17]

See Q17 of DCC Statement Matter 2 (WPHD 02)

6. Have all reasonable alternative sites, particularly with regard to the allocated sites in the Green Belt and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and that may affect internationally designated habitats, been assessed and the reasons for rejection set out? [20]

See Q12 of DCC Statement Matter 1 (WPHD 01) regarding internationally designated habitats

See Q21 of DCC Statement Matter 2 (WPHD 02) regarding Green Belt and AONB

7. How would development of the allocated sites safeguard and enhance local amenity, landscape and natural resources, environmental, cultural and economic assets, tourism and the health and well-being of the people? [22]

See Q22 of DCC Statement Matter 2 (WPHD 02)

8. Would any of the allocations result in significant adverse impacts that could not be acceptably mitigated? In such cases how have the benefits of allocation been demonstrated to outweigh the detriment?[23]

See Q23 of DCC Statement Matter 2 (WPHD 02)

Matter 3A - Forecasts and Need for New Facilities:

Policies 1. 2 & 4

DCC Statement No(s): **WPHD03**

9. Are the assumptions made regarding growth and the spatial distribution of facilities robust?

Assumptions regarding growth:

LACW

Assumption 1: Housing will grow in accordance with what is planned.

Yes, this is robust as it is based on most up to date strategic housing market assessment (SHMA), covering eastern Dorset, and the Local Plan covering western Dorset (West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland) See Matter 3, Q29.

Assumption 2: Tonnage of waste per household will also grow - Growth is based on an increase in arisings per household based on a 5 year average.

Discussions with the three waste management authorities and the waste industry has supported the assumption that LACW will grow during the Plan period and the rate of 0.9% is generally supported. Assumptions over rate of growth took into account recent trends. This option, along with others was consulted on and there have been no concerns raised.

CIW

Assumption 1: Commercial and industrial waste arisings can be expected to respond to trends in the economy.

The reasons for this assumption are:

- Historically, economic growth has been considered a key driver for the growth of arisings of C&I waste, with this waste stream responding to changes in the economy.
- Consultees have favoured an approach where arisings would respond to trends in the economy.
- The Planning Practice Guidance states that 'waste planning authorities should assume a certain level of growth in waste arisings unless there is clear evidence to demonstrate otherwise'. (Waste, Paragraph 032).

Therefore, it is appropriate to assume that arisings will grow.

The Local Economic Forecasting Model for Dorset, produced by Cambridge Econometrics for the Dorset LEP area, establishes projected economic growth (growth in Value Added). This provided a robust basis for the Plan's forecasting.

Forecasts were recently updated to reflect the latest local economic forecasting model (2016/17).

Assumption 2: Arisings will grow at a slower rate than economic growth. The Waste Plan assumes that CIW will grow at 85% the rate of economic growth.

The reasons for this assumption are:

- The Government has a clear objective to decouple economic growth from waste arisings in the future ('Government Review of Waste Policy in England', Defra 2011).
- Defra figures showed a decrease in total arisings at the national level from 2012 to 2014. Provisional estimates for 2015-2016 show a continuing decrease/stabilisation ('UK Statistics on Waste', Defra, February 2018).
- Research on commercial and industrial waste growth projects a fairly stable production of this waste stream to 2020 ('Commercial and Industrial Waste in the UK and Republic of Ireland', CIWM, 2013)

There has been support to this approach that reflects the Government's objective to decouple waste growth with economic growth. This still builds in growth in arisings, as advocated by the PPG, of 1.4% (a higher rate than LACW).

Provision for LACW & CIW

In terms of provision for LACW and CIW, the Plan builds in sufficient flexibility through making more than sufficient provision for projected arisings.

Inert Waste

Assumption 1: Inert waste arisings will grow in line with projected growth in 'Value Added' for the construction sector.

This assumption was made because inert waste is most linked with this sector.

The Local Economic Forecasting Model for Dorset, produced by Cambridge Econometrics for the Dorset LEP area, establishes projected economic growth (growth in Value Added). This provided a robust basis for the Plan's forecasting.

Forecasts were recently updated to reflect the latest local economic forecasting model (2016/17).

Assumption 2: 80% of inert waste arisings will be recycled.

This assumption was made because the revised Waste Framework Directive sets a target for the amount of CDE waste that should be recycled, stating that the rate of reuse and recycling of CDE waste should be increased to a minimum of 70% by 2020. However, it is recognised that up to 90% of inert waste arisings may be able to be recycled. A rate of 80% has been assumed in order to ensure sufficient provision is made for both recycling and recovery/disposal.

No objection has been received to this approach.

Assumptions regarding spatial distribution:

Regular liaison with Dorset Waste Partnership has ensured that the spatial distribution of allocated local recycling facilities (HRCs and transfer facilities) are appropriate. The WPA is not aware of any concerns with regard to the location of these allocated sites.

Four sites (Insets 7 to 10) are allocated for the development of facilities for the management of non-hazardous waste. This will include the management of residual waste.

The WPA considers the spatial distribution of these sites will meet the needs of the Plan area. The majority of the capacity of the site allocations comprising Insets 7 to

10 are rightly located in South East Dorset, as this is where the largest quantities of residual waste will arise.

Appendix 1 provides detail on the waste arisings for the Dorset districts and boroughs and shows that the proportion of residual waste arisings is higher within South East Dorset than rural Dorset:

- Approximately 68% of residual waste arisings come from SE Dorset (Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch & East Dorset)
- Approximately 32% of residual waste arisings come from rural Dorset

10. Would the policies be effective in providing for an appropriate level of waste infrastructure to cater for growth over the plan period?

The site allocations (7 to 10) are allocated to manage non-hazardous waste. These are flexible allocations that would enable a range of facilities to be brought forward to react to the market and needs of the Plan area. Therefore, capacity within these sites could be utilised for the management of recyclates or food waste where shortfalls in capacity have also been identified, as well as residual waste.

The Waste Planning Authority has undertaken a high-level calculation to compare the total projected shortfalls in waste capacity (recyclates, residual and food waste) with allocated capacity for non-hazardous waste within Insets 7 to 10 overall. The additional MRF capacity at Canford Recycling Centre (referred to in Chapter 7 of the Waste Plan) has also been included within this assessment.

Table 1 below shows that the potential capacity within the combination of allocated sites (Insets 7 to 10) and the additional MRF Capacity at Canford Magna provides a surplus of capacity during the first half of the Plan period. However, towards the latter part of the Plan period the surplus is very small and at the end of the Plan period there is a potential shortfall in capacity.

The WPA considers that this level of over provision is appropriate in the early years. Over provision on this scale will enable the Plan to remain flexible if waste arisings grow beyond the level planned. Flexibility is also important to allow for applications not coming forward within the allocated sites. Assumptions have been made regarding the potential capacity available within the allocated sites.

To not include any of these sites within the Plan would lead to a shortfall in capacity throughout the Plan period. The level of growth in waste arisings will be monitored during the Plan period. If levels of waste arisings are consistently higher than the level of growth planned for within the Waste Plan then this will highlight a need to review the Plan or part of it. This would be achievable well before the end of the Waste Plan period, in line with the need to review Local Plans every five years.

The level of shortfall at the end of the Plan period is relatively small and the WPA is confident that this should not cause a problem.

Table 1: Assessment of allocated capacity (tonnes)

	2018	2023	2028	2033
Recyclates shortfall	-251,197.98	-201,995.18	-242,921.34	-270,126.42
Residual shortfall	-136,654.54	-178,408.94	-213,859.15	-234,076.27
Food shortfall	-44,877.17	-48,990.99	-53,749.00	-59,184.88

Total shortfall (capacity gap)	-432,729.69	-429,395.11	-510,529.49	-563,387.57
Add. MRF capacity	148,750.00	148,750.00	148,750.00	148,750.00
Allocated capacity	385000	385000	385000	385000
Projected surplus/shortfall	101,020.31	104,354.89	23,220.51	-29,637.57

Policy 4 and other criteria based policies allow for applications to come forward to address any shortfall (identified through monitoring) or to provide flexibility if allocated sites don't come forward. This could include improvements to existing transfer facilities which enable the movement of waste up the hierarchy.

11. How do the planned housing figures compare to actual housing numbers for the baseline year (2015/16)?

Table 2 sets out the assumptions in the Waste Plan regarding the existing number of dwellings in the Plan area. It can be seen from columns 1 and 2 that the Waste Plan assumption, based upon 358,665 dwellings, is marginally higher than the actual number of dwellings according to Council Tax records (357,039). The difference of 1,626 represents a variation of only 0.4%.

Columns 3 and 4 give an indication of dwelling completions and planned dwellings for 2015/16. This shows that the planned housing numbers (i.e. the local plan annual target) is higher than the actual completions in this year. This in itself does not raise any concerns as completions will fluctuate from one year to the next depending upon a variety of circumstances. The important point to make here is that the Plan is based upon reasonable and evidenced assumptions of planned housing growth and its strategy takes account of this. Furthermore, government records would support the accuracy of the baseline data.

Table 2: Number of dwellings at 2015/16

Authority	Assumed housing numbers in Waste Plan	Actual number of existing dwellings¹	Additional dwelling completions in 2015/16²	Planned annual dwellings 2015/16³
Poole	68,515	68,056	335	500
Bournemouth	89,912	89,506	730	730
West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland	200,238	82,004	666	775
North Dorset		31,572	220	285
Purbeck		22,335	232	120
Christchurch and East Dorset		63,566	354	566
Total	358,665	357,039	2,537	2,976

¹ DCLG records for Council Tax, November 2016

² Information collated from relevant Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments / 5-year housing land supply reports / Annual Monitoring Reports

³ Based upon current local plans in baseline year

Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities

12. Should Policy 2 describe what 'complementary activities' are likely to be? [40]

It is considered that this is covered within paragraphs 3.22-23, including MM3.3.

Policy 4 – Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan

13. Should the advantages stated in paragraph 6.10 of the Pre-Submission Waste Plan for the purpose of Policy 4 also be stated in the background text of the BDPWP?

The text included in paragraph 6.10 is considered sufficient to assist with the interpretation of the policy and provide examples.

Matter 4 - Recycling, Recovery, Disposal and other waste facilities

DCC Statement No(s): **WPHD04**

Policy 5 – Facilities to enable the recycling of waste

14. Does Policy 5 make adequate provision for recycling facilities and are its requirements clear?

Yes. Policy 5 provides criteria against which proposals for applications for recycling facilities can be considered. Wherever possible, sites have been allocated to make provision for identified needs for recycling. However, this hasn't been possible for all cases (e.g. a household recycling centre for Wimborne) and it is acknowledged that other recycling facilities may come forward, such as transfer facilities etc. Policy 5 would be used for applications on both allocated and unallocated sites.

It is considered that the requirements are clear.

Policy 6 – Recovery facilities

15. Does Policy 6 make adequate provision for recovery facilities and are its requirements clear?

Yes. Policy 6 provides criteria against which proposals for applications for recovery facilities can be considered. Insets 7-10 are allocated to make provision for the identified needs for residual waste. However, there may be other recovery facilities that come forward. Policy 6 would be used for applications on both allocated and unallocated sites.

It is considered that the requirements are clear.

Policy 7 – Final disposal of non-hazardous waste

16. Should Policy 7 support completion of landfills to their permitted capacity instead of to expiry of their planning permissions?

Applications for new sites or extensions of life for existing landfills would be dealt with against Policy 7. Policy 7 does not place any extra limits on the completion of landfill sites. The Pre-Submission Plan only safeguarded non-hazardous landfill sites to the expiry of their planning permissions. However, MM13.1 proposes safeguarding these sites throughout the Plan period to reflect the importance of husbanding remaining capacity for non-hazardous waste and to help Dorset to achieve self-sufficiency.

This position can be considered through any review of the Plan.

Policy 8 – Inert waste recovery and disposal

17. Does Policy 8 make adequate provision for inert waste recovery and disposal and are its requirements clear?

Yes. Policy 8 provides criteria against which proposals for applications for inert waste recovery and disposal facilities can be considered. The Plan does not allocate any specific sites for inert waste recovery or disposal. There is a surplus overall in permitted non-recycling capacity for inert waste, until the middle of the Plan period. The criteria-based policy makes adequate provision.

Policy 8 distinguishes between recovery and disposal, placing a presumption against disposal. It is considered that the requirements are clear. However, it is proposed to amend criterion c to include 'permitted waste sites' (MM10.5)

There were no objections to this policy.

Policy 9 – Special types of waste

18. Does Policy 9 make adequate provision for special types of waste and are its requirements clear?

Yes. Policy 9 provides criteria against which proposals for applications for facilities for special types of waste can be considered. The Plan does not allocate any specific sites for hazardous waste as no specific needs were identified. The criteria based policy makes adequate provision and it is considered that the requirements are clear.

There were no objections to this policy or this approach.

Policy 10 – Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site

19. Is the amended policy and background text justified and effective having regard to the representations by NDA and Magnox?

Issue of access through the Innovation Park

The WPA accepts that access via the Enterprise Zone is a matter of negotiation between Magnox and the landowner (Dorset County Council and Purbeck District Council). However, it is important to note that criterion d of Policy 10 does not require access to be achieved and this is not a prerequisite to the decommissioning programme. The policy is attempting to establish an aspiration that this option needs to be explored; this will potentially be to the benefit of Magnox (providing logistical options) and to stakeholders, including residents on Gatemore Road. Criterion d establishes an important principle and will assist Magnox in further discussions with the landowner, who must also work with the highway authority in relating to managing traffic to and from the site. If it transpires that access is not achievable this will not prejudice the continued decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith.

Use of the rail sidings

In previous representations Magnox has sought the deletion of criterion c which seeks to maximise the use of the rail sidings. The WPA is of the view that criterion c sets out a reasonable expectation, in the interests of sustainable transport, if there is an opportunity to do so. It could also assist in reducing impact of vehicles on the amenities of residents on Gatemore Road. However, it is not a prerequisite and the WPA acknowledges that this will be dependent on a number of logistical and cost considerations. To make this clearer the WPA has proposed a modification (MM11.10) to specify where this is 'logistically and economically feasible' and has also proposed the removal of the last part of criterion c which refers to retention of the sidings post-decommissioning. Overall the WPA considers this to be a reasonable approach that should not prejudice the decommissioning of the site but which quite rightly flags up the importance of exploring sustainable transport options if they exist.

Relationship with the Innovation Park

Magnox has raised concerns about the references (notably in criterion e) to the Innovation Park. It should be noted that the WPA is intending to provide Magnox with

a degree of flexibility to allow for this area to form part of the Innovation Park, if agreement is reached, which potentially could reduce restoration liabilities in terms of the final landform if this area becomes part of the innovation park. It is not intended to require this to take place and in policy terms the WPA would have no difficulty with this area being part and parcel of the nuclear decommissioning programme with full restoration to a heathland landscape. The WPA is not aware that this matter has been determined by Magnox or the innovation park and so we would contend that the flexible approach in this policy is appropriate.

Issues relating to a masterplan

Magnox had raised some concern about the references to a masterplan in Policy 10. It is important to note that the WPA and LPA are already engaging with Magnox over the principle of a masterplan for the entire site. There is a realistic prospect that some of the below-ground structures will remain in situ after decommissioning, and some of the voids might feasibly be considered for on-site disposal of waste streams emanating from the decommissioning programme. It is accepted by Magnox and the WPA that the restoration project will be the subject of an Environmental Impact Assessment. To enable the WPA to properly consider matters such as cumulative effects it will be vital to have some form of masterplan. Magnox has begun work on strands of this, including mapping out provisional decommissioning milestones and a site-wide landscape masterplan. This is in accordance with Policy 10 and the WPA contends that it is important to retain a commitment to this in the policy.

The proposed modifications to the supporting text and policy (MM11.9 and MM11.10) provide some more explanation around the purpose of a masterplan and take the reference to supplementary planning document out of the policy and place it in supporting text in recognition of the representation from Magnox.

Issues relating to community benefits

Magnox considers that Policy 10 should not include a reference to community benefits. The WPA agrees that restoration of the site with public access will in itself represent a significant community benefit. However, it is relevant to note that the final restoration plan could potentially result in 'islands' where the site remains licensed and fenced for significant periods. The local community has a good relationship with the Winfrith site but inevitably may be subject to some disturbance during the restoration programme.

It is common practice in the energy sector (renewable energy, oil and gas, nuclear) to recognise that community benefits can play an important part in compensating local communities for the national 'burden' that such communities have taken on in accepting nationally significant energy infrastructure, and that the decommissioning process itself may have impacts, including potential legacy waste.

NuLeAF (the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum) is a Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association supported by 110 local authorities and 3 national park authorities across England and Wales. Its remit encompasses all aspects of the management of the UK's nuclear waste legacy, including spent nuclear fuel and waste management from prospective new nuclear generating capacity. NuLeAF produced a position paper on community benefits⁴ and this concluded that '*NuLeAF and local authorities wish to see a clear commitment to community benefits and funds across all significant sites in the NDA estate*'.

⁴ Community Benefits and Radioactive Waste Management: NuLeaf Position Paper and Proposed Community Benefits Framework (April 2014)

It is important to state that community benefits are over and above what is required in order to make a development acceptable in planning terms and MM11.11 clarifies this. Consequently the reference to community benefits in Policy 10 should not in any way be seen as a prerequisite to the restoration of the site. Indeed, the restoration is in itself a significant benefit. However, the WPA considers that the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) and Magnox should be open to the principle of community benefits. This can inspire confidence and trust in the industry and would be a recognition of the vanguard position that Winfrith has in the NDA's decommissioning programme.

Conclusion

Subject to the proposed modifications that the WPA has tabled it is considered that the policy and supporting text are both justified and effective; they present a positive and supportive statement that is designed to assist Magnox in restoring the site whilst reflecting pertinent planning matters that should be taken into account in achieving a sustainable outcome for the site.

Policy 11 – Waste water and sewage treatment works

20. Does Policy 11 make adequate provision for waste water and sewage treatment and are its requirements clear?

Yes. Policy 11 provides criteria against which proposals for applications for waste water treatment can be considered. Although two sites were allocated for known planned extensions to STWs, further proposals relating to existing STWs are quite possible/likely within the longer term. Policy 11 therefore provides the basis for considering such proposals. It is considered that the requirements are clear.

There were no objections to this policy.

Matter 5 - Development Management

DCC Statement No(s): **WPHD05**

Policy 12 – Transport and Access

21. Is the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network designed to maintain tranquillity in AONBs?

The Dorset Advisory Lorry Route network is designed to utilise the Strategic Road Network (A31, A35, A303 trunk roads) and the Primary Road Network avoiding height, weight, and width restrictions where possible. These are considered to be the most suitable routes for HGV traffic. However, most of these routes are in AONBs which cover a large part of Dorset.

22. Is this route network designed to avoid disturbance to residents?

Yes, where possible. Due to the County's rural character, some of these major roads cut through settlements causing disturbance to residents including noise, vibrations, fumes and severance. Although this is an "advisory" route network, there will be some locations where disturbance from passing HGV traffic is greater.

23. Does the last sentence of paragraph 2 duplicate criterion (b) of the policy?

It is agreed that there is duplication within this policy and this could be clarified through a modification. It is suggested that the final sentence of paragraph 2 is deleted and an additional reference to the strategic and/or primary road network within criterion b is added as follows (see MM12.9):

b. the development makes provision for any highway and transport network improvements necessary to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of a the strategic, primary and/or local road network highway, railway, cycle way or public right of way. ~~Where they are in the control of the developer,~~ Improvements will be delivered in a timely manner to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority;

Where possible, proposals should have direct access or suitable links with the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network. Where this is not possible, appropriate routes to the strategic road network should be utilised. ~~Where necessary transport improvements will be provided to overcome any significant, adverse impacts, on the strategic, primary and/or local road network.~~

Policy 13 – Amenity and quality of life

24. Is Policy 13 effective in safeguarding amenity?

Yes, Policy 13 is effective in providing an appropriate level of protection for the amenity and quality of life of sensitive receptors whilst promoting the development of waste facilities to address the needs that have been identified.

Policy 14 – Landscape and design quality

25. Is Policy 14 effective in protecting landscape and ensuring good quality design?

Yes, with the modifications proposed (MM12.10 and 12.11), Policy 14 is effective in protecting landscape and ensuring good quality design.

Modifications will ensure relevant proposals take account of the AONB management plans and ensure protection of the West Dorset Heritage Coast and the Purbeck Heritage Coast.

Policy 15 – Sustainable construction and operation of facilities

26. Is Policy 15 effective?

Yes, with the modifications proposed (MM12.4 and MM12.12), Policy 15 is considered effective.

Modification MM12.4 provides clarification that the policy applies to new waste management facilities and proposals to improve existing facilities in response to a representation received.

Policy 16 – Natural resources

27. Is Policy 16 effective?

Yes, Policy 16 is considered effective in providing protection for water resources, soils and agricultural land. No objections have been raised regarding this policy.

Policy 17 – Flood risk

28. Should Policy 17 also require application of the sequential test, particularly for sites that are not allocated in the Plan?

See MM12.14 which clarifies within Policy 17 that proposals for new waste management facilities should demonstrate that they have applied the Sequential Test in areas known to be at risk from flooding.

There are no outstanding objections from the Environment Agency.

Policy 18 – Biodiversity and geological interest

29. Would Policy 18 effectively safeguard biodiversity?

Yes, Policy 18 will effectively safeguard biodiversity. The Policy has been assessed and approved by Natural England and mirrors Policy DM5 (Biodiversity) in the Dorset Mineral Strategy which was adopted in 2014. The Policy addresses biodiversity at all levels, from international and European sites and European Protected Species to County Wildlife sites, veteran trees and Local Geological Sites. Policy 18 also states that all development will be assessed under the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol and Dorset Compensation Framework. These processes, assessed by DEFRA, are specifically designed to meet National Planning Policy (NPPF, 2012, para 118 'aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity') and ensure that net gain for biodiversity is always achieved through development.

Policy 19 – Historic environment

30. Having regard to the agreement reached between the Councils and Historic England, would Policy 19 as amended be consistent with national planning policy?

Yes. The proposed modifications to Policy 19 draw a distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets, reflecting paragraphs 132 – 135 of the NPPF. Paragraph 139 is reflected in Policy 19 by attributing the same weight to non-designated archaeological assets of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments.

The terms ‘substantial harm’ and ‘less than substantial harm’ are not included in Policy 19, however paragraph 3 relates to any degree of harm as any harm requires justification and reference to public benefits (NPPF paragraphs 133 and 134).

Policy 20- Airfield Safeguarding Areas

31. Is the BDPWP sufficiently clear as to airfield safeguarding requirements? In particular, safeguarding areas should be shown on the Policies Map.
32. Is policy 20 in accordance with Circular 01/2003?

The WPA has considered Policy 20 and Circular 01/2003 further. The concern about adding aerodrome safeguarding to the policies map was that these are not in the control of the WPA and may be liable to change during the Plan period. Bournemouth Airport has confirmed that this is highly unlikely. The WPA therefore agrees that these should be included on the Policies Map along with an explanation of why the area has been safeguarded taken from Circular 1/2003 Direction 2002, Annex 3 ‘Officially safeguarded civil aerodrome’.

Bournemouth Airport agree that the following proposed modification would cover the airport from the safeguarding perspective: (text underlined black is original MM12.7)

Proposals for waste management facilities partly or completely within an the Airfield Safeguarding Areas within 13km of Bournemouth Airport and Yeovilton Aerodrome, as shown on the policies map, may be the subject of consultation with the aerodrome operator and may require restrictions on the height or detailed design of buildings. Proposals will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate through an aviation impact assessment that the proposed development and, where relevant, restoration and afteruse of the site, will not give rise to new or increased hazards to aviation.’

Policy 21 – South East Dorset Green Belt

33. Would Policy 21 as amended accord with national planning policy on Green Belt?

Following further discussions at the hearings modifications are proposed to ensure that Policy 21 accords with national policy on Green Belt contained within the NPPF. See modifications schedule WPDCC-78.

There are no outstanding objections relating to this Policy.

Policy 22 – Waste from new developments

34. Is Policy 22 effective?

Yes, with the modifications proposed (MM12.18), Policy 22 is considered clear and effective. The proposed modification provides clarification that financial contributions towards provision of waste management infrastructure may be required in accordance with the community infrastructure regulations.

See also modifications schedule WPDCC-78

There are no outstanding objections relating to this Policy.

Policy 23 – Restoration, aftercare and afteruse

35. Is Policy 23 effective?

Yes, with the proposed modification (12.8), Policy 23 is considered effective. The proposed modification aims to tighten up the policy as recommended by the Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs AONB.

Policy 24 – Safeguarding waste facilities

36. Table 11 states that non-hazardous landfill sites are safeguarded until expiry of planning permission. Should this make provision for any potential extension of the time period allowed by permissions?

The Pre-Submission Plan only safeguarded non-hazardous landfill sites to the expiry of their planning permissions. However, MM13.1 proposes to safeguard these sites throughout the Plan period, reflecting the importance of husbanding remaining capacity for non-hazardous waste and to help Dorset to achieve self-sufficiency.

Any new planning permissions granted that meet the thresholds set out would be safeguarded in any case. The safeguarded waste facilities will be subject to monitoring.

Implementation and Monitoring

37. Are there any questions regarding implementation and monitoring?

No.

Matter 3B - Forecasts and need for new facilities: Policy 3

Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management.

38. Is it necessary to refer to the 'proposed uses' in the second paragraph of the policy?

Where relevant, the proposed uses set out in the Insets provide specific detail on what the site is allocated for based on the identified needs.

This is considered necessary within Policy 3 to avoid inappropriate uses and/or uses that have not been assessed being given the weight of Policy 3. This would help to avoid the loss of an unallocated site for a use other than that specified.

The terminology could be amended – see below and the modifications schedule WPDCC – 78.

39. Should the tables in the Insets refer to 'allocated uses' or similar?

Yes, it is proposed that the term 'proposed uses' is replaced with 'allocated uses'. However, this also necessitates a change to Policy 3. See MM5.5.

See also modifications schedule WPDCC-78

40. Should the wording in Insets 7 to 10 be the same as in Policy 3 with regard to allocated uses?

Yes, this could be made consistent – it is proposed that the term 'redevelopment' is be added to the allocated uses for Insets 7-10.

See modifications schedule WPDCC-78

41. Should Insets 7 to 10 provide text to state that the exact additional capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals?

Yes. It is agreed that this text could be included in the tables of Insets 7-10 to provide clarification that the exact capacity proposed through an application would need to be assessed.

See modifications schedule WPDCC-78

Matter 3B - Forecasts and need for new facilities: Insets

DCC Statement No(s): **WPHD03**

AGENDA:

Inset Maps

Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross

42. Does the permission for office, industrial and mixed use development affect the deliverability of the site for a waste facility?

Outline planning permission has been granted for the construction of mixed employment development. The proposal specifically included use of land as a waste transfer facility. The planning application was submitted by the landowner who is also promoting the allocation of land for waste uses. Therefore, there should be no issues of deliverability of this site.

43. Would designation of an area of search at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate be more effective than allocation of the southern area?

Designation of an area of search would be more effective as it would provide a greater level of flexibility for waste uses to come forward within a wider area.

See modifications schedule WPDCC-78

44. If so what areas should be included?

The WPA considers that an area of land covering both the eastern and southern parcels of land, as included in the 2016 Waste Plan (WPDCC03), would provide an effective area of search to enable waste uses to come forward.

NB: Part of the eastern area of employment land is in separate ownership. The landowner has confirmed that they do not wish to see their land allocated in the Waste Plan. The landowner is already in discussions with a developer and therefore the land is unlikely to be available for waste uses. This land has therefore been excluded from the new 'Area of Search'.

See modifications schedule WPDCC-78

45. Is 2ha an appropriate area to accommodate the waste uses while maintaining adequate employment areas?

The WPA consider that an area of land of approximately 2ha would be sufficient for the development of both a waste transfer station and a facility for the management of bulky waste.

The approximate land take for these facilities is:

General waste transfer – up to 1ha

Bulky waste transfer/treatment – up to 1ha

It is proposed to add text within Inset 1 to explain that waste uses will take up no more than approximately 2ha. See modifications schedule WPDCC-78

46. Has traffic modelling been undertaken for use of the site for a strategic bulky waste facility?

A Transport Assessment was produced by Ramboll for the Outline Planning Application for mixed employment at the site in 2015, and this looked at traffic generation from employment land-uses including general waste transfer. but did not specifically include the use of the site for a bulky waste facility.

The forecast trip generation for a Bulky Waste facility is for 4-10 HGV one-way movements per day plus a small number of staff cars. The Highways Authority does not consider this small number of HGV movements to have a significant impact on the road network nor justify detailed modelling at this planning making stage. We would require a detailed Transport Assessment including traffic modelling if the site was to be developed for this use. This would be prepared to support a planning application.

47. Does Highways England or the Highway Authority have any outstanding objection?

Highway Authority – no outstanding objections. The proposed junction improvement at the entrance to Woolsbridge (Ringwood Road/Old Barn Farm Road) has been approved in the Outline Planning consent and this would be a requirement for further development of the site as a Waste Facility, along with other employment uses.

Highways England – raised concerns regarding traffic movements associated with a household recycling centre at Woolsbridge, but we are not aware of any outstanding objections to Waste Transfer and Bulky Waste facilities. Given the level of movements associated with the proposed uses, Highways England did not require the identification of mitigation to support the sites inclusion in the Waste Plan.

The following representation was received to the allocation in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan.

‘As previous comments have outlined, Highways England’s main concern was regarding the use of the site as a Household Recycling Centre. Whilst the use of the site as a Household Recycling Centre has been discounted, Highways England still has concerns about this allocation due to its proximity to the A31, although Highways England recognise that the trip estimates for the site are not at a level where a significant impact on the SRN is expected (2,000 movements per year, and 4-10 HGV movements per day for the waste transfer stations and bulky waste treatment facility respectively) and **therefore we do not require the identification of mitigation to support the sites inclusion in the plan.** Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion, and any forthcoming application would need to provide information on trip distribution and timing.’

Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford

48. Is the boundary of Inset 2 appropriate having regard to other potential employment requirements identified by Blandford + Neighbourhood Plan?

Yes. The site boundary was reduced from that originally proposed in recognition that impact would be minimised by aligning the development to the existing Sunrise Business Park. This provides reassurance that any built development would be pushed to the north-western part of the field.

It is understood that the comments of Blandford + are based on the principles of the land available being shared between a waste facility and employment potential.

The site area allows space for developing a facility and incorporating appropriate access and landscape mitigation measures. The L shape enables various access options to be considered within the allocated land, including access from the bypass. Should this access option be taken forward it could potentially also provide access to other uses in the wider field, if they were deemed appropriate. Once a fixed design is complete the remaining land could be released for employment land, if it was deemed an appropriate use.

It should be noted that the Blandford + proposals are still emerging and it is not known whether employment uses in this area will be considered acceptable.

49. To what extent has agreement been reached between the Waste Planning Authority and Cranborne Chase AONB regarding this allocation?

The WPA has involved the AONB team fully in the progression of the Plan and the search for a suitable site at Blandford. The AONB team objects to locating the site in the AONB, however the WPA considers that the development would be in the public interest and that there are no suitable alternatives. The WPA considers the tests of paragraph 116 of the NPPF are met.

Various meetings have been held with the AONB team, including a site visit to the Bridport WMC. The WPA met with the AONB team in 2017 to discuss Inset 2 being taken forward in the Pre-Submission Plan. Design and mitigation matters for the site were discussed, including the importance of aligning any built form with the existing business park. Following this meeting, the site boundary was reduced to meet this aspiration. A detailed set of development considerations were also drawn up with input from the AONB team having particular regard to mitigating potential impacts on the landscape.

50. Were any alternative sites in the Shaftesbury/Gillingham area considered?

It should be noted that there is a need for a new HRC for both Blandford & Gillingham (met by Insets 2 and 3). There is a need for a waste transfer facility for North Dorset, which is considered best located at Blandford. Co-locating a HRC and transfer facility brings environmental and financial benefits and a reduced landtake is required.

Locating a waste transfer facility in a key location to both accommodate current capacity at the existing Blandford waste management centre (WMC) and to provide resilience in future years is of key importance. With the exception of Bridport WMC, all DWP recycle and transfer facilities in the county are near to capacity, meaning there is currently no contingency for north and eastern Dorset. The need to store or relocate waste for periods of time in the event of an incident at other sites is critical to providing a reliable collection service.

Dorset Waste Partnership has undertaken modelling work to consider the impact of locating the transfer facility at Gillingham as opposed to Blandford, looking at vehicles needed if the waste was delivered to different locations. This showed that in a 'business as usual' situation, there would be little difference purely in terms of hours (round time) between the locations of Gillingham and Blandford, however this

does rely on the road network operating without delay. In reality, the road network in the area of Gillingham is restricted, whereas Blandford is served by a good road network from all directions.

It is also necessary for the transfer facility to act as a possible contingency site in the event that third party disposal sites are unavailable. Taking this into account, the Gillingham location is very inefficient. The time difference would be an additional 142 hours per week for Gillingham compared to Blandford. This would also mean rounds would be unlikely to be able to be completed due to the additional mileage.

Table 3 shows the results of the modelling work:

Table 3: Results of route optimisation modelling

Location of a waste management centre	Round time – Normal operations (assuming Canford and Blue Haze are open) (hours per week)	Round time – Contingency operations (assuming Canford and Blue Haze are closed) (hours per week)	Time difference for entire fleet (hours per week)
Blandford	1475.35	1563.94	-88.59
Gillingham	1458.67	1689.56	-230.89
Difference			142.3

It is important to note that Blandford has better access and a better road network than Gillingham. Gillingham is accessed by the B3081 and B3092, both of which, whilst linking to the A30 and A303, are undulating and narrow in places and unsuitable for refuse collection vehicles and bulkers. Blandford on the other hand has roads links to major towns on primary routes through the county including the A354 to Salisbury, A350/A31 to Wimborne/Ferndown/West Moors, A350/A35 to Wareham/Poole, A354 to Dorchester, A357 to Sturminster Newton/Sherborne and A350 to Shaftesbury. These roads are used to reach the nearby existing waste management centre on Blandford Heights Industrial Estate and routes to the proposed facility (Inset 2) would not be affected compared to the existing situation.

Locating a transfer facility in Gillingham would actually result in more HGV traffic travelling through/alongside the edge of the AONB since the bulker HGVs would need to travel back down through Shaftesbury and Blandford to Poole, based on current arrangements. The Spatial Strategy for the Waste Plan seeks to achieve self-sufficiency through provision of recovery facilities, primarily in South East Dorset. The allocated sites for residual waste management are therefore also located in South East Dorset, so the same issue would occur when new recovery facilities are developed in line with the Plan.

It is considered therefore that Blandford is the right location for a new transfer facility in line with the Spatial Strategy of managing Dorset’s non-hazardous waste in South East Dorset, to act as contingency for waste from north, eastern and Purbeck areas of Dorset, and taking into account access and the advantages of the road network it is served by.

51. Would the allocation entail excessive HGV traffic through the AONB?

The A350 and the A354, although located in the AONB, are primary routes. Trip generation is forecast to be 2000 HGV one-way movements per annum equating to 5 HGV one-way movements per day. This is not considered to be excessive.

The majority of household collected waste will come from towns in North Dorset outside the AONB. The main centres of population are Blandford, Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Sturminster Newton and Stalbridge (all outside AONB). Collection vehicles will use A roads – primarily the A350 and A357 to get to Blandford. The A350 is the main road north from Poole-Blandford-Shaftesbury. It sits on the edge of the AONB for most of North Dorset, north of Blandford it runs between the borders of the two different AONBs.

There would be no difference in terms of HGV traffic through the AONB with Inset 2 compared to if the existing site was retained. Inset 2 would result in less traffic movements along the edge of the AONB than a location at Gillingham, as outlined in Q50 above.

Inset 3 – Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham

52. Have the landowner's concerns been addressed?

See Matter 3, Q45 (WPHD03) where the WPA set out its position. Without removing the site, it is not possible to fully address the landowner's concerns. However, the site is identified as an area of search and only 1-2ha out of the 10ha employment site would be required for the HRC.

The WPA considers that the site doesn't compromise the strategic role of the wider employment land allocation. The employment allocation forms part of the Gillingham strategic southern extension. This makes provision for 1800 dwellings plus a range of infrastructure (Policy 21, North Dorset Local Plan 2016). The District and town councils recognise the need for a new HRC to support this development. North Dorset District Council supported the allocation through its response to the Pre-Submission Plan.

53. Would a Household Recycling Centre (HRC) and depot realistically be deliverable?

Given that the landowner is supportive of the site being developed for employment (North Dorset Local Plan 2016), it is considered reasonable to expect that a HRC/depot would be deliverable within the area of search. The provision of the facility does not prejudice the ability of the landowner to bring forward the wider site for a range of other uses.

NDDC confirms that Inset 3 is unlikely to have significant impact on employment land availability (see SCG-02).

The allocation of the area of search confirms that adequate provision/space should be made within any masterplan and/or outline application. The North Dorset Local Plan refers to the urban extension incorporating recycling facilities.

Dorset Waste Partnership would deliver the facility.

Inset 4 – Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate

54. Are there any outstanding concerns with respect to Inset 4?

No. It is proposed to include an additional development consideration regarding contaminated land, in response to the Environment Agency's representation (MM AS4.3). Comments from a neighbouring business referred to impact on amenity,

however it is considered any impact on the amenity of neighbouring businesses could be adequately mitigated in accordance with Policy 13.

Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester

55. Has any potential alternative site for a HRC been identified by West Dorset District Council and if so have any discussions taken place between the Authorities?

No. The West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Local Plan is due to go out to preferred options consultation in August. It includes a site known as 'North Dorchester' as a preferred option for an urban extension. West Dorset District Council has confirmed that the preferred options policy for the North Dorchester site does not make provision for a household recycling centre. West Dorset District Council supported Inset 5 in their response the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan.

The West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan is still emerging and it is not yet known whether the North Dorchester site will proceed to adoption. Locating the HRC here was considered through the preparation of the Waste Plan (site WP10 Stinsford Hill, 2016 Draft Waste Plan Update) but discounted. Significant landscape and heritage impacts were identified. It is considered premature to allocate this site for development of a HRC in advance of the North Dorchester extension being tested/allocated.

Relocation of the existing Dorchester HRC is required at the earliest opportunity since Wessex Water (the landowner) intends to secure planning permission within the next 12 months to redevelop the wider area. At this point, it is understood that they would ideally want the existing HRC site vacated in order to form a one-way system around their yard. It is considered that Inset 5 would provide an improvement on the existing situation and is likely to lead to a reduction in queues because it can accommodate more cars on site and allow for one-way circulation to reduce queue length at the entrance to the site. Dorset Waste Partnership has confirmed with Wessex Water that should a new site go ahead, investigations would consider upgrading the road to adoptable standards, including additional widening where possible.

Following the hearing sessions further discussions have taken place with the Dorset Councils Partnership (West Dorset District Council) and Dorchester Town Council. A Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and a modification is proposed to explain that there may be opportunities for a HRC, during the life of the Waste Plan, within the options currently being considered for the expansion of Dorchester. See SCG-07 and modifications schedule WPDCC-78.

Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester

56. Are there any outstanding concerns with respect to Inset 6?

No. It is proposed to include an additional development consideration regarding contaminated land, in response to the Environment Agency's representation (MM AS4.3).

The Dorset AONB commented that the site would not necessarily generate significant adverse effects on the AONB subject to appropriate design and mitigation. A series of design considerations had been drawn up and these were reiterated in the Dorset AONB team's representation. It is proposed to include these considerations within the development considerations (MMAS6.2).

Inset 7 – Eco-Sustainable Solutions, Parley

57. Would the allocation displace any existing or approved capacity?

58. If so, what type of waste process and what capacity would be displaced?

Future development at the allocated site would not displace any existing, operational waste management capacity that has been relied upon for the management of waste in Dorset.

Permitted, undeveloped capacity for the management of food waste through AD and the management of a small tonnage of residual waste through a Solid Recovered Fuel Facility has not been accounted for within the capacity that forms the basis of the need for new facilities in the Waste Plan. The WPA understands, through discussions with the operator that these facilities are unlikely to be developed.

59. Development Consideration 10 requires the application of a sequential test for flood risk as small parts of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3. Should the sequential test be a requirement of the development plan process before allocating the site?

Yes, in considering the waste sites for allocation, the WPA carried out a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (WPSD 08) incorporating the sequential test to determine whether the sites were appropriate as strategic allocations given associated flood risks.

At the strategic level, Inset 7 was assessed to come to a view about flood risk posed to it or flood risk development may pose to other areas/people. The Sequential Test comments taken from the SFRA are:

'Site is already a permitted waste facility. This site is partly in FZ2 and 3 which would require application of the sequential test if taken forward for potential development. However, it is likely to be possible to avoid development on these areas. Further work, site specific FRA, may be required to support development on this site.'

Over 95% of the site is within FZ1 and the WPA is confident that development can take place outside FZ 2 and 3.

The development consideration is proposed to be modified to reflect this. See modifications schedule WPDCC-78.

60. Should Development Consideration 2 make clear that any requirement for restoration of heathland would be considered in relation to national policy and legislative tests for planning conditions and obligations?

As with every other aspect of the Plan, it is assumed that development will be considered in relation to national policy and legislative tests for planning conditions and obligations. These considerations underlie all our planning decisions and it does not seem necessary to state them in Development Consideration 2.

Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna, Poole

61. Having regard to Natural England's comments about White's Pit being directly adjacent to European designated sites should the Development Considerations refer to the potential need for appropriate assessment?

NE concerns about White's Pit being directly adjacent to European sites relate to proximity effects from dust and vermin. We know from previous waste applications at this site that mitigation against these potential effects can be built in to the design of any scheme, and it was felt that this removed the requirement to refer to the potential need for appropriate assessment. However, this is being specifically considered to ensure a consistent approach across all sites (Inset 7 to 10) for the management of non-hazardous waste.

62. Is Development Consideration 2 adequate to ensure protection of the SSSI?

Yes, subject to the inclusion of MM AS8.2 development consideration 2 would provide adequate protection to the SSSI.

63. Would there be any cumulative adverse effect in combination with site(s) in the Minerals Sites Plan?

No additional uses are proposed through the Mineral Sites Plan. The allocation is for the consolidation of existing consented operations. Likely Significant Effects have been screened out.

Traffic generation has the potential for cumulative impacts. The management of an additional 25,000tpa of waste would give rise to approximately 13 additional HGV movements per day. Advice from Pool Borough Council Transport Planning suggests that this level of additional movements would not be a serious problem.

64. What development previously occupied the site?

This is an existing waste facility, originally the site control centre for White's Pit landfill site.

Inset 9- Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole

65. Would the site (1.6 ha) be of sufficient size to accommodate a strategic facility?

The site promotor considers the site is of sufficient size to accommodate a strategic facility managing up to 100,000tpa of waste. The WPA has no reason to believe that this would not be achievable within the range of waste management methods available.

66. Would waste processing uses other than production of Refuse Derived Fuel or Solid Recovered Fuel be acceptable on this site?

At the time of publishing the Waste Plan there was concern over certain waste management activities within this site. The area of most concern was the impact on

Natura 2000 sites within the vicinity of the site namely Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Canford Heath SSSI. There was concern that the level of information provided to support the allocation of the site was not sufficient to rule out likely significant effects.

As a result, the site was allocated for a restricted level of waste management uses – the management of non-hazardous waste through the preparation of Refused Derived Fuel and Solid Recovered Fuel. The council was confident that these uses would have no likely effects on these ecological designations.

The recent Court of Justice of the European Union (ECJ) ruling: *People Over Wind, Peter Sweentman v Coillte Teoranta* gave the WPA the opportunity to review the Habitats Regulations Assessment and have further discussions with Natural England, particularly in the light of the objection received from Suez to the allocation at Mannings Heath.

A meeting was held with Natural England on 23 May 2018. During this meeting the Waste Planning Authority gained a better understanding of Natural England's thoughts on different types of residual waste treatment technologies and which are likely to cause likely significant effects on designations in the vicinity of allocated sites. These discussions were not restricted to Inset 9 Mannings Heath but also reflected the other three flexible sites allocations Inset 7 Eco Sustainable Solutions, Inset 8 Land at Canford Magna and Inset 10 Binnegar Environmental Park.

In conclusion, there is significant concern that traditional methods of waste incineration will give rise to likely significant effects on European sites. No information has been provided, to date, to conclude otherwise. However, the Waste Plan does contain sufficient safeguards to ensure that planning permission would be refused for any application resulting in Likely Significant Effects. Safeguards are contained within policy guidance (Policy 3 and 18) and 'Development Considerations'.

In terms of the deliverability of the Waste Plan and the need for facilities to manage residual waste. Discussions with NE have given the WPA increased confidence that waste facilities for the management of residual waste are appropriate on all of the allocated sites (Inset 7 to 10) enabling the waste management needs of Dorset to be met.

Inset 10 – Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke

[67. Are the Development Considerations for Inset 10 clear and are they consistent with national policy?](#)

A modification is proposed to provide clarification with regards to the need for Appropriate Assessment (Development Consideration 1) (MMAS10.2)

An additional development consideration is proposed (MM AS10.1) to provide adequate protect to the River piddle. This was in response to a representation made by the Environment Agency and a local resident.

Furthermore, to reflect the HRA it is proposed to include an addition modification relating to mitigation from development proposals. See modifications schedule WPDCC-78.

Inset 11 – Bourne Park, Piddlehinton

68. Are the Development Considerations for Inset 11 clear and are they consistent with national policy?

A modification is proposed to development consideration 1 (MM AS11.1) to ensure the Waste Plan and the Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan are providing consistent advice with regards to development as suggested by West Dorset District Council.

A modification is proposed to development consideration 3 (MM AS11.2) to reduce the traffic impacts of development and respond to concerns raised by residents locally.

Inset 12 – Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works

69. Are the Development Considerations for Inset 12 clear and are they consistent with national policy?

Planning permission has now been granted for the expansion of this site. Therefore, it is proposed to delete it from the Waste Plan.

Inset 13 – Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works

70. The AONB Management Plan encourages underground infrastructure but the Councils consider this not to be necessary. Please explain this further.

The Waste Planning Authority has received the following response from the Dorset AONB Team:

'In my opinion the additional effects of the extended development would not necessitate undergrounding. In terms of assessing landscape and visual effects, the magnitude of change arising from the extension area needs to be compared to the baseline position, this being the existing as STW as built (the existing facility is not subterranean). The existing site's landscape and visual effects will be increased by the extensions to a degree, through the need to increase the overall site area and locate further equipment within the area. However, the additional effects of development within the extension area are not regarded as significant and therefore I do not consider that the undergrounding of equipment could reasonably be considered necessary. The extension area is not inherently more sensitive than the existing site area and the viewshed of the overall facility will be unchanged. Given this position, it is not considered necessary to require the undergrounding of development within the extension area. Instead, planted mitigation measures have been recommended as a suitable approach.'

Appendix 1 LACW and CIW Arisings: SE Dorset/Rural Dorset Split

	Population 2015	LACW 2015/16			CIW 2015			
		percentage	Total waste arisings (tonnes)	Total residual waste arisings (tonnes)	Total waste arisings (tonnes)	Total residual waste arisings (tonnes)		
B,D&P	762,530		387,000	167,600	447,000	119,762		
Dorset	418,500	55	208,000	71,200	Dorset	65,729		
Bournemouth	189,640	25	98,800	48,200	Bournemouth	29,785		
Poole	149,010	20	80,000	48,200	Poole	23,403		
					Percentage of total		Percentage of total	
SE Dorset	475,860	62	247,597	119,744	71%%	SE Dorset	74,738	62.4%
Rural Dorset	281,290	37	140,297	48,025	29%	Rural Dorset	44,335	37%
Christchurch	49,010	12	24,960	8,338	Christchurch	7,697		
East Dorset	88,200	21	43,837	15,006	East Dorset	13,853		
North Dorset	69,980	17	34,781	11,906	North Dorset	10,991		
Purbeck	46,700	11	23,211	7,945	Purbeck	7,335		
West Dorset	100,550	24	49,975	17,107	West Dorset	15,792		
Wey/Portland	65,050	16	32,331	11,067	Wey/Portland	10,217		

Total residual waste SE Dorset	194,482	67.8 %
Total residual waste Rural Dorset	92,359	32.2 %

