

## Report on comments to the Draft Waste Plan site options and officer response – May 2016

917 responses were received to the consultation on the Draft Waste Plan (July 2015) from 197 contributing consultees (individuals/organisations), raising a range of different issues to be taken into consideration. A summary of the issues raised and officer response for each of the site options presented in the Draft Waste Plan is set out below. Following the officer response is a section which states if the site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan and a summary of the reasoning. This is subject to Member approval.

A separate report sets out the responses to the draft policies, text and strategy.

The number of representations (third column) is approximate and should be seen only as a guide to the level of objection or support for each site. This is for a number of reasons, representations were made to the questions in the consultation documents and/or the site options within the appendix and it was not always clear whether stakeholders were disagreeing or supporting a site especially where stakeholders ranked options in order of preference.

Please note: The issues listed below for each site option are in no particular order.

A few general comments were raised that could relate equally to all sites or a number of sites, a single response to these can be found at the end of this report.

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>BO01 – Kinson Sewage Treatment Works</b>	Brownfield site being considered for bulky waste transfer/treatment	3 comments received	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on SNCI</li> <li>2. land contamination risk – proximity of former landfill site</li> <li>3. Impact on the greenbelt</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advice from the County Ecologist is that a Phase 1 habitat survey should be undertaken to demonstrate what ecological interests may be present. Initial indications are that ecology is unlikely to present a major constraint to development.</li> <li>2. Given the proximity of the former landfill and risk of contamination advice from the Environment Agency is that this site may require site investigation, risk assessment and a remedial options appraisal. However this work is likely to be appropriate at the planning application stage.</li> <li>3. It is acknowledged that the site lies within the Green Belt. The site is previously developed land and further work will be needed to consider the impact upon openness of the Green Belt. The screening provided by the existing vegetation helps to reduce its susceptibility and should be protected, retained and managed as part of any development.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. There are considered to be sites in better locations strategically and outside of the Green Belt for bulky waste treatment.</b></p>
<b>CB01 – Hurn MRF</b>	Existing MRF being considered for alternative use as a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility	3 comments 1 agree 1 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consideration of bird strike issue</li> <li>2. Access/additional traffic</li> <li>3. Land should be used for employment uses to support economic growth</li> <li>4. Flood Risk</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site assessment acknowledges that this option is situated in close proximity to Bournemouth Airport. Bird strike is an important issue however, by its very nature, bulky waste is unlikely to attract birds.</li> <li>2. It is accepted that there is traffic congestion along the B3073 corridor. Funding is available and significant improvements along this route are planned over several years. However, any alternative use for the site would replace the existing facility therefore vehicle movements would not be in addition to existing movements and may be reduced.</li> <li>3. Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. This is an existing waste facility and development of an alternative waste use would not result in a loss of employment.</li> <li>4. It is acknowledged that part of this site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. A Sequential Test will be required to ensure that development can be safely and sustainably delivered. Waste treatment facilities are classified as 'less vulnerable' and are appropriate in FZ1, 2 and 3a. It may be possible to utilise existing buildings, situated outside of FZ2 and 3 for the development of a bulky waste treatment facility.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. This is an existing MRF and its future is unclear. It is proposed to safeguard the site rather than allocate it in the final Waste Plan.</b></p>
<b>CB02 – Eco-composting Parley</b>	This site was being considered for reconfiguration including the introduction of a solid recovered fuel processing plant	1 comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on internationally designated sites/Ecological mitigation/long-term restoration</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planning permission has now been granted for the reconfiguration of this site. A Habitats Regulations Assessment of the implications of the proposed development was undertaken, overall it was concluded that there will be no adverse effect on integrity. Appropriate conditions have been applied to the permission to ensure any impacts are mitigated to an appropriate level.</li> </ol> <p><b>Following the grant of planning permission for the reconfiguration of this site it is being considered for its potential for additional residual capacity.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>ED01 – Brook Road, Wimborne</b>	This site was being considered as an extension to the existing HRC	4 agree 2 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concern that the site has been sold and may not be available</li> <li>2. This would be a short term solution</li> <li>3. 'Convenient, central and sustainable location'</li> <li>4. Traffic/access</li> <li>5. Proximity to residential development</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Waste Planning Authority has had confirmation from the landowner of this site that the site is currently being used for storage, however it is still likely to be available for an extension to Brook Road and should therefore be fully considered.</li> <li>2. It is agreed that the available land is too small for the creation of a modern split level HRC. However, if an alternative site cannot be found this option would improve the existing site and alleviate some of the traffic impacts through better circulation.</li> <li>3. The Brook Road facility may be convenient for residents of Wimborne however the facility is very small, has poor access and in need of modernisation. An extension may be possible by this would enable only limited improvements.</li> <li>4. It is acknowledged that there are access difficulties along Brook Road and these may be increased by further development in the area. An extension would help to alleviate some of the traffic through better circulation.</li> <li>5. Recent developments have brought residential properties closer to the HRC. Available land to extend the existing facility should not bring the facility any closer.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The site is considered too small to create a modern, split level HRC, other sites are likely to be available in the Ferndown area that would enable this to be achieved.</b></p>
<b>ED02 – Blunts Farm, Ferndown</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste Vehicle Depot</li> <li>• Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>• Bulky Waste transfer/treatment</li> <li>• Residual waste treatment</li> </ul>	6 agree  25 disagree (most were general objections to the development of the site.5 specifically related to residual treatment)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Property devaluation</li> <li>2. Recreational use of site and impact on adjacent recreational land</li> <li>3. Impact on Castleman Trailway</li> <li>4. Impact on SNCI</li> <li>5. Land should be used for employment uses to support economic growth</li> <li>6. Traffic/Access</li> <li>7. Uddens Drive is unsuitable for HGV's</li> <li>8. Proximity to residential properties/schools – health impacts/noise/visual impacts</li> <li>9. Site previously rejected by Inspector</li> <li>10. Lack of information on what would be burnt on site</li> <li>11. Flood Risk</li> <li>12. Increase in vermin</li> <li>13. Energy from Waste Opportunities</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.</li> <li>2. The Blunts Farm site is allocated employment land and therefore will inevitably be developed in the near future. The site is considered to be well screened from Uddens and Cannon Hill plantations by both trees and the A31.</li> <li>3. The Castleman trailway is some distance from the Blunts Farm site and should not be affected by development.</li> <li>4. Blunts Farm is a large site, if the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon. This would exclude the SNCI and include an appropriate buffer from it.</li> <li>5. Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy. Further discussions will be necessary with the district council and the landowner to agree the most appropriate location for the required waste facilities.</li> <li>6. The Blunts Farm site is allocated employment land and therefore will inevitably be developed by uses that generate additional vehicle movements. It is acknowledged that this part of Dorset has congestion issues and the Waste Planning Authority is working with Highways England and the Highways Authority in developing preferred sites in the most appropriate locations.</li> <li>7. 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.</li> <li>8. Blunts Farm is a large site, if the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon this will take into consideration the distance from sensitive receptors, landscaping etc. Furthermore work is currently being undertaken to assess the suitability of the site for a range of treatment facilities. This will include an assessment of any likely emissions and their impact on the health of people living and working in the vicinity. If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</li> <li>9. It is acknowledged that this site has previously been rejected by a planning Inspector for a waste treatment facility. One of the key reasons for this decision was because the land was in the South East Dorset Green Belt. This is no longer the case, the land is allocated employment land in a good strategic location and therefore must be considered.</li> <li>10. One of the identified needs that is being considered for Blunts Farm is a facility to treat black bag rubbish that cannot be recycled or reused. Further information on what treatment technologies are available will be available to support the development of the preferred site.</li> <li>11. The site is within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding, and therefore should be appropriate for all types of development including waste management. However a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required at the planning application stage.</li> <li>12. Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. For all of the waste facilities being considered, the majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.</li> <li>13. It is agreed that this site, adjoining an existing industrial site has good opportunities for the generation of heat and power from waste.</li> </ol> <p><b>An objection has been raised by the landowner to this site for the development of waste management uses. As a result a wider area of search is being considered for all uses to allow flexibility.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>ED03 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate</b>	<p>This option is split into two parcels of land. Land to the east of the existing industrial estate and land to the south. Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste Vehicle Depot</li> <li>• Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>• Bulky Waste transfer/treatment</li> <li>• Residual waste treatment</li> </ul>	<p>4 agree 8 Disagree</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need to consider cumulative impact of waste development and further non waste development.</li> <li>2. Impact on visitors to Moors Valley County Park</li> <li>3. Impact on ecological designations – particularly southern site</li> <li>4. Flood Risk</li> <li>5. Land should be used for employment uses to support economic growth</li> <li>6. Location away from population HRC designed to serve</li> <li>7. Impact on existing and new business</li> <li>8. Contamination of the Moors River System</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is agreed that an assessment of cumulative impacts, particularly in relation to traffic movements would be helpful. However it should be noted that this site is allocated employment land and will inevitably be developed resulting in an increase in traffic movements.</li> <li>2. This site is allocated employment land and therefore will inevitably be developed. Moors Valley is some distance from this site therefore there should be no unacceptable impacts.</li> <li>3. Two separate areas of allocated employment land are being considered at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, if the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon this will take into consideration the distance from ecological designations. Furthermore work is currently being undertaken to assess the suitability of the site for a range of treatment facilities. This will include an assessment of any likely emissions and their impact on the environment.</li> <li>4. It is acknowledged that part of this site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. A Sequential Test will be required to ensure that development can be safely and sustainably delivered. Waste treatment facilities are classified as 'less vulnerable' and are appropriate in FZ1, 2 and 3a. However, the majority of the allocated land under consideration is within Flood Zone 1, the lowest risk of flooding, and therefore should be appropriate for all types of development including waste management.</li> <li>5. Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy. Further discussions will be necessary with the district council and the landowner to agree the most appropriate location for the required waste facilities.</li> <li>6. It is acknowledged that this site is further from the populations of Wimborne and Ferndown. However, it would serve as a more central HRC should it not be possible for East Dorset residents to use the Hampshire facility.</li> <li>7. Modern waste management facilities can be designed to be located alongside other non-waste uses. The majority of waste would be managed within enclosed buildings which are industrial in nature.</li> <li>8. The site drains into the sensitive Moors River. If this site were to be developed mitigation would be required to ensure there is no contamination. It is likely that this could be dealt with at the planning application stage.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan to address the strategic needs of residual treatment/bulky waste treatment</b></p> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage for HRC/Depot as there is likely to be a site available in a better location to serve the needs of Wimborne/Ferndown.</b></p>
<b>ED04 – West Moors Petroleum Depot</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste Vehicle Depot</li> <li>• Bulky Waste transfer/treatment</li> <li>• Residual waste treatment</li> <li>• Household Recycling Centre</li> </ul>	<p>4 agree 6 disagree</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proximity to ecological designations</li> <li>2. Water contamination/Moors River SSSI</li> <li>3. Location away from population HRC designed to serve</li> <li>4. Impact on the Green Belt</li> <li>5. Proximity to residential properties - health /noise/visual impacts</li> <li>6. Traffic/access</li> <li>7. Cost of purchase/lease may be prohibitive</li> <li>8. Plenty of available land</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is acknowledged that this site is in very close proximity to ecological designations and the Habitats Regulation's Screening concluded that there is a 'Likely Significant Effect'. If this site is progressed any impacts will need to be mitigated to an acceptable level.</li> <li>2. The site drains into the sensitive Moors River. If this site were to be developed mitigation would be required to ensure there is no contamination. It is likely that this could be dealt with at the planning application stage.</li> <li>3. It is acknowledged that this site is further from the populations of Wimborne and Ferndown. However, it would serve as a more central HRC should it not be possible for East Dorset residents to use the Hampshire facility. There is an additional issue with this site as it may not be publically assessable making it inappropriate for a HRC.</li> <li>4. It is acknowledged that the site lies within the Green Belt. The site is previously developed land and further work will be needed to consider the impact upon openness of the Green Belt.</li> <li>5. If the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon this will take into consideration the distance from sensitive receptors, landscaping, buffers etc. If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</li> <li>6. If this site emerges as a preferred site further work will be necessary to ensure a safe access can be developed. This site is more remote than other options and would see an overall increase in vehicle miles.</li> <li>7. The costs associated with bringing this site forward are currently unknown. If this site emerges as a preferred site an assessment of viability will be necessary.</li> <li>8. It is agreed that there is a large amount of brownfield land in this location however the deliverability of the site should be further tested including public access.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. There are sites available on allocated employment land outside of the Green Belt that are preferred.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>ED05 – Little Canford Depot, Hampreston</b>	Site being considered for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Vehicle Depot</li> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> </ul>	4 agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on SNCI</li> <li>Central location</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is considered that appropriate mitigation could protect the SNCI from adverse impacts this could include a buffer area between any development and the SNCI.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is well located to serve Wimborne, Ferndown and surrounding areas.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The landowner has confirmed that the site is being progressed for residential uses and is no longer available for a HRC and/or depot. In addition, there are sites available on allocated employment land outside of the Green Belt that would be preferred.</b></p>
<b>ED06 – East Dorset Police Headquarters</b>	Site being considered for one or more of the following uses; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Vehicle Depot</li> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Bulky Waste transfer/treatment</li> <li>Residual waste treatment</li> </ul>	5 agree 2 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor use of resources</li> <li>Flood Risk</li> <li>Impact on SNCI</li> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Away from residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order to develop this site for a waste management facility the current office block would have to be demolished. The site is currently being marketed, it is thought likely that a more appropriate use will be found for the site and existing buildings.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that the majority of the site lies in FZ2 and the southern end within FZ3. A Sequential Test will be required to ensure that development can be safely and sustainably delivered and that there are no sites in a lower flood zone available. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required. Most of site is in FZ2 and the proposed use could be considered in this zone (Less Vulnerable development classification) according to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</li> <li>It is considered that appropriate mitigation could protect the SNCI from adverse impacts this could include a buffer area between any development and the SNCI.</li> <li>This site is in a good strategic location with good access onto the A31.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that this site is away from residential properties with the closest being the other site of the A31.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The landowner has confirmed that the site is in the process of being sold and is unavailable for waste uses.</b></p>
<b>ED07 – Bailie Gate Industrial Estate &amp; Extension Area</b>	Site being considered for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Vehicle Depot</li> </ul>	4 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/Access</li> <li>Proximity to residential properties</li> <li>Water contamination</li> <li>Concern over waste storage</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bailie Gate is allocated employment land and therefore will inevitably be developed by uses that generate additional vehicle movements. The Waste Planning Authority will need to work with Highways England and the Highways Authority in developing preferred sites in the most appropriate locations. Consideration will need to be given to the impact of additional HGV movements on residential properties, shops etc along the access route.</li> <li>If the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon this will take into consideration the distance from sensitive receptors, landscaping, buffers etc. If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels. It should be noted that only a vehicle depot is being proposed on this site and therefore no storage of waste. There should be no odour/vermin issues associated with this development.</li> <li>Site is near Source Protection Zone 2. This site is in a more sensitive location on the Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation. The Environment Agency will require any development to carry out a more detailed risk assessment and will be subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination.</li> <li>Only a vehicle depot is being proposed on this site and therefore no storage of waste. There should be no odour/vermin issues associated with this development.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. A depot would be better located in Ferndown and sites are likely to be available for co-location of depot with HRC which would provide advantages.</b></p>
<b>ED08 – Land at Candy's Lane, Corfe Mullen</b>	Site being considered for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Vehicle Depot</li> </ul>	1 agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water contamination</li> <li>Traffic/Access</li> <li>Site preferred for a HRC</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is partly inside Source Protection Zone 1 and SPZ 2. Therefore particular protection of groundwater in the vicinity will be required by the Environment Agency. This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. It should be possible to place standard conditions to any planning application for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination.</li> <li>If this site emerges as a preferred site further work will be necessary to ensure a safe access can be developed. Highways England suggest that any application for development would need a robust transport evidence base to ensure that the actual movements to and from the site are at a level that would not adversely impact on the Strategic Road Network.</li> <li>This site was not considered for the development of a HRC because of the level of vehicle movements associated and impact on the A31. In addition a HRC at this location would be some distance from the population it is intended to serve resulting in an increase in vehicle movements along the A31.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. A depot would be better located in Ferndown and sites are likely to be available on allocated employment land and the co-location of depot with HRC would provide advantages.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>ND01 – Holland Way, Blandford</b>	Site being considered for a waste management centre	8 Agree 2 Disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access</li> <li>2. Size of site – short term option</li> <li>3. Cost may be prohibitive</li> <li>4. Well located</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Developing this site would require improved access. This would require landowner consent and purchase of additional land. Costs are unknown at this stage but if this site emerges as a preferred site an assessment of viability will be necessary.</li> <li>2. The availability of land at this location needs to be established when developing the preferred site. It will be important to ensure sufficient space is available to develop a modern waste management centre, that will meet the needs of Blandford both now and in the future. Further work to establish deliverability and viability will be necessary when establishing the preferred site.</li> <li>3. The costs associated with bringing this site forward are currently unknown. If this site emerges as a preferred site an assessment of viability will be necessary.</li> <li>4. It is agreed that this site already used as a waste transfer station and could benefit from expansion. It is in an industrial location and convenient for users.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. This site has been investigated by the Waste Planning Authority and Dorset Waste Partnerships but there are issues with the deliverability of this site, unwilling landownership and potential costs likely to prohibit development.</b></p>
<b>ND02 – Land of Shaftesbury Lane, Blandford</b>	Site being considered for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>• Waste Vehicle Depot</li> </ul>	4 agree 6 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Restricted capacity available</li> <li>2. Greenfield site/AONB</li> <li>3. Valuable employment land</li> <li>4. Proximity of residential properties</li> <li>5. Size of site</li> <li>6. Well located</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is agreed that this site would be too small for a Waste Management Centre but has been considered for a household recycling centre and/or waste vehicle depot. Although it may be most appropriate to locate all facilities together on one site this is not essential. It is considered that the available land should be sufficient for the development of a modern HRC or depot.</li> <li>2. This site is a green field site within the Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs AONB. However, it is allocated employment land within the Blandford bypass and is therefore considered appropriate for the development of waste management facilities.</li> <li>3. Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy. Further discussions will be necessary with the district council and the landowner to agree the most appropriate location for the required waste facilities.</li> <li>4. It is likely that any waste management use would be situated to the east of the site where there is outline planning permission for employment units. It is accepted that there are residential properties in close proximity and consideration will be needed to assess whether mitigation will satisfactorily reduce any impacts.</li> <li>5. It is likely that any waste management use would be situated to the east of the site where there is outline planning permission for employment units rather than the land with outline planning permission for the development of Asda superstore to the west. It is understood that the employment area to the east would provide 1.1ha of land which would be sufficient to develop a HRC or depot.</li> <li>6. It is agreed that this site is well located, within the Blandford bypass.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The landowner is not promoting the site for waste uses. This site could only accommodate HRC and depot, the preferred site would accommodate a waste management centre which provides advantages.</b></p>
<b>ND03 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• waste management centre</li> <li>• Waste Vehicle Depot</li> </ul>	7 agree 7 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic/access</li> <li>2. Greenfield site/"wrong side" of the bypass</li> <li>3. AONB</li> <li>4. Loss of agricultural Land</li> <li>5. Good sized site with good access and away from residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Further consideration will be needed, when developing the preferred site, to ensure that an appropriate access can be created to access this site. Initial indications are that it would be possible to create a new arm onto the roundabout to create an appropriate access.</li> <li>2. The area of land being considered lies outside of the existing settlement boundary, however a settlement boundary review could take place in the North Dorset Local Plan Part 2 or a neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>3. It is acknowledged that the site is in the AONB, if this site emerges as the preferred site further work will need to be undertaken to demonstrate that it is in the public interest having regard to a number of factors including need, impact on the local economy and the impact on the environment, landscape and recreation opportunities within the area and the extent to which these impacts could be mitigated.</li> <li>4. 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.</li> <li>5. There should be sufficient land available in this location for the development of a modern waste management centre and depot.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The site is situated in a good location to serve Blandford and surrounding villages and there is the potential to provide a new access. The site is being progressed outside of Waste Plan process.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>ND04 – Brewery Site, Blandford</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Vehicle Depot</li> </ul>	2 agree 6 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to town centre, better uses for the land</li> <li>Heritage value of the site</li> <li>Restricted capacity</li> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Flood Risk</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that the site lies within the Blandford St. Mary and Bryanston Conservation area and any development and any development should accord with the area's special architectural or historic interest. It is understood that archaeological recording of the brewery complex has been undertaken in relation to recent development, so there may be no further archaeological issues here.</li> <li>Given its size, the site is only being considered for a waste vehicle depot. It is agreed that the site would not be able to accommodate the wider waste management needs.</li> <li>Development of this site would require an assessment of the cumulative impact of this proposal plus other local committed development on the local network.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that a small part of site is within FZ2/FZ3. It was considered that development could be designed to avoid this area.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The landowner has confirmed that the site no longer available due to re-development.</b></p>
<b>ND05 – Land South of Pimperne</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>waste management centre</li> <li>Waste Vehicle Depot</li> </ul>	12 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside settlement boundary</li> <li>AONB</li> <li>Traffic/Access</li> <li>Distance from populations</li> <li>Flood Risk/Groundwater/river</li> <li>Agricultural Site</li> <li>Proximity to residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is agreed that the area of land being considered lies outside of the existing settlement boundary. However, a settlement boundary review could take place in the Local Plan Part 2 or a neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that the site is in the AONB, if this site emerges as the preferred site further work will need to be undertaken to demonstrate that it is in the public interest having regard to a number of factors including need, impact on the local economy and the impact on the environment, landscape and recreation opportunities within the area and the extent to which these impacts could be mitigated.</li> <li>The site promoter has provided two options for site layout and access proposals, in highway safety terms both are considered acceptable by DCC Highways.</li> <li>A HRC at this location would be some distance from the population it is intended to serve resulting in an increase in vehicle movement accessing the site.</li> <li>Most of site is in FZ1. However, there is a strip of FZ 2 and 3 along the north and east boundary. It is understood that any built development could be located away from the FZ2 and 3. The site is situated in a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ), the Environment Agency will require detailed risk assessment and additional mitigation measures to be put in place to manage any risks to groundwater. The Environment Agency has raised some concerns over the impact of development on Pimperne Stream. It is understood that otters are known to use this stream. They are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) and Conservation (Natural Habitats, &amp;c.) Regulations 1994 and will need to be protected during and post construction.</li> <li>It is understood that not all of the site is greenfield and there has been some spillage of the existing industrial development to the north on to the land to the south, however this needs to be confirmed. The landowner has confirmed that the site has not been used for grazing or agriculture or for over 20 years. It is currently used only for occasional clay pigeon shooting</li> <li>The closest residential properties lie to the north of the proposed site however there is existing employment development in between.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The preferred site has benefits over this site. The preferred site is in closer proximity to the town of Blandford and the catchment of the facility and has the potential to create a better access. Although both sites are in the AONB the preferred site is a more natural extension to an existing/established industrial estate and is being considered for a range of new uses.</b></p>
<b>ND06 – Land north of Wincombe Business Park, Shaftesbury</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> </ul>	2 agree 1 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside of the settlement and District boundary – site should be kept within Dorset</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is accepted that this site is outside of the settlement and District boundary. However it is adjacent to the existing HRC and is the only available option to improve the current facility within minimal impact on users.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The preferred site has advantages over this site such as being on allocated employment land. This site is in Wiltshire so will not be able to be allocated in the Dorset Waste Plan. This site is very small and although development here would be an improvement, development of a modern split level facility on this site would be unlikely to be achievable.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>ND07 – Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	2 Agree 2 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/Access</li> <li>Flood Risk</li> <li>Well located site</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option would be part of the much larger development of the Gillingham Southern extension which will require issues at New Road/Shafesbury Road to be resolved with the creation of a new access serving the extension area.</li> <li>The Gillingham southern extension is a large area of land, if the site emerges as a preferred site for a HRC it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon. A small part of wider Gillingham southern extension lies within FZ2/FZ3, it is thought that this land could be avoided.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is well located on allocated employment land. There is plenty of scope to develop a modern facility to serve both towns of Gillingham and Shaftesbury as they expand.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. There is plenty of available employment land in a good location, with planned access improvements, to the south of Gillingham which should be accessible to both residents of Shaftesbury and Gillingham. Further consideration is needed to consider if it is possible to reduce the land area to a more defined site allocation in the final Waste Plan.</b></p>
<b>ND08 – Enmore Green, Shaftesbury</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	3 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape impact – Inc. conservation areas</li> <li>High position, windblown litter</li> <li>Outside of the settlement boundary</li> <li>Ecological impact</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are concerns over the landscape and visual impacts of the development of this site which will need to be considered further if this site emerges as a preferred site.</li> <li>Modern, well run, waste management facilities should see all waste being managed in covered areas. There should be no issues associated with windblown litter.</li> <li>It is accepted that the area of land being considered is outside the settlement boundary</li> <li>The area of land being considered lies outside of the existing settlement boundary, however a settlement boundary review could take place in the North Dorset Local Plan Part 2 or a neighbourhood plan. It is likely that this site will need to be unlocked with the construction of a new link road between the A30 and B3081.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that there are a number of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest nearby. Development should not impact on these however a Phase 1 habitat survey would be required to demonstrate what ecological interests may be present.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The preferred site has advantages over this site including being allocated employment land. There are also significant landscape concerns to development on this site with no possible mitigation.</b></p>
<b>ND09 – Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works</b>	Site being considered for a; Sewage treatment works (expansion)	1 agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to residential properties - odour</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that there are existing residential properties within 200m to the north of the site boundary. It is understood that the area of land shown includes adequate space for mitigation of impacts including hedge planting and tree screening.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. This was the only option available to address the need to expand the STW.</b></p>
<b>PO01 – Area 2 and 3 Ling Road, Mannings Heath</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulky waste transfer/treatment</li> <li>Residual waste treatment</li> </ul>	2 agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial area</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is agreed that this is an existing industrial area appropriate for the development of waste management facilities.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. It is in a good strategic location with good accessibility. However, there is a danger that if the MRF is developed (as permitted) there is unlikely to be sufficient space for residual waste treatment in addition.</b></p> <p><b>It is proposed to allocate an 'area of search' including this site and SITA MRF site (PO04) to allow maximum flexibility.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>PO02 – Site Control Centre, Canford Magna</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intensification of existing uses within the existing site and/or proposed site</li> </ul>	3 Agree 4 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on heathland</li> <li>Traffic</li> <li>Cumulative impact of additional waste uses</li> <li>Green Belt</li> <li>Extension to the east – proximity to residential properties/schools</li> <li>B4 lagoon should be used to create an SNCI</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to the results of a Phase 1 habitat survey and reptile survey ecology is considered unlikely to present a major constraint to the extension of this site to the east. Further work will be required to assess how the continued use of existing site may affect any restoration of adjacent White's Land fill site and potential biodiversity enhancements. The extension B4 would be adjacent to SSSI SPA SAC and would mean the loss of lagoon which in the past it has supported various species, so require necessary surveys and mitigated if required.</li> <li>It is considered that the site has good access via a signalised junction and private haul road. It is acknowledged that congestion does occur in the area and the impact of additional traffic will need to be considered further.</li> <li>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. This work is likely to be most appropriate at the planning application stage.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that the site lies within the Green Belt. The site is however identified in Poole's Development Plan as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. Further work will be needed to consider the impact upon openness of the Green Belt of the two possible extension areas and intensification of the existing site. The screening provided by the existing vegetation helps to reduce its susceptibility and should be protected, retained and managed as part of any development.</li> <li>It is accepted that an extension to the east of the existing site would bring the site closer to the residential area of Bearwood. If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise and other impacts to acceptable levels. Further consideration will be given to any mitigation that would be required to reduce impacts to an acceptable level.</li> <li>At this stage, the B4 lagoon area is being considered as an extension of the site for waste management uses. If this is considered inappropriate the creation of an SNCI will be discussed with the site operator/owner.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site and the B4 lagoon extension are proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan.</b>  <b>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, therefore extend into it without harming the perceived openness of the green belt or the rural character of the surrounding area. However, this is not the case for the extension to the east of the site which is not proposed to be allocated. Land to the east is visually separate from the existing facility and is very rural in character.</b></p> <p><b>It is proposed to support intensification of this site through allocation of the existing site and B4 lagoon area in the Waste Plan which will enable increased capacity and the ability to manage waste further up the waste hierarchy.</b></p>
<b>PO03 – Nuffield Waste Management Centre</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bulky waste transfer/treatment</li> <li>HRC for use by Dorset Residents</li> </ul>	1 agree (bulky waste) 2 disagree (HRC)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial area</li> <li>HRC for East Dorset residents would increase traffic movements</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is agreed that this is an existing industrial area appropriate for the development of waste management facilities.</li> <li>It is agreed that closure of the Wimborne HRC and replacement with the Nuffield Waste Management Centre would increase the distance travelled by residents. This issues will need to be considered further when developing a preferred site for a HRC to serve the East Dorset area.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. A HRC to serve East Dorset in this location would result in increased vehicle movements. This would have only been an option if no suitable site could be identified within Wimborne or Ferndown.</b></p> <p><b>The site is also considered too small for any form of residual waste treatment.</b></p> <p><b>There is potentially sufficient available space for the development of a bulky waste management facility; however this would be within the existing waste transfer building. The WPA is not in a position to prove deliverability during the plan making process as the future of Poole's waste management contacts is unknown.</b></p>
<b>PO04 – Sita MRF, Mannings Heath</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residual waste treatment</li> </ul>	2 agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site already being used for waste management activities</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is agreed that this facility is already in use for waste management facilities and there is scope for further uses.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The site is small but the operator considers the site suitable for waste treatment so deliverability higher than allocation of a green field site.</b></p> <p><b>It is proposed to allocate an 'area of search' including this site and Ling Road site (PO01) to allow maximum flexibility.</b></p>



	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>PK01 – Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	1 agree  Several further comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ecological impact</li> <li>Traffic – impact on Sandford.</li> <li>Prime employment areas – impact on other users</li> <li>Cumulative impact of minerals and waste traffic should be considered</li> <li>Industrial area away from residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that this site is close to international ecological designations. However this is unlikely to present a major constraint to the development of a transfer station or depot.</li> <li>A transfer facility in this location would serve the needs of Purbeck and therefore most waste arriving at the site would arise from the west along Sandford Road. This waste would be bulked up and loaded into larger vehicles that are likely to be delivered to the treatment facilities located further east via the A35. The highways authority has no concerns over the development of a waste transfer facility or vehicle depot in this location.</li> <li>Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy. Further consideration will need to be given to any necessary screening or other forms of mitigation to ensure there are no unacceptable impacts other businesses in the vicinity.</li> <li>A Sustainability Report will be undertaken to support the final Waste Plan, this will include an assessment of cumulative impacts of waste development with other developments including where appropriate minerals proposals.</li> <li>It is agreed that this is an appropriate industrial location, consistent with national waste policy, away from residential properties.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The site is better located than other options and is allocated employment land which is consistent with National Policy for Waste.</b></p>
<b>PK02 – Dorset Green Technology Park</b>	Site being considered for a; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	2 agree 4 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compatibility with the ambition of the LEP, PDC and DCC – high tech companies defence/marine/and advanced engineering</li> <li>Traffic – level crossing/impact on rural roads</li> <li>Noise, odour, dust</li> <li>Ecological impacts</li> <li>Cumulative impact of minerals and waste traffic should be considered</li> <li>Flood Risk</li> <li>Ecological impact</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is understood that part of the site is being acquired by Purbeck District Council and Dorset County Council jointly and has been awarded Enterprise Zone status. There may be limitations on this land that could prevent a waste use. This is however a large site and it is likely that land could be available in the wider site, this will be investigated further when considering the preferred site.</li> <li>Issues raised relating to the impacts of additional traffic are noted, however this is an employment site and will be developed resulting in additional traffic. The highways authority has no concerns over the development of a waste transfer facility or vehicle depot in this location.</li> <li>It is considered that with appropriate mitigation, the uses being considered on this site would not result in unacceptable levels of noise, dust or odour. It should also be noted that development of a waste vehicle depot would not require the storage of waste on site.</li> <li>Dorset Green Technology Park is a large site, if the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider area can be agreed upon. This would take into consideration appropriate distances from ecological designations and mitigation.</li> <li>A Sustainability Report will be undertaken to support the final Waste Plan, this will include an assessment of cumulative impacts of waste development with other developments including where appropriate minerals proposals.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that part of the south east corner of the site is located within or adjoining Flood Zones 2 and 3. This is however a large site and it is likely that land could be available away from these more sensitive areas, this will be investigated further when considering the preferred site.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that there are international ecology designations adjacent to the site. However this is unlikely to present a major constraint to the development of a transfer station or depot incorporating appropriate mitigation.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The site is in a poor location to serve Purbeck and much of the site is unavailable.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>PK03 – Binnegar Environmental Park, Wareham</b>	Waste transfer facility –  Bulky waste transfer facility/Materials Recycling Facility	2 agree 3 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative impact of minerals and waste traffic should be considered</li> <li>Reduce the opportunity to restore the site</li> <li>Impact on Ecology</li> <li>Traffic impact – rural roads</li> <li>Site should be considered for a vehicle depot</li> <li>Mothballed site that could be quickly be brought back into use.</li> <li>Remote site, away from residential properties and well screened.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Sustainability Report will be undertaken to support the final Waste Plan, this will include an assessment of cumulative impacts of waste development with other developments including where appropriate minerals proposals.</li> <li>Further consideration will need to be given to restoration of the site if this site is to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan.</li> <li>There are ecological concerns relating to the additional activity, movement, disturbance and noise resulting from further development on this site. The loss of habitat creation opportunities caused by the lack of restoration is also of concern. Consideration will need to be given to whether mitigation could reduce these impacts to an acceptable level if this site emerges as preferred.</li> <li>Issues raised relating to the impacts of additional traffic are noted, however the highways authority has no concerns over the development of a waste transfer facility in this location.</li> <li>There are a number of reasons why this site has not been shortlisted for a waste vehicle depot. Firstly, it is considered that there are other options that are more consistent with the aims of national policy, due to their location on industrial/employment land. In addition, it is considered that development on this site would give rise to landscape/visual and ecological impacts. There are also unlikely to be opportunities for employees to utilise sustainable transport to access the site at a convenient time. This site is also poorly located given that the main populations the facility will serve are Wareham/Swanage. Given that there are more sustainable, alternative options for the development of a waste vehicle depot, Binnegar was discounted as an option for this use.</li> <li>A material recycling facility is located on the site but has recently been mothballed. Subject to planning permission this building could be used for an alternative use. However, the waste planning authority is not aware of the landowner/operators plans for the site.</li> <li>It is agreed that this is a remote site, however its remoteness gives rise to additional vehicle miles compared to sites closer to communities that generate waste.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The site is in a poor location to serve Purbeck and the preferred site is allocated employment land which is consistent with National Waste Policy.</b></p>
<b>WD01 – Land north of Monkey's Jump, Dorchester</b>	Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste Management centre</li> </ul>	5 agree 6 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape and visual impacts -AONB</li> <li>Proximity to existing and planned residential properties – noise/smells</li> <li>Site identified as a potential site for off-site biodiversity mitigation measures in relation to future developments at Poundbury</li> <li>Impact on bridleway (S8/5) forms a significant part of the rather limited network of public and permissive paths connecting Poundbury to the surrounding countryside</li> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Good size site, could accommodate all facilities</li> <li>Away from residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are concerns of landscape and visual impacts that could arise from development in this site in the AONB. Consideration of mitigation will be necessary if this site emerges as a preferred site.</li> <li>Although there are residential properties near to this site they are situated the other side of the A37 and should not be affected by development of a waste management facility. Modern, well run, waste management facilities should see all waste being managed in covered areas. There should be no issues associated with windblown litter, smells etc. It should also be possible to incorporate screening into any development to reduce the impact of noise to acceptable levels.</li> <li>There is a strategy for ecological mitigation related to the Poundbury development, however there are no proposals for this particular piece of land.</li> <li>It is acknowledged that a public footpath runs through this site. If this site emerges as a preferred site consideration will need to be given to the diversion of the footpath.</li> <li>There are concerns that it will be difficult to provide a safe/practical access to this site. If this site emerges as a preferred site this issue will need to be resolved with input from the Highways Authority and Highways England.</li> <li>It is agreed that this is a good sized site with plenty of space to co-locate all the required waste management needs in one place.</li> <li>It is also agreed that this site is separated from residential properties by the A37 which should ensure that there are no adverse impacts arising from a waste facility.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. There are considered better options outside of the AONB with less potential landscape/visual impacts and better access.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>WD02 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste Management centre</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	10 agree 2 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape and visual impacts -AONB</li> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Away from residential properties</li> <li>Established entrances/exists</li> <li>Well positioned with established buildings</li> <li>Suitable size to accommodate all facilities</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 emerges as a preferred site 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.</li> <li>This site is unlikely to be acceptable if development would lead to additional traffic movements across the A35. The development of a HRC is of particular concern for safety and capacity reasons. The site is also considered to be poorly located for a HRC as all traffic accessing it would have to travel further and use the A35. 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.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is away from the main populations of Dorchester and Poundbury. However there are a number of properties in the vicinity. It is considered that it should be possible to mitigate impacts.</li> <li>Again, it is agreed that this site has an established access that could be used by a waste facility.</li> <li>This site also has established buildings. It is likely that these would need to be retained and any additional buildings constructed behind, to minimise landscape impacts.</li> <li>It is unlikely to be possible to accommodate all waste management needs on this site.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan for the development of a waste transfer station and depot only.</b></p> <p><b>The site is not proposed to be progressed for HRC due to accessibility. There are more suitable locations for the publicly accessible site off the main trunk road network.</b></p>
<b>WD03 – Land south of stadium roundabout, Dorchester</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste Management centre</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	4 agree 7 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Landscape/AONB</li> <li>Flood Risk</li> <li>Impact on cycle path</li> <li>Impact on scheduled monuments</li> <li>Economies of scale – development of HRC and park and ride together.</li> <li>Away from residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are concerns over the development of this site in terms of additional traffic generation. This junction experiences peak time and seasonal capacity issues. The site is also considered to be poorly located as all traffic accessing it would have to use the A35.</li> <li>There are concerns of landscape and visual impacts that could arise from development in this site in the AONB.</li> <li>This site is within Flood Zone 1 and so should be suitable for development. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required, however it is considered that this could be undertaken at the planning application stage.</li> <li>If this site emerges as a preferred site the impact of waste management uses on the cycle path should be considered and mitigated.</li> <li>Any development on this site would require a pre-determination archaeological assessment and evaluation. The impact on the setting of Scheduled Monuments in the area such as Maiden Castle and Herringston round barrows would need to be included in the assessment.</li> <li>It is agreed that there could be advantages of developing a number of facilities in one location. This is unlikely to be appropriate in this location given the cumulative impacts of development.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is away from the main residential areas of Dorchester.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The site was found unsuitable for trunk road service station by West Dorset Local Plan Inspector. A Waste Management Centre would have similar impacts and therefore has been discounted.</b></p>
<b>WD04 – Charminster Depot</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	1 agree 3 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access/traffic</li> <li>Proximity to residential properties - recent outline permission for residential development</li> <li>Source Protection Zone 1.</li> <li>Site too small to accommodate all facilities</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the relatively small number of vehicle movements associated with a waste vehicle depot it is considered an appropriate use for this site.</li> <li>The extension area identified, that could accommodate a waste vehicle depot, would not bring development any closer to existing residential properties than the existing development. An outline application for residential development for up to 70 dwellings and a multi-purpose community building was recently approved on land to the south. This would be around 100m from the site and any impacts should be mitigated.</li> <li>It is understood that this site is within SPZ1, a more sensitive location on the Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation. Any development will require a more detailed risk assessment and will be subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site would be too small to accommodate all waste management facilities needed in the Dorchester area. This site is only being considered for a waste vehicle depot. There could be advantages of developing a number of facilities in one location. However, where this is not possible options for siting individual facilities are being considered. This location has other advantages as there are a number of existing facilities on the Charminster depot site that could be shared.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The existing uses would be complementary and a waste vehicle depot could share many of the facilities associated with the existing highways depot.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>WD05 – Land at Stinsford, Dorchester</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste Management centre</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood Risk</li> <li>Landscape impact</li> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Large site</li> <li>Away from residential properties</li> <li>Future development could take into account waste facility.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The southern half of the site is covered by FZ2 and FZ3. A Sequential Test will be required to ensure that development can be safely and sustainably delivered and that there are no sites in a lower flood zone available. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required. Further investigations are required to see if development could take place avoiding FZ2 and 3. In addition, detailed FRA required to assess fluvial flood risk, and other sources of flood risk.</li> <li>There are concerns about the landscape and visual impact of developing this green field site on the approach to Dorchester. However, given that it is outside the AONB further work will be necessary to consider if appropriate mitigation could minimise impacts to an acceptable level.</li> <li>There are traffic concerns given the sites proximity to Stinsford roundabout which raises the potential for adverse impact on this junction which experiences peak and seasonal capacity issues. If this site emerges as a preferred site further work will be required to ensure that an appropriate access can be developed. There could be benefits on the strategic road network from this location as many people will access the site from the west, therefore avoiding the A35. There are also advantages of having a waste facility on the east of Dorchester, as most of the waste collected would travel to the disposal/treatment facilities in the east of the county.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is large enough to accommodate all facilities subject to an assessment of cumulative impacts.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is away from the main residential areas of Dorchester.</li> <li>This is currently an undeveloped part of Dorchester. Allocating a site at this stage would ensure that any further non-waste development could take the waste facility into account in its design to minimise impacts.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Further consultation is proposed on a wider area of land to enable landscape mitigation measures to be incorporated into any future development. The site has advantages over other sites, it is outside the AONB and access would not be directly onto the trunk road network.</b></p>
<b>WD06 – Rainbarrow Farm, Martinston</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> <li>Waste transfer station</li> <li>Waste vehicle depot</li> </ul>	<p>1 agree 4 disagree</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape/AONB</li> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Away from residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are significant landscape and visual concerns related to further development on this site within the AONB. It is considered that impacts are unlikely to be able to be mitigated to an acceptable level.</li> <li>There are significant concerns over additional development of this site in terms of additional traffic generation and impact on capacity and safety issues. Development of this site would require all traffic to use the A35, Monkeys Jump roundabout.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is away from the main residential areas of Dorchester, however this would result in additional vehicle miles.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. There are considered to be better options outside the AONB with less landscape/highways impacts</b></p>
<b>WD07 – Loudsmill, Dorchester</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> </ul>	<p>10 agree 3 disagree</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/access</li> <li>Too small for all facilities</li> <li>Proximity to residential properties</li> <li>Flood Risk</li> <li>Brownfield site</li> <li>Established facility</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 HRC the immediate access along St Georges Road would also need to be improved. The expansion of the existing facility would improve circulation within the site and would ensure that the site would not need to close when skips are removed. These measures would reduce queuing traffic along St Georges Road.</li> <li>Mainly due to this sites location in a residential area and narrow access this site was only shortlisted for a HRC (expansion of the existing facility).</li> <li>It is considered that the site itself is a reasonable distance from residential properties and separated by industrial units and a sewage treatment works. Access to the site is through a residential area. If this site emerges as a preferred site further work will be required to ensure development would not have an unacceptable impact.</li> <li>A small part of site is within FZ2. If the site emerges as a preferred site for a waste management facility it is hoped that a more specific site within the wider allocation can be agreed upon, it is likely to be possible to avoid land within FZ2.</li> <li>This is a brownfield site within allocated employment land, development in this location would therefore be consistent with national policy for waste.</li> <li>A full site selection exercise has been undertaken to find appropriate locations for facilities to need the identified needs. Although this is an existing established facility this does not mean that this is the most sustainable location for expansion. The merits of this site will be assessed against other shortlisted sites.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The site has advantages over other options being outside the AONB and situated on employment land. Further investigate needed to define a specific site for allocation in final Waste Plan.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>WD08 – Parkway Farm Business Park, Poundbury</b>	<p>Site being considered for one or more of the following uses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household Recycling Centre</li> </ul>	2 agree 50 disagree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/Access – short access/safety/emergency vehicles</li> <li>Cumulative impacts of additional traffic from new housing/primary school</li> <li>Landscape/AONB</li> <li>Devaluation of property values</li> <li>Other sites could accommodate all waste management needs/problematic shape</li> <li>Surface water drainage issues</li> <li>Vermin</li> <li>Ecological impact</li> <li>Loss of community farm</li> <li>Prevailing winds – noise/smell/litter</li> <li>Impact on residential properties/allotments/college/nursery/businesses</li> <li>Loss of valuable employment land</li> <li>Fly tipping</li> <li>Light pollution</li> <li>Permissive path</li> <li>Good location to serve the town with good access</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although concerns have been raised regarding the local road network, advice from the Highways Authority is that the site is served by an adequate road network and appropriate junctions. Unlike other options, this site provides potential for trips to avoid the strategic road network. It will be important that the design and layout of a HRC in this location considers how vehicles will circulate to avoid queuing traffic onto Middle Farm Way. It is considered that this should be achievable.</li> <li>The Waste Planning Authority seeks comments from the Highways Authority and Highways England when considering the suitability of site options. The responses that are received take into consideration planned non-waste developments which in this case should include new housing and the development of a new school. There are not considered to be any capacity issues.</li> <li>Subject to appropriate design and mitigation it is not considered that this site would generate significant adverse landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB.</li> <li>In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.</li> <li>There could be advantages of developing a number of facilities in one location. However, where this is not possible options for siting individual facilities are being considered. Given the available land in this location the site was only shortlisted for a HRC as this was considered the most appropriate use.</li> <li>If this site emerges as a preferred site a detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required.</li> <li>Modern waste management facilities should not give rise to vermin. The majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings.</li> <li>Phase 1 habitat and common protected reptile survey required now to determine what ecological interests may be present.</li> <li>It is accepted that the development of this site would result in the loss of a community farm. However, this is allocated employment land and therefore will be developed in the near future.</li> <li>Modern, well run, waste management facilities should not give rise to smells or litter as the majority of waste would be stored within enclosed buildings. If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions could be attached to restrict noise to acceptable levels.</li> <li>The nearest residential properties are located on Laddock Green, some 150m to the north of the site, and Laddock Terrace, some 160m to the north west of the site. They are located to the north of Middle Farm Way and would be separated from a HRC by the Parkway Farm Business Park. There would be no treating of waste on site therefore there should be no unacceptable impact on the nursery, college or other businesses in the vicinity.</li> <li>Waste facilities are essential infrastructure and required to support economic growth. The development of waste facilities on allocated employment land is consistent with National Policy. Further discussions will be necessary with the district council and the landowner to agree the most appropriate location for the required waste facilities.</li> <li>There should be no issue with fly tipping from the development of a HRC, any waste that is left outside the site would be tidied up on a regular basis by HRC staff.</li> <li>This is an employment site and therefore inevitably will be developed. It should be possible to incorporate modern lighting solutions that do not have unacceptable impacts in terms of light pollution.</li> <li>No public rights of way cross the site.</li> <li>It is agreed that this site is in a good location to serve Dorchester and surrounding villages. Further work will be required to ensure that access to the site is appropriate.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. The landowner has confirmed that this site is being developed and therefore is unavailable for a waste use.</b></p>
<b>WD09 – Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works</b>	Site being considered for an expansion to the existing sewage treatment works.	Several comments were made	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape/AONB</li> <li>Proximity to residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are concerns that there may be an adverse impact on the Dorset AONB from this development. Further investigation will be required to consider whether it would be possible to extend the site to the north west?</li> <li>The nearest properties are situated to the west of the site and are separated from the facility by the Weymouth to Bristol mainline railway.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, however an alternative area of land is being considered to reduce the landscape and visual impacts by enabling mitigation to be built into any future development.</b></p>

	Summary of site option	Representations * all number are approximate	Summary of issues	Officer Response
<b>WD10 – Broadcroft Quarry, Portland</b>	Site being considered for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste transfer Station</li> <li>Inert landfill</li> </ul>	Several comments were made	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic – the road network cannot cope with extra traffic</li> <li>Transfer station should not delay restoration</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is an existing inert landfill and transfer facility. There should be no increased traffic as a result of extending the landfill and transfer operations to 2028.</li> <li>There is an identified need for a transfer facility to enable sorting, recycling and bulking of materials on Portland. It should be noted that an application is currently being considered for inert landfill along with time extensions for waste transfer activities crushing and screening operations and skip storage area. If approved there will be no need to allocate this site in the Waste Plan.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. An application is currently being considered for the extension of Broadcroft inert landfill and time extensions for the waste transfer activities, crushing and screening operations. If this application is approved there will be no need to allocate the site in the Waste Plan.</b></p>
<b>WD11 – Combefield Quarry, Portland</b>	Site being considered for; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste transfer Station</li> <li>Inert landfill</li> </ul>	Several comments were made	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic – the road network cannot cope with extra traffic</li> <li>Impact on public footpaths</li> <li>Proximity to residential properties</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments with regards to traffic are noted. It is not proposed to allocate Combefield quarry for inert fill as there is unlikely to be a need during most of the Plan period. As proposed the waste transfer station would have replaced the facility at Broadcroft therefore overall traffic movements would not be increased on Portland.</li> <li>It is not proposed to allocate this site for inert filling or transfer therefore there will be no effect on public footpaths.</li> <li>It is not proposed to allocate this site for inert filling or transfer currently, any future application for development at Combefield will have to consider the impact on nearby sensitive receptors.</li> </ol> <p><b>This site is not being shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan, at this stage. If permission is granted for the extension of Broadcroft inert landfill and time extensions for the waste transfer activities there is unlikely to be a need for further inert waste capacity on Portland until the end of the Plan period. It is proposed 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 there are restoration benefits.</b></p>

#### Other comments – relevant to many site options

Summary of Issue	Officer response
Any site should be capable of housing all required waste management activities in one place. This would minimise HGV movements.	A number of different facilities are required in some Dorset towns. It is agreed that there could be advantages and economies of scale from developing a number of facilities in one location. This has been considered when possible, often this is unlikely to be appropriate given the size of available sites, pressure from other non-waste developments and the cumulative impact of developing a number of waste management facilities in one location.
All sites should be located away from houses and schools etc.	Certain waste management facilities, such as household recycling centres, are best located within the communities they are designed to serve in order to minimise the distances that residents have to travel and reduce vehicle miles. Waste dealt with at these types of facilities tends to be stored within a building and impacts associated should be able to be minimised to an acceptable level with appropriate mitigation. The Waste Plan will highlight sensitive receptors such as residential properties that are located near to preferred sites for new/improved waste facilities. The details of mitigation, screening and appropriate buffer zones are best addressed at the planning application stage.
Sites should be future proof	The evidence that supports the Waste Plan has considered the waste management needs of the three authorities for throughout the plan period and beyond. It is important to ensure that preferred sites provide sufficient space/capacity for the future to reduce the need to relocate. Well-designed household recycling centres can often managed greater quantities of waste without the need for physical expansion. Simply by replacing the skips to remove the waste more frequently.
Concern over the increased costs associated by building new facilities when infrastructure already exists.	Financial viability and deliverability is an important issue that will be considered further when arriving at preferred sites for new/improved waste facilities. The cost associated with building new facilities will vary considerably and will need to be considered on a site by site basis. In some circumstances it will not be possible to retain/improve existing facilities. This could be due to the expiry of a lease.