

Report on comments to the Draft Waste Plan Update – Additional and Emerging Preferred Waste Site Allocations 2016

This report provides a summary of the comments made to the 2016 Draft Waste Plan. 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. At this stage this is intended only as a guide for Members and other stakeholders to understand how the consultation responses and further work is guiding the decision making process. Additional work is on-going prior to publishing the Pre Submission Draft Waste Plan. The Pre Submission Draft Waste Plan will be presented to Members for their approval during autumn 2017.

Draft 'Development Considerations' are also included in the final column, these will be refined as appropriate following further assessment work and included in the final Plan alongside the site allocations. 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.

Summary of site option and facilities proposed	Representations * all numbers are approximate	Summary of issue and officer response	Officer conclusions
<p>WP01 Ferndown Area of Search</p> <p>Bulky waste transfer/treatment Residual waste treatment Inc. energy from waste</p> <p>Household Recycling Centre</p> <p>Waste vehicle depot</p>	232 disagree	<p>Issue 1: Green belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land should be retained for recreation/public amenity • Lack of green space locally particularly given planned housing increases • Land is well managed by the 'Friends of the Woods' • Displacement of people using land for recreational purposes which could put pressure on sensitive habitats • Green Belt Land should not be developed • safe pedestrian crossing over the A31 to access the rest of the Cannon Hill Plantation and the Castleman Trailway • Blunts Farm is designated employment land and should be considered ahead of land within the Green Belt. <p>Officer Response: The 'Area of Search' included a triangle of land within the Green belt. During the consultation it became apparent that the area of land south-west of Blunts Farm is particularly well used for recreational purposes, provides access to nearby recreational areas and is managed by a local group. This was not known when the Forestry Commission suggested this land as an alternative to the development of Blunts Farm. The importance of Green Belt is acknowledged and inappropriate development that is harmful should only be approved in very special circumstances. Local green space is important and it is agreed that additional new housing will put further pressure on existing recreational space. The Waste Planning Authority has concerns that development of the Green Belt will place extra pressure on and impact upon the nearby internationally designated heathlands sites. It is not considered that there very special circumstances and the benefits of development in the greenbelt are not outweighed by other considerations given the availability of allocated employment land nearby.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on bridleways and trailways including the Castleman Trailway</p> <p>Officer Response: It is agreed that development of the SW parcel of Green Belt land would have an impact on the various bridleways, trailways and the Castleman Trail.</p> <p>Issue 3: Impact on existing woodland</p> <p>Officer Response: The development of Blunts Farm would have an impact on existing woodland. However, this is commercial forestry and will inevitably be removed. In addition, this land is allocated employment land and therefore will be developed in the future with the loss of woodland.</p> <p>Issue 4: Impact from additional traffic, congestion, noise and dust/Planned residential infrastructure expansion will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Removing green belt land and the SNCI from the area of search would improve robustness of the area of search in giving a meaningful steer to development. Further consideration could also be given to the removal of land close to the SNCI to create a buffer to ensure no adverse effects.</p> <p>Development of a HRC/Depot and/or waste transfer station is emerging as a more suitable outcome than residual or bulky waste treatment.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of public water main that borders the southern boundary of Blunts Farm ;provision of 6m buffer • Appropriate buffer from the SNCI paying particular attention to the triangle of land between the old railway line and the bypass from the southern boundary of the SNCI north-eastwards.

		<p>Officer Response: The development of a waste facility anywhere within the 'area of search' will create additional traffic. Dorset County Council Highways Authority have no in principle objection to the impact of additional vehicles however the local impacts would need to be considered further within a Transport Assessment (TA). This should be carried out at the planning application stage when a specific site and access is known. The TA 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.</p> <p>The highways authority are fully aware of planned housing and take this into consideration when providing their views on waste site options. If the site is taken forward for a HRC/Depot/waste transfer facility only there would help to limit possible movements, particularly HGV movements, associated with waste in this area.</p> <p>Issue 5: Impact on Canford Bottom roundabout</p> <p>Officer Response: Transport modelling work that has been undertaken has concluded that the impact of moving the existing HRC from Wimborne to Ferndown should see minimal additional vehicle movements across Canford Bottom Roundabout. Further impacts will be considered within a Transport Assessment at the planning application stage when a specific site and access is known.</p> <p>Issue 6: Uddens Drive is an unsuitable access/junction</p> <p>Officer Response: Uddens drive is one of two options to access the Blunts Farm site. It is accepted that improvements would be required to enable this route to be used as an access and this will need to be considered further when a specific site is identified from within the 'area of search'. If a specific site becomes available within the existing Ferndown Industrial Estate is it likely that existing roads such as Cobham Road would be used.</p> <p>Issue 7: Impact on quality of life/nearby sensitive receptors including smallholdings, a livery and children's nursery – noise/odour etc</p> <p>Officer Response: Impacts on the quality of life of residents or other sensitive receptors will depend on the precise location of the waste facility within the 'area of search'. When a site is found further consideration will be given to mitigation, such as landscaping, which will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. Waste managed at modern HRC's is generally stored within a building which should address any odour/litter issues. If a HRC/Depot/transfer facility were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Issue 8: Waste facilities should be located away from residential areas</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste facilities should be located in accessible locations close to main settlements in order to minimise the distance travelled by waste (and people). Modern waste management facilities can be designed to fit well into residential/employment areas. Historically waste facilities were situated in more rural areas. This was because they often evolved from landfill sites in quarries, where there was no choice over site location.</p> <p>Issue 9: Impact on wildlife</p> <p>Officer Response: The principle of development of Blunts Farm has already been established in the East Dorset and Christchurch Local Plan. However, an application for the development of a waste facility would require an appropriate level of ecological survey work at the application stage. Should a site be found on brownfield land within the existing Ferndown Industrial Estate there should be much less (if any) impact on wildlife from the development of a waste facility.</p> <p>Issue 10: Landscape impact from scale of facility and 40m chimney</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Officer Response: A HRC/Depot/transfer station would not require the development of a high chimney and its scale would be consistent with existing development on the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate. If considered at the master planning stage a new waste facility could be designed to be located in the most appropriate part of Blunts Farm with adequate land for screening.</p> <p>Issue 11: Inappropriate use of land - Blunts Farm is more appropriate for employment uses/providing jobs</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and are required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land (Blunts Farm) is consistent with National Policy. The Waste Planning Authority acknowledges the concerns of East Dorset District Council, the Forestry Commission and others regarding the use of a significant part of Blunts Farm for waste uses. Residual treatment or bulky waste treatment facilities would require the greatest land take. Focusing on the need for a HRC/Depot/transfer would reduce the land take to approximately 1.5ha. Maintaining the 'area of search' encompassing the existing Ferndown Industrial Estate provides the flexibility to consider the development of a brownfield site if one becomes available when required. This reduces the reliance on Blunts Farm.</p> <p>Issue 12: Existing HRC at Brook Road should be retained. Moving the site to Ferndown will lead to fly tipping.</p> <p>Officer Response: The existing HRC in Wimborne is small, has poor access and no space for expansion. 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>Issue 13: Impact on property values</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority needs to consider whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing permitted/authorised land uses/activities in the area (see issue 7).</p> <p>Issue 14: Flooding/ Pollution of local water supply land drainage – seepage of pollutants</p> <p>Officer Response: The Environment Agency have no objection in principle to development of waste facilities in this location in relation to flooding. The area of search falls within Flood Zone 1, which suggests it is at low risk of flooding. However, a Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required at planning application stage.</p> <p>There is a public water main which borders the southern extent of the site. No construction will take place within a reasonable distance of this and this issue will be reflected in the development considerations within the Waste Plan.</p> <p>Issue 15: Air pollution</p> <p>Officer Response: Concerns related to air pollution were associated with the development of a residual waste treatment facility and the associated emissions.</p> <p>Issue 16: Stack height – aviation concerns</p> <p>Officer Response: Manchester Airport Group (MAG), who would advise on aerodrome safety issues, have not raised concerns with regards to a chimney in this location.</p> <p>Issue 17: Loose waste could be blown onto oncoming traffic on the Wimborne bypass</p> <p>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>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Issue 18: Incinerator plants have already been historically rejected in Ferndown</p> <p>Officer Response: It is correct that land at Blunts Farm has in the past been considered for a facility for the management of residual waste. However, the situation has now changed and the emerging plan must consider current waste needs. Blunts Farm has been removed from the Green Belt and is allocated as employment land. Waste facilities on allocated employment land are consistent with National Planning Policy for waste.</p> <p>Issue 19: This site is also being considered for a gypsy and traveller site</p> <p>Officer Response: It is correct that the parcel of land within the Green Belt forming part of the 'area of search' is also being considered for a gypsy and traveller site. A decision on this land for a gypsy and traveller site is still to be made.</p> <p>Issue 20: Flies/Vermin</p> <p>Officer Response: Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.</p> <p>Issue 21: No comprehensive search for alternative sites has been undertaken</p> <p>Officer Response: A comprehensive search for sites within the Wimborne and Ferndown areas has been undertaken. All sites considered and the reasons for progression or not is set out in a background paper which supports the preparation of the Waste Plan.</p> <p>Issue 22: Object to all of Dorset's waste being dealt with in Ferndown</p> <p>Officer Response: There are concerns about a strategic facility to manage all Dorset's waste being developed in Ferndown. Ferndown is a good choice for a strategic facility given its central location and relatively good transport links. Alternative sites to address the need for residual/bulky waste management are available elsewhere but no alternative sites for a new HRC/Depot/transfer station have been identified. One option to consider is to focus the 'Ferndown area of search' on the need for such a facility.</p> <p><u>Suggested Alternative Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand one of the existing sites – Brook Rd, Longham or Hurn <p>Officer Response: Consideration has been given to the expansion of the existing Brook Road facility however only a very small area of additional land is available and this would not be sufficient to develop a modern, spilt level HRC that would address the long term needs of the area. New housing is also encroaching on the existing facility.</p> <p>The HRC at Longham, known as Millhams, is run by Bournemouth Borough Council. Although the authority is happy for Dorset County Council residents to use the site now this may change in the future as the population of Bournemouth increases and puts pressure on the existing facility. It is important for Dorset to be self-sufficient in terms of its waste facilities so that all residents have access to a facility for the disposal of their waste. In addition, the Millhams site is constrained and options for expansion are very limited.</p> <p>Consideration is being given to the expansion of an existing waste facility at Hurn to manage significantly increased quantities of residual waste as an alternative to a new treatment facility within the Ferndown 'area of search'. Hurn is not an appropriate location for a HRC to serve Wimborne, Ferndown and surrounding areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land between the access road to the current Ferndown / Dorset Police station and the Ferndown by-pass 	
--	--	--

		<p>Officer response: The former police headquarters site was considered but it has been sold and is unavailable for a waste use. The wider land is within the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ferndown golf course <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority is not aware of any available land at Ferndown Golf Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land North of Wimborne <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority undertook a comprehensive assessment of available land. No suitable, available land was found north of Wimborne.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council offices at Furzehill <p>Officer Response: It is the understanding of the Waste Planning Authority that the Council Offices at Furzehill are not available for the development of a waste facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winfrith <p>Officer Response: The need for a strategic residual waste facility is driven by waste arisings from Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. As a result a site is required in a central location. West Dorset and Purbeck are relatively rural areas in comparison to the South East Dorset conurbation where the majority of waste arises. In order to reduce the impacts of transporting waste the preference is for a strategic site to be located within the South East Dorset with good transport links. This should be supported by transfer facilities in the West and North of Dorset to bulk up waste.</p>	
<p>WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate</p> <p>Bulky waste transfer/treatment</p> <p>Residual waste treatment Inc. energy from waste</p>	<p>53 disagree</p> <p>1 Petition Inc. 93 signatures</p>	<p>Issue 1: Increased traffic during the construction and operation/access safety concerns – a relief road would be the solution/Cumulative impact of additional housing, employment and waste vehicles in this locality.</p> <p>Officer Response: Development of a waste facility on this site would increase traffic movements on current levels. However, the principle of development of employment uses on this site has already been established as this is allocated employment land. As part of the allocated extension to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, a new signalised junction onto Ringwood Road is proposed. Any proposals here (waste or other) would need to consider the impact on this junction, however this is likely to be the preferred option to access any new waste facility.. This is in part because this site is more remote from the principal origin of waste than other options and the level of movement associated would result in an increase in overall vehicle miles on the road network compared to other options. It is still proposed to take this site forward for bulky waste management. This facility alone would generate a lower number of vehicle movements. Further discussions will be needed with Highways England with regards to any impacts on the Strategic Road Network - this would include consideration of existing and likely increased traffic resulting from planned housing etc.</p> <p>It is understood that a relief road in this location is unlikely and should not be relied upon to reduce impacts from additional vehicles.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on quality of life of sensitive receptions - noise, dust, odour and environmental impacts</p> <p>Officer Response: Impacts on the quality of life of residents or other sensitive receptors will depend on the precise location of the waste facility within the sites. When a site is found further consideration will be given to mitigation, such as landscaping, which will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. If a facility to manage bulky waste management only were to be proposed it would manage mattresses, sofas etc. and therefore would be unlikely to generate any odours or dust. If a waste facility were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that this site warrants continued consideration for bulky waste treatment/transfer but is less suitable for residual waste treatment.</p> <p>The site boundary would benefit from an amendment to exclude land in Flood Zones 2&3.</p> <p><u>Development considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate buffer from FZ2&3 • Appropriate buffer from the SNCI • Consideration of mitigation to avoid contamination of the SNCI from the ditch running from the existing industrial estate, alongside the proposed site.

	<p>Issue 3: Impact on SSSI/SNCI</p> <p>Officer response: Management of bulky waste would be similar in impacts to other industrial/employment activities. Depending on the location of a bulky waste facility, it should be possible to include mitigation such as an appropriate buffer between the facility and the SNCI/SSSI. This will be referred to in the Plan within the development considerations to ensure it is addressed at the planning application stage. Residual waste treatment would need to be fully assessed in terms of implications for designated habitats.</p> <p>Issue 4: Pollution/emissions from treatment of waste</p> <p>Officer Response: Noted. Such matters would require detailed consideration. However, the remote location of this site compared to other options could rule out its suitability for residual waste treatment rather than for reasons of pollution and potential emissions.</p> <p>Issue 5: Proximity to Moors Valley County Park/entrance</p> <p>Officer Response: There are not considered to be any unacceptable adverse impacts on Moors Valley County Park from the siting of a bulky waste management facility on this site – see also issue 1.</p> <p>Issue 6: Impact on the Castleman Trail</p> <p>Officer Response: The Castleman trail passes near to the site and would not be directly affected by development. Depending on the specific location within the wider site consideration will need to be given to screening the facility from the Castleman trail.</p> <p>Issue 7: Impact on the large fuel facility nearby – fire/ risk of explosion</p> <p>Officer Response: There are no envisaged impacts from the development of a waste facility on the fuelling facility near this site.</p> <p>Issue 8: Flooding</p> <p>Officer Response: The current site boundary includes land within flood zone 2 and 3. It would be advisable to exclude this land from the site allocation to satisfy the sequential test. A buffer of undeveloped land along the edge of FZ2/FZ3 would also allow for any variability of the flood zones over future years due to climate change. The Strategic Flood Risk assessment is currently being updated and will be taken into consideration when the site boundary is defined and/or through development considerations.</p> <p>Issue 9: There are already two waste facilities in the area dealing with current waste arisings</p> <p>Officer Response: It is correct that there are other waste facilities in the vicinity. One is a HRC and the other is a composting facility. There remains a need for a bulky waste management facility to manage a very specific waste stream.</p> <p>Issue 10: Vermin</p> <p>Officer Response: Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings. In addition, the nature of bulky waste would not give rise to vermin.</p> <p>Issue 11: Impact on property values</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority needs to consider whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing permitted/authorised land uses/activities in the area.</p> <p>Issue 12: Inappropriate use of employment land</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and are required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy. The Waste Planning Authority acknowledges the concerns of East Dorset District Council and others regarding the use of a significant part of the site for waste uses. Residual treatment would require the greatest land take. Focusing on the need for bulky waste treatment/transfer would reduce the land take to approximately 1 ha.</p>	
<p>WP03 Mannings Heath Area of Search</p> <p>Bulky waste transfer/treatment</p> <p>Residual waste treatment Inc. energy from waste</p>	<p>60 disagree</p>	<p>Issue 1: Air pollution/emissions and/or odours</p> <p>Officer Response: 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 they would monitor the site on a regular basis.</p> <p>Issue 2: Noise</p> <p>Officer Response: It is considered that with appropriate design and layout including all operations being undertaken within buildings and appropriate screening, a waste facility in this location should not result in unacceptable levels of noise. Conditions could be placed on a planning permission to ensure noise levels were kept to an appropriate level.</p> <p>Issue 3: Inappropriate use of employment site – Proximity to small businesses and employment/Impact on tourism/economy/driving businesses away.</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste facilities are considered appropriate within industrial sites and on allocated employment land. This location is consistent with National Planning Policy for Waste for the siting of waste facilities. 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.</p> <p>Issue 4: Proximity to sensitive receptors including residential properties, leisure facilities of Tower Park and supermarket</p> <p>Officer Response: Through careful design, layout and screening it should be possible to mitigate impacts from waste facilities on nearby receptors. There is a big advantage in siting these types of waste facility close to major heat users as they can benefit from the energy and heat generated from the waste treatment facility.</p> <p>Issue 5: Fire risk</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority is not aware of any significant risk of fire from waste treatment facilities that cannot be minimised through good site management and monitoring.</p> <p>Issue 6: Increased traffic, particular HGV's</p> <p>Officer Response: A waste facility would generate additional vehicle movements. Advice from Poole Highways Authority suggests that improvements would be needed to ensure safe access and egress to the site. Any proposals would need to build into the design capacity to ensure there is no potential queuing on the highway. This is an issue that can be highlighted in the Waste Plan development considerations to ensure it is addressed in any planning application.</p>	<p>Evidence would indicate that this site remains an option for the management of residual/bulky waste. However, there are concerns related to emissions from any treatment facility and impacts on nearby European Sites. Further consideration/assessment is needed to reach a decision on preferred site (s) for allocation in the final Waste Plan.</p> <p>If this site is included in the final Plan the site boundary should be reduced to include only land owned by SUEZ.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access/egress improvements

	<p>Issue 7: Vermin</p> <p>Officer Response: Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.</p> <p>Issue 8: Litter</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste managed at modern treatment facilities is generally stored and treated within an enclosed building which should address any litter issues.</p> <p>Issue 9: Risk of fire</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority has no reason to believe that a waste facility would give rise to increased risk to fire that other industrial processes.</p> <p>Issue 10: Site assessment should refer to housing, offices, restaurants nearby</p> <p>Officer Response: The site assessment will be reviewed to ensure it refers correctly to sensitive receptors nearby.</p> <p>Issue 11: The marked plan appears incorrect in that it outlines land already subject to planning permission for industrial units.</p> <p>Officer Response: The plan will be checked to ensure it reflects the current situation. However, changes were made prior to the recent consultation to reflect a recent planning permission.</p> <p>Issue 12: Impact on property values</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority needs to consider whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing permitted/authorised land uses/activities in the area.</p> <p>Issue 13: Light pollution – a large building will block light from adjacent offices</p> <p>Officer Response: Consideration can be given at the planning application stage to the design of a waste facility in order to minimise impacts on nearby properties to acceptable levels this would include the loss of light.</p> <p>Issue 14: Stack height – aviation safety concerns</p> <p>Officer Response: Manchester Airport Group (MAG), who would advise on aerodrome safety issues, have not raised concerns with regards to a chimney in this location.</p> <p>Issue 15: Waste from outside Poole should not be managed within Poole. Poole does not collect food waste?</p> <p>Officer Response: This facility is not proposed to manage food waste collected separately as this waste stream is managed through an anaerobic digestion in a facility north of Dorchester. The Waste Planning Authority understands that Poole Borough Council do not currently have plans to separately collect food waste. Therefore food waste arisings from Poole are part of the residual waste stream and could be managed at a treatment facility in this location.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winfrith 	
--	--	--

		<p>Officer Response: The need for a strategic residual waste facility is driven by waste arising from Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. As a result sites are best located central location. West Dorset and Purbeck are relatively rural areas in comparison to the South East Dorset conurbation where the majority of waste arises. In order to reduce the impacts of transporting waste the search for a strategic site has been focused within South East Dorset in areas with good transport links. Treatment facilities will be supported by transfer facilities in the West and North of Dorset to bulk up waste.</p>	
<p>WP04 Site Control Centre</p> <p>Intensification of existing waste management facility, including increased capacity for the management of residual waste and complementary activities that push waste up the waste hierarchy.</p>	7 disagree	<p>Issue 1: Cumulative impacts of intensification of existing facility – noise/smells and traffic</p> <p>Officer Response: Intensification of development of this site would require an assessment of the cumulative impact of this proposal plus other local committed development on the local network including residential and Magna Business Park. This work is likely to be most appropriate at the planning application stage when detailed proposals are known.</p> <p>Issue 2: EA has reported noise/smell complaints – not consistent with Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Officer Response: The Environment Agency has raised no objection to the intensification of this facility.</p> <p>Issue 3: Impact on Ecological Designations</p> <p>Officer Response: Further work will be required to assess how the continued use of the existing site may affect any restoration of adjacent White’s landfill site and potential biodiversity enhancements. The extension into the B4 Lagoon area would be adjacent to SSSI/SPA/SAC and would mean the loss of lagoon which in the past has supported various species - appropriate surveys would be required and mitigation as appropriate.</p> <p>Issue 4: Green Belt</p> <p>Officer Response: It is acknowledged that the site lies within the Green Belt. The site is however currently identified in Poole's Development Plan as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. Originally the operator was promoting further expansion of the site to the east. However, this extension was not taken forward as it is visually separate from the existing facility and is very rural in character. The B4 lagoon area is currently well-screened on all sides, with the exception of the boundary with the existing waste Control Centre. Complementary waste uses could potentially extend into it without harming the perceived openness of the green belt or the rural character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Issue 5: These areas are also included in the Poole Local Plan review for housing.</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority is aware that land in the vicinity is being considered by the Borough of Poole for additional housing.</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that this site warrants continued consideration for allocation in the Waste Plan for general intensification to manage an additional tonnage of waste.</p> <p><u>Development consideration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention of woodland strip to provide a buffer between the site and the SSSI. Ecological mitigation likely to be required given proximity of the SSSI.
<p>WP05 Eco-Sustainable Solutions</p> <p>Intensification of existing waste management facility, including increased capacity for the management of</p>	4 disagree	<p>Issue 1: Impact on highways/increased HGVs/cumulative impacts</p> <p>Officer Response: Development of an energy from waste facility on this site would see an increase in HGV traffic. It should be noted that Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership is funding significant transport improvements in this area that will be implemented over several years. Work is currently being undertaken to improve the network and consideration is being given to the potential increased movements generated by this waste proposal. A transport impact assessment will be required, at the planning application stage, to determine the impact on the network on proposals and how any impacts will be mitigated.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on amenity/local community</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that this site warrants continued consideration for the management of residual waste. Further consideration/assessment is needed before a decision is made on preferred site(s) for allocation in the final Waste Plan.</p> <p><u>Development considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological mitigation and long-term restoration given the site’s proximity to ecological designations. The issues of appropriate stack height and lighting will be important considerations. It is hoped that more detail can be included on these issues in the final Plan.

<p>residual waste and complementary activities that push waste up the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>Officer Response: Consideration will need to be given to mitigation, such as landscaping and site design/layout to reduce impacts on the community to an acceptable level. Waste managed at modern waste treatment facilities would be stored/treated within an enclosed building which should address any odour/dust issues. If a waste facility were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Issue 3: Impact on aviation park</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority is working with Manchester Airport Group to fully consider the intensification of this waste site and its impact on the aviation park. Issues such as appropriate stack height and lighting could be highlighted within the Waste Plan development considerations in order to ensure they are addressed through any planning application.</p> <p>All proposals for lighting in both the construction or operational phase (or other potential sources of glare) should be examined to ensure there is no impact on the sightlines from Air Traffic Control or aircraft operating from or in the vicinity of the airport. Details of any radio communications systems operating in the vicinity of the airport should be assessed to ensure there is no interference with on-airport critical equipment or communication frequencies. It is appropriate to deal with these issues at the planning application stage when precise details of the proposal are known.</p> <p>Issue 4: Impact on Ecological Designations</p> <p>Officer Response: Impacts on adjacent heathland from gaseous emissions from an EfW stack will need to be assessed and subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment at both the Plan making and planning application stage as well as being subject to all the usual constraints such as Environmental Permitting. Ecological mitigation and long-term restoration would need to be agreed - this could be highlighted in the Waste Plan development considerations to ensure the issue is addressed in any planning application.</p> <p>Issue 5: Contingency given the large quantities of waste involved</p> <p>Officer Response: Development of a facility for the management of residual waste on this site would mean that Dorset had (a minimum of) two major facilities for managing this waste stream. This would provide a contingency that currently does not exist. In addition, a new transfer facility in Bridport offers significant quantities of temporary waste storage. The Waste Plan is also looking to allocate new transfer facilities in the Blandford, Dorchester and Purbeck areas. These facilities, if developed, would allow for additional quantities of temporary storage of waste if there was a short term problem at a treatment facility.</p> <p>Issue 6: Details of sensitive receptors are incorrect</p> <p>Officer Response: The site assessment will be checked to ensure that all sensitive receptors are referred to.</p> <p>Issue 7: Water pollution</p> <p>Officer Response: The Environment Agency have no objection in principle to the development of a residual waste facility in this location. Detailed comments for consideration have been made and are included with the site assessment form. This includes the requirement for standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination.</p> <p>Issue 8: Bird Strike</p> <p>Officer Response: The possibility of bird strike will need to be assessed and mitigated. However, modern waste treatment facilities should minimise opportunities as all waste will be stored/treated within an enclosed building.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park</p> <p>Household Recycling Centre</p> <p>Waste Transfer Station</p> <p>Waste Vehicle Depot</p>	<p>7 disagree</p> <p>4 agree</p>	<p>Issue 1: Impact on the AONB</p> <p>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. A comprehensive review of the Blandford area has been unable to find an alternative site outside of the AONB. Further work will be needed to ensure that any impacts from this development can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>Issue 2: Traffic/Access</p> <p>Officer Response: The development of a waste management facility in this location would inevitably increase traffic locally. It is the view of DCC highways that this location 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. Access through the business park is likely to be difficult due to high levels of on-street parking.</p> <p>Issue 3: Loss of green field/agricultural land</p> <p>Officer Response: The land is partially grade 2 and partially grade 3 and therefore classified as 'Best and Most Versatile' 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.</p> <p>Issue 4: Contamination – impact of waste facility in close proximity to a large food outlet, vermin</p> <p>Officer Response: 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>Issue 5: Impact on quality of life/sensitive receptors</p> <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.</p> <p>Issue 6: A waste management site should be away from residential areas</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste facilities should be located in accessible locations close to centres of population in order to minimise the distance travelled by waste. Modern waste management facilities can be designed to fit well in residential/employment areas. Historically waste facilities were situated in more rural area. This was because they often evolved from landfill sites in quarries where there was no choice over site locations. In any case this particular site option, is separated from residential areas by the Blandford bypass and there are only limited sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Issue 7: A site should be found within the bypass</p> <p>Officer Response: A comprehensive review of available sites throughout Blandford has been undertaken including a 'call for sites' letter to landowners. No suitable alternative site has been found within the bypass that could enable a modern split level waste household recycling centre and transfer station of sufficient scale to meet the needs of the town.</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that this site warrants continued consideration for a Waste Management Centre to serve the needs of Blandford and surrounding areas.</p> <p>However, two alternative site options have come forward and these will be given full consideration/assessment prior to reaching a decision on the preferred site for allocation in the final Plan.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the design, layout and landscape treatment of the site shall minimise impacts upon the AONB a dark skies strategy should demonstrate how light spill into the AONB will be minimised
---	----------------------------------	--	--

		<p>Issue 8: Impact on proposed Lidl site</p> <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority has no reason to believe that the development of a modern waste management centre on the site would jeopardise the proposed Lidl site.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land North East beyond the Sunrise Business Park, with access off the C13 Shaftesbury Road <p>Officer Response: The suggested alternative site is also within the AONB. This site has been subject to further assessment but it is considered that the site should not be progressed given its high visual and landscape sensitivity and context. It's considered that mitigation and /or enhancement is unlikely to be possible in this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Langton Lodge Farm, east of Blandford <p>Officer Response: The suggested alternative site is also within the AONB. An assessment will be made to consider whether the site provides advantages, particularly in terms of impact on the AONB, over the current emerging preferred site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding and developing the existing site at Holland Way <p>Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority has already considered this site and understands that there are issues with the deliverability of the site, in particular the potential costs likely to prohibit development. The site may also be too small to develop a modern waste management facility to serve the needs of the town and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Support for this proposal</p> <p>Issue 1: Best option for a waste management centre to serve Blandford</p> <p>Officer Response: A comprehensive site selection exercise had determined this site to be the best available site to develop a modern waste management centre to meet the needs of Blandford and surrounding areas. Further consideration will need to be given to the alternative sites suggested (see above).</p> <p>Issue 2: Good access from A350 – less affected by holiday and event traffic</p> <p>Officer Response: It is agreed that an appropriate access could be developed for this site.</p> <p>Issue 3: Closer to principal users</p> <p>Officer Response: Generally, this site is in a good location to serve the town and surrounding villages and is also accessible for use as a waste transfer station.</p>	
<p>WP07 Brickfields Business Park</p> <p>Household Recycling Centre</p>	<p>2 agree</p> <p>1 comment</p>	<p>Issue 1: Impact on public footpath</p> <p>Officer Response: Development of this site would require diversion of footpath N64/48.</p> <p>Issue 2: If the Shaftesbury facility is to be closed, it would seem better to have the new Gillingham recycling centre at the Shaftesbury end of the town, rather than bring all that extra traffic into the town.</p>	<p>Evidence supports continued consideration of this site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Vehicle Depot to serve the needs of Gillingham and Shaftesbury.</p> <p>There may be scope to reduce the site boundary to a more specific site for allocation in the final Waste Plan. However, the Waste Planning Authority understands that master planning for this site is still some way off. This will be monitored prior to publishing the final Plan.</p>

Waste Vehicle Depot		<p>Officer Response: The planned Brickfields Business Park will have a new link road from the B3081 therefore traffic accessing the business park and any waste facility would not need to come through the town. An indicative route will be added to the site allocation in the final Waste Plan.</p> <p>Issue 3: Flooding</p> <p>Officer Response: Consideration will be given to removing the Flood Zone from the site allocation in the final Plan.</p> <p>Support for this proposal</p> <p>Issue 1: It is agreed that this site is well located with planned access improvements. The site provides plenty of scope to develop a modern facility to serve both towns of Gillingham and Shaftesbury as they expand.</p> <p>Issue 2: Sustainable site, good access site, in an area where there will be both residential and employment</p> <p>Officer Response: Support for this proposal is welcomed</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Park behind Orchard Park <p>Officer Response: Orchard Park is situated to the east of Kingsmead Business Park, outside of the settlement boundary and not a part of the employment allocation. NDDC have confirmed that other uses proposed on the site are likely to be incompatible, particularly due to the aim to create a local centre. Brickfields Business park is a more appropriate site being allocated employment land within the urban extension.</p>	It is hoped that an indicative access route into the site can also be included in the final Waste Plan.
WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works	2 disagree 1 agree	<p>Issue 1: Proximity to existing properties – encroachment on existing properties/ odours etc</p> <p>Officer Response: It is acknowledged that expansion of the sewage works would bring the facility closer to the existing residential properties. The Waste Planning Authority understands that the area of land proposed for allocation would allow for hedge and tree screening which should mitigate impacts from the facility to acceptable levels. The site is constrained on all other sides by the floodplain and the railway line.</p> <p>Issue 2: An extension which followed the line of the railway track i.e. South West of the existing site would reduce the impact from the facility.</p> <p>Officer Response: The land adjacent to the railway line falls within the flood plain maps published by the Environment Agency and therefore is unsuitable for extension. There are also existing rising mains and outfall sewers within this land. It is understood that land to the south west is sited in the wrong location for process enhancements and is also too small for the longer term capacity improvements required.</p>	Evidence supports continued consideration of this site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works.
WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works	1 agree	<p>Issue 1: The inclusion of an area for landscape mitigation is supported.</p> <p>Officer Response: It is agreed that incorporating land for landscaping will assist in mitigating impacts from the expansion of this facility</p>	Evidence supports continued consideration of this site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for expansion of Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works.
WP10 Land at Stinsford Hill Household recycling Centre Waste Transfer Station	1 comment 1 agree 4 disagree	<p>Issue 1: Impact on air quality</p> <p>Officer Response: Waste managed at modern household recycling centres is generally stored within a building which should minimise impacts in terms of air quality to satisfactory levels.</p> <p>Issue 2: Traffic/Access</p>	It is not recommended to take this site forward for allocation in the final Waste Plan. There is considerable uncertainty over the deliverability of this site and it is considered that there would be a risk in identifying a site that relies upon the possibility of future larger scale development on this side of Dorchester. There are also concerns related to traffic/access and likely to be landscape impacts that could be difficult to overcome through mitigation.

<p>Waste Vehicle depot</p>	<p>Officer Response: There are concerns resulting from a waste facility in this location which would need to be resolved if this site were to be developed. There is potential for impacts on Greys Bridge and Stinsford Hill and access onto the B3150 lies close to the junction with the A35 so there would likely be impact on the Strategic Road Network. A transport assessment would need to be undertaken if this site were to be taken forward for development.</p> <p>Issue 3: Landscape Impacts</p> <p>Officer Response: There are concerns that development of a waste facility would have landscape and visual impacts that are unlikely to be mitigated even given the larger area of land proposed.</p> <p>Issue 4: Flooding/Water contamination/proximity to River Frome SSSI</p> <p>Officer Response: The southern section of the site is covered by FZ2 and FZ3 and a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required. However, given the larger area of land it is likely to be possible to avoid the Flood Zones.</p> <p>Existing water supply pipelines cross the site and no construction would be possible within 5 metres of these mains. A diversion of these mains may be required to allow appropriate development of the site.</p> <p>Issue 5: Impact on Ecology</p> <p>Officer Response: Advice from DCC County Ecologist is that a Phase 1 habitat survey would be required before development were to take place. There is also the need also to determine if any Higher Lever Stewardship/Entry Level Stewardship agri-environment schemes are present and what benefits have occurred as a result of any scheme.</p> <p>As the proposal is located close to the River Frome SSSI the Environment Agency will need to be consulted to consider if the proposal represents an acceptable environmental and public health risk which can be appropriately mitigated. A robust risk assessment with any mitigation measures are undertaken would be required to satisfy the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Issue 6: Vermin</p> <p>Officer Response: Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.</p> <p>Issue 7: Impact on quality of life of sensitive receptors</p> <p>Officer Response: Consideration will need to be given to the design and layout of any waste facility to ensure any impacts or perceived impacts are mitigated to an appropriate level. Unlike other sites this site has relative few sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Issue 8: Risk of contamination to the public water supply</p> <p>Officer Response: The site falls within a groundwater source protection zone and close to water supply boreholes on adjacent land. Risk of contamination to the public water supply will need to be considered further if this site were to be taken forward. Wessex Water advise that there will be risks of contamination from the waste transfer and spillage, waste storage and recycling operations surface water run-off and vehicles. A robust risk assessment and mitigation will need to demonstrate that contaminants can be prevented from polluting the groundwater source. The Environment Agency will also need to be satisfied that appropriate risks and mitigation measures are considered in any operating permits.</p>	
----------------------------	---	--

		<p>Suggested Alternative Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Radio Station <p>Officer Response: The old radio station is being considered for a waste transfer station and/or vehicle depot. It has however been discounted for a household recycling centre primarily due to accessibility given the number of householder vehicles that would need to cross the A35 in this location. There are considered to be more suitable locations for a publicly accessible household recycling centre off the main trunk road network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poundbury <p>Officer Response: A comprehensive search for sites for waste facilities in and around Dorchester has been undertaken. This included Poundbury. One site, known as Parkway Farm, was included in the 2015 Draft Waste Plan however it has not been shortlisted as the landowner has confirmed that this site is being developed for other uses and therefore is unavailable for a waste use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monkeys Jump roundabout <p>Officer Response: A site at Monkeys Jump was included in the 2015 Draft Waste Plan however has not been shortlisted as there are considered to be better options outside of the AONB with less potential landscape/visual impacts and better access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Beacon Hill <p>Officer Response: The need for a replacement household recycling centre to serve Dorchester and surrounding towns was first identified in the Waste Plan Issues Paper (December 2013). This document contained an area within which a search for a suitable site would take place. This area was centred on Dorchester and focused on employment sites, consistent with National Planning Policy for Waste. Greenfield sites outside of the town were generally not considered unless specifically suggested by a landowner or other consultee. Household recycling centres need to be well located to serve the populations that they are intended to serve. Land at Beacon Hill is some distance from the centre of population resulting in a large proportion of the users of the site having to travel much greater distances to access a facility.</p>	
<p>WP11 Loudsmill Household Recycling Centre</p>	<p>7 disagree</p>	<p>Issue 1: Access/poor road infrastructure</p> <p>Officer Response: It is accepted that there are currently congestion issues in this location. However, the site will soon be served by an extension to Lubbecke Way that will take traffic away from the constrained St. Georges Road residential area. Furthermore, if investment were to be put into improving the existing household recycling centre (HRC) it is likely that the immediate access along St. Georges Road would also need to be improved. The expansion of the existing facility would allow for improved circulation within the site and would ensure that the site would not need to close when skips are removed. These measures would significantly reduce queuing traffic along St. Georges Road and improve accessibility to the site.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on quality of life for sensitive receptors</p> <p>Officer Response: Impacts on the quality of life of residents or other sensitive receptors will depend on the precise location of the waste facility within the wider site. When a more specific site is found further consideration will be given to mitigation, such as landscaping, which will reduce impacts to an acceptable level. Waste managed at modern HRCs is generally stored within a building which should address any odour/litter issues. Planning conditions could be attached to any planning permission to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Issue 3: A one-way system would reduce queuing</p>	<p>Evidence suggests that this site remains a realistic option for allocation in the final Waste Plan. This site is likely to provide a financially viable option to provide an improved facility to serve Dorchester and surrounding areas.</p> <p>It is understood that master planning is at an early stage on the wider site. It is hoped to be able to reduce the size of the site to a more specific allocation in the final Waste Plan.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBC when a more specific site allocation is known

		<p>Officer Response: It is agreed that site design and layout will be important to the development of an improved facility in this location. It is agreed that the operation of a one way system would improve circulation and reduce queuing.</p> <p>Issue 4: The new recycling centre should retain a line of sight from the railway to the elevated signage at Louds Mill Lakeside Industrial Estate</p> <p>Officer Response: This will depend on the precise location and design of the HRC and is not currently know. Should this site be allocated and an application submitted these issues should be raised again at this stage.</p> <p>Issue 5: Impact on Ecology</p> <p>Officer Response: Advice from DCC County Ecologist is that a Phase 1 habitat survey would be required before development were to take place.</p> <p>Issue 6: Impact on Groundwater</p> <p>Officer Response: Advice from the Environment Agency is that due to the site being in Source Protection Zone 2, a detailed risk assessment would be required. It's likely that any development will be subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination.</p> <p>Support for this proposal</p> <p>Issue 1: Businesses located on Louds Mill Lakeside Industrial Estate get increased publicity and trade from passing users of the HRC</p> <p>Officer Response: Support for the retention/improvement of this site is noted.</p>	
<p>WP12 Old Radio Station</p> <p>Waste Transfer Station</p> <p>Waste Vehicle Depot</p>	<p>1 disagree</p>	<p>Issue 1: Traffic/access</p> <p>Officer Response: This site is unlikely to be acceptable if development would lead to additional traffic movements across the A35. This is likely to rule out consideration of the site for a household recycling centre which was of particular concern for safety and capacity reasons. However, if a transfer station and/depot were to replace vehicle movements from the existing Dorset Passenger Transport Depot this could be acceptable subject to the provision of a transport evidence base.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on Maiden Castle/AONB</p> <p>Officer Response: Although this site is in the AONB, it is considered that mitigation could reduce adverse landscape and visual impacts to an acceptable level. If this site is taken forward for allocation, there will be a need to identify appropriate mitigation within the development criteria. This could include the retention of the existing buildings to screen any additional development. Given this site's location in the AONB, detailed 'Design Guidelines' have been prepared to support the development of the site. This information can be found as an appendix to the site assessment.</p>	<p>Evidence would indicate continued consideration of the site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for a waste transfer station and vehicle depot. There are both financial and operational advantages to having both facilities located together rather than on separate sites around the town.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation of impacts arising from new development and the achievement of enhancement opportunities are key considerations. A landscape led masterplan approach is recommended with reference to design considerations contained within the 'Design Guidelines' that have been prepared to support the development of this site.
<p>WP13 Charminster Depot and Farm</p> <p>Waste Vehicle Depot</p>	<p>8 disagree</p>	<p>Issue 1: Impact on quality of life for nearby residents</p> <p>Officer Response: Impacts on the quality of life of residents or other sensitive receptors nearby will depend on the precise location of the waste facility. Further consideration would be given to mitigation, such as landscaping, which would reduce impacts to an acceptable level if a specific site were to be allocated.</p>	<p>Evidence would indicate continued consideration of the site for allocation in the final Waste Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the alternative site (WP12 – Old Radio Station) has better access and room for both a waste transfer station and depot together in one location which provides operational and financial advantages.</p>

		<p>This site is only being considered for a waste vehicle depot. There would be no requirement for the storage of waste therefore there should be no issues with odour/dust/litter. Planning conditions could be attached to any planning permission to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</p> <p>Issue 2: Traffic/Access</p> <p>Officer Response: It is acknowledged that there would be an increase in vehicle movements locally as a result of the development of a vehicle depot. Given the relatively low level of movement associated with a depot Dorset County Council Highways Authority has raised no objection. This is with the knowledge of the new residential development and associated vehicle movements.</p> <p>Issue 2: Proximity to new residential development</p> <p>Officer Response: Development of a waste vehicle depot on greenfield land would require mitigation to ensure impacts on the new residential development are minimised to an acceptable level.</p>	
<p>WP14 Land at Bourne Park</p> <p>Green Waste Composting</p>	1 comment	<p>Issue 1: Site not designated as employment land. Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan not supportive of further development.</p> <p>Officer Response: It is acknowledged that this site is not allocated employment land however the type of facility proposed would complement the existing anaerobic digestion facility and addresses an identified need for green waste composting capacity within the general area of search proposed. It is noted that the Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan is not supportive of further development. The Plan has been subject to examination and subject to modification will proceed to referendum. The proposed modification includes a less restricted approach to development within Bourne Park to ensure the Plan is in general conformity with the Local Plan.</p> <p>Issue 2: Landscape/proximity to the AONB</p> <p>Officer Response: Although this facility is not in the AONB it is in close proximity. Good design, appropriate landscaping and sensitive lighting will be important to mitigate impacts from any further development.</p> <p>Issue 3: Traffic/access</p> <p>Officer Response: Any development is likely to require a traffic routing agreement to reduce impact on local rural roads and residents. A routing agreement would ensure that traffic accessing the site would do so via the existing Piddlehinton Enterprise Park entrance onto the B3143 and that HGV traffic approaches and leaves the site to the south avoiding London Row.</p>	<p>Evidence would indicate continued consideration of the site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for green waste composting to serve an identified local need.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good design, appropriate landscaping and sensitive lighting design will be critical to this development • Traffic routing agreement to ensure that access to the site is via the existing Piddlehinton Enterprise Park, avoiding London Row.
<p>WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath</p> <p>Waste Transfer Station</p> <p>Waste Vehicle Depot</p>	1 comment 1 agree	<p>Issue 1: Traffic/access</p> <p>Officer Response: Development of a transfer station would generate additional traffic. Given the number of vehicle movements involved the proposal is thought to be acceptable. Dorset County Council highways authority does not object to the proposal.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on designated heathland/damage to verges</p> <p>Officer Response: This site lies in close proximity to internationally designated heathland/SNCI. However, it is not considered that the development of a waste transfer station would have an unacceptable impact. It may be appropriate to highlight the importance of the verges close to the proposed site within the Plan 'Development Considerations' to ensure they are protected from damage.</p>	<p>Evidence would indicate continued consideration of the site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for a waste transfer station.</p> <p><u>Development consideration</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The verge areas close to the proposed development should be protected against damage particularly from traffic

<p>WP16 Swanworth Quarry Inert Waste Filling</p>	<p>61 disagree 1 agree</p>	<p>Issue 1: Impact of waste transportation Officer Response: Additional infill within the existing quarry would not increase vehicle movements on a daily or annual basis, instead vehicle movements would continue at the same level of movements as occur at present over a longer period of time – to 2024.</p> <p>Issue 2: Impact on tourism Officer Response: There should be no specific impacts on tourism from the proposals. Inert fill is also important in terms of the eventual restoration of the quarry to a suitable land form within the AONB.</p> <p>Issue 3: Concern over infilling of black bag waste/non-hazardous waste Officer Response: The Waste Planning Authority can confirm that it is proposed to increase the current level of infilling of inert waste. There are no proposals to fill the site with black bag/non-hazardous waste.</p> <p>Issue 4: Impact on the AONB/Purbeck Way/SSSI/Jurassic Coast Officer Response: The Dorset AONB team consider that landscape and visual impacts on the AONB are likely to be acceptable in principle. The proposal will not extend the agreed restoration period. The proposal to increase the final levels by 2-3 m across the site would be unlikely to result in a material alteration to the agreed appearance of the restored quarry and it is conceivable that the approach could result in a slight improvement to the final appearance.</p> <p>Issue 5: Additional infill should not delay restoration Officer Response: It is understood that restoration would not be delayed as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>Issue 6: Water contamination Officer Response: A detailed Flood Risk Assessment and hydrological risk assessment would be required at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Issue 7: Why is this the only site being considered for inert waste disposal? Why are there no options available? Officer Response: Unless specifically promoted by the operator/landowner, the Waste Planning Authority intends to rely on a criteria based policy to enable localised inert waste recovery, or otherwise disposal opportunities to come forward as the need arises or where there are restoration benefits. The 2016 Waste Plan Update consultation document highlighted a number of sites where inert fill might be used to aid successful restoration. Swanworth Quarry has been specifically promoted for inclusion in the Waste Plan by the landowner/operator.</p>	<p>Subject to further work evidence would indicate continued consideration of the site for allocation in the final Waste Plan for inert filling within the existing void.</p> <p>NB: During the consultation there was some confusion about this proposal for additional inert filling and the separate proposal within the Mineral Sites Plan for an extension to the quarry for additional extraction.</p> <p><u>Development Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBC
---	--------------------------------	--	---