

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 50

Given their close proximity to each other, have these sites' potential cumulative effects been adequately assessed including traffic impacts, harm to landscape, residents' visual and other amenity, and the historic environment?

1. No.
2. The three sites have been assessed as individual sites.
3. MPC believes it is wrong to assume that these three quarries will create one vast quarry. They will not. As a result MPC does not believe they will create any potential cumulative effects.
4. It should also be borne in mind that all 3 sites will not operate at the same time.
5. Station Road and Hurst Farm are planned to operate sequentially. So at most, only 2 quarries will operate at any one time.
6. The sites will be operated on the same principle as the current Woodsford Quarry, that is by progressive extraction and concurrent restoration.
7. The Hurst Farm and Woodford Extension quarry sites are relatively remote and distant from the Station Road quarry site, and hence their visual impact will be very limited. This is especially the case for the Woodsford Extension proposed quarry.
8. Because of the cumulative impact of the Station Road quarry, the development of over 1554 houses in Moreton and Crossways and consequent traffic growth on the B3390 it is the strong view of Moreton Parish Council (MPC) strongly suggest that the proposed Station Road quarry should be deleted from the list of allocated quarries in the MSP.
9. In the light of Moreton Parish Council's work on the Mineral Strategy and attendance at the Mineral Strategy Examination, the council recognise that DCC is obliged to nominate enough quarries to achieve an annual aggregate output target.
10. However, as indicated in MPC's response to the MSP Pre-Submission Draft MS1 and reiterated in MPC's answer to the Inspector's question 9, the MSP aggregate output will only briefly come up to the aggregate target and for the majority of the time will produce less than the required amount of aggregate.
11. MPC has proposed in the past alternative sites which would be entirely suitable to replace the Station Road quarry, including the larger of the two Gallows Hill site. But DCC have, as indicated in MPC's answer to Question 24, DCC have not indicated a willingness to consider suggested alternative sites.

12. MPC highlighted in its response to MS-2 that whilst the area of search indicates a plentiful supply of aggregate is located in Dorset, very little of it has been offered to the DCC for consideration for extraction.
13. As a result, MPC proposed in its response to MS-2 that DCC should request at the Examination that its annual aggregate output target should be reduced to take account of the limited availability of aggregate and to conserve stocks.
14. Thus MPC is strongly committed to pressing for the deletion of the proposed Station Road quarry and has made worthwhile suggestions on how the already inadequate aggregate supply which will result from the MSP can be accommodated.
15. MPC does not believe that there will be potential cumulative impacts between Hurst Farm and the Woodsford Extension.
16. The traffic from the Woodsford Extension will not access the B3390 road but will exit the site through the existing exit from the current Woodsford Quarry. Only Hurst Farm will access the B3390 and vehicles will predominantly travel north and not south to Crossways.
17. The Station Road quarry will be virtually amidst the likely traffic congestion at the Moreton Station level crossing.
18. In comparison to the Woodsford Extension and Hurst Farm proposed quarries the Station Road quarry will be very visible to the residents of Station Road, the relocated caravan park on the opposite side of the B3390, to the residents of Woodsford Drive in Moreton Station Settlement and to the vehicles using the Redbridge to Moreton Tea Rooms and the surrounding dwellings and Lawrence of Arabia's grave.
19. The Station Road proposed quarry will have a major impact on the Moreton Conservation area, the local facilities such as equestrian events and historical features in Moreton by virtue of its proposed bunds, working machinery, noise, piles of aggregates, debris and dust on Station Road and frequent hgv vehicle movements.
20. The Hurst Farm quarry will have only limited impact on the Conservation area and the Woodsford Quarry extension will have no impact on Moreton.
21. It is MPC's strong belief that it is the proposed Station Road quarry which will have the most dramatic impact on Moreton and Crossways through the cumulative impact of the quarrying within Moreton and adjacent to Crossways and this impact will be dramatically compounded by the proposed 1554 housing developments in Moreton and Crossways and the consequent dramatic traffic build up to at least 81% capacity along the B3390.
22. By comparison the impact of the Hurst Farm proposed quarry on Moreton and Crossways and the B3390 will be relatively modest.
23. Because the proposed Woodsford quarry extension is some way from both Moreton and Crossways and it will not use the B3390, it will have very little impact on Moreton and Crossways and will not be visible.
24. Station Road, Hurst Farm, Woodsford extension proposed quarries will not have a cumulative impact.

25. But the Station Road quarry, adjacent Moreton and Crossways 1554 housing developments, and dramatic traffic build up and congestion on the B3390 from about the Station Road quarry and southwards that will be the major cumulative impact to be avoided.
26. Deleting the Station Road quarry from the MSP list of allocated quarries will help towards the reduction of this cumulative impact.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm

Question 51

Should more direction be given in the DGs on mitigating cumulative effects to an acceptable level?

1. Yes.
2. But the direction should be much more imaginative and far more helpful than simply recommending the use of bunds.
3. Bunds are extremely ugly, and only serve to hide less ugly scenes behind.
4. Extensive experience with the extant quarries around Moreton and Crossways and has unequivocally established that bunds do not attenuate noise and serve no purpose other than to hide incompetent management.
5. The directions could offer advice on sequential operation of quarries, investigating alternative quarry sites to proposed quarries, not planning quarries in close proximity to communities, operating quarries on a just in time basis, advising on major and ongoing noise reduction techniques with yearly targets for incremental noise reduction, advising on how quarries can easily be made attractive by suitable planting of flower and trees, operating effective wheel washes, not allowing the burning of any material on site, not storing machinery on site, de-industrialising the appearance of sites, making a very strong and public commitment to prompt and ongoing restoration such that when the last load leaves the site, a month later the site is completely vacated, the gate closed and the site returned to farming or some other non-industrial use.
6. Essentially quarries are still managed and operated today with the mindset prevalent in the 19th century, which is entirely inappropriate for the 21st century.
7. There are no reasons why aggregate quarries should not be quiet, attractive, productive and profitable locations which blend well with the surrounding countryside and which are accepted by local communities rather than being considered repellent by local communities.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm

Question 52

The SA indicates that the main areas of cumulative traffic impact are likely to be along the B3390 and particularly the two narrow Hurst Bridges and the Waddock Cross junction, where there has previously been an accident problem. Does the transport assessment adequately consider and resolve these potential impacts taking account of all minerals and other built development in the area?

1. The Traffic Impact Assessments, MSDCC – 35 and 36 primarily focus on the traffic build up in Crossways but also consider the wider area especially at the Moreton and Woodsford No 38 level crossings, the bridge over Highgate Lane, and states that *the biggest impact being on the A35/A352 Dorchester Bypass junction* (all in the Executive Summary, page 4)
2. The Traffic Impact Assessments have recorded readings at Waddock Cross and the Hurst Bridges but make no comment about the traffic at these locations. The Executive Summary does state that: *The modelled volume over capacity figures show that the other junctions can cope with the predicted AM peak traffic.*
3. I have noted in my answer to question 27 that the I consider that the Traffic Impact Assessments are too optimistic because they overlook several key factors. However these factors are not due to the present hgvs or be exacerbated by the future quarry hgvs.
4. The Executive Summary also states: *Total quarry related traffic is predicted to reduce as in future only two quarries will be working simultaneously rather than the current three.*
5. Even this is a significant overestimate since the proposed Station Road and Hurst Farm sites will be worked sequentially, and the Woodsford Extension quarry hgvs will exit via the existing Woodsford quarry exit and travel to the Dorchester bypass before proceeding to their ultimate destination.
6. The number of quarries hgvs on the B3390 will be far outnumbered by the other commercial hgvs should the proposed quarries be operated.
7. Problems at the Hurst Bridges and at Waddock Cross are almost invariably caused by cars travelling too fast and not taking enough care at both locations. Quarry lorries invariably allow on coming vehicles to cross the narrow Hurst Bridge closest to Moreton before they cross. The second Hurst Bridge is wide enough to allow 2 way traffic.
8. Lorries turning towards Bere Regis at Waddock Cross are usually fully laden and travelling slowly. This is because of their limited manoeuvrability due to their full loads. They invariably take the corner in a cautious manner.
9. I passed the scene of the most recent crash at Waddock Cross and it only involved cars. I have also passed previous crash scenes at Waddock Cross and they all only involved cars.

10. In short, the existing quarry hgv drivers are extremely familiar with the local road network as they travel along it 5/6 days a week. It is their livelihood and they do not appear to want to jeopardise it by careless driving or being involved in an accident. It is extremely unusual to be in any way affected by the quarry lorries on the local roads.
11. Regrettably the same cannot be said for a minority of car drivers.
12. In future there will simply be far too few quarry hgvs relative to the dramatic growth in the number of cars on the local roads due to the housing increase, for the quarry hgvs to be considered a problem.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 54

I note that the traffic modelling in the Moreton/Crossways/Woodsford Traffic Impact Assessments 2016 appear to be based on a SATURN model of the Crossways area created in 1999, although the network was audited and the model altered to reflect current conditions. How have changes in development between then and the 2016 base year been taken into account within the assessment?

1. I have provided an answer to question 27 which which partly covers this question.
2. I have repeated the relevant part of my answer to question 27 below:

10. The study makes no allowance for the congestion which currently occurs on the B3390 Warmwell Road in proximity to the Co-op shop. It is not unusual for the traffic to be reduced to almost a standstill one lane due to cars and heavy goods vehicles parking on the road due to the very limited car parking, as drivers access the shop. Neither the West Dorset Local Plan, Preferred Options or Purbeck Local Plan, or the Joint Working Group for Crossways and Moreton of which the MSP DCC author is a member, have proposed any additional parking.
11. The Traffic Impact Study has not taken any account of the very serious congestion at the Co-op.
12. The Traffic Impact Study has also not taken account of the fact that Summer Farm and the new Crossways surgery and village hall will require access to and from the B3390 Warmwell Road, further adding to congestion on the road. Pedestrian access the Summer Farm estate, surgery and village hall will all have to take place across the very busy B3390.
13. The Traffic Impact Study does not state that it has allowed for the fact that the Moreton Station level crossing one lane gates are due to be replaced by gates which span the road, in the same manner as the level crossing gates at Wool. Whereas by design the one lane gates remain down for a couple of minutes at most, because there is always an exit route available should a car inadvertently be in the middle as the gates are lowered, the full gates will remain closed for extended period as is currently the case at Wool to allow a car stuck in the middle time to arrange an exit before a train arrives.
14. This will produce very significant congestion on the B3390.
15. The study was conducted in the spring of 2016 which the report states on page 10 represents a *neutral time of year*. The report therefore does not project the likely traffic increase in the summer months which might well exceed the 85% congestion threshold (page 26, paragraph 5.21)
16. None of this appears to have been taken into account in the Traffic Impact Study.
17. Thus, for the only traffic impact study in the Examination Library, the answer to question 27: *In general, has adequate transport evidence been obtained for the allocated sites, both individually and in combination with other developments?* is most definitely no.

3. The Traffic Impact Assessment does include a significant amount of data from a number of monitoring locations across a wide and appropriate local area.
4. The study has considered a fairly accurate housing increase for the Crossways area in the worst case SC5 scenario.
5. The study states on page 4 in the Executive Summary that: *The new model adequately reflects current (2016) average traffic flows.*
6. It would appear, however that the model results could be considered an underestimate of the likely future traffic because of the absences noted above in the extract from my answer to question 27.
7. The fact that no attempt has been made to indicate the likely increase in traffic during the summer months represents a significant omission.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm

Question 55

In its Site Assessment comments on AS-25 and AS-26, Highways England refers to traffic modelling only being inter-peak period. Has this now been resolved to include all peak periods?

1. The Traffic Impact Assessment (AM Peak) (MSDCC – 35) states on page 10 that the *AM period* is an average of 0800 to 0900.
2. The Traffic Impact Assessment MSDCC – 37 states on page 10 in paragraph 2.8 that: *The model represents current (2016) conditions for a neutral time of year (spring) for the inter-peak period (average of 10:00 to 16:00).*
3. Thus only the AM peak period has been covered.
4. From subjective observations the PM peak period although similar to the AM peak period is not the same.
5. Thus the answer to question 55 is that only one of the two working day peak periods has been studied.
6. This omission combined with the other omissions note in the answers to questions 27 and 54 mean that the Traffic Impact Assessments are of limited value and the peak and inter-peak traffic growth is very likely to be greater than the studies report and importantly, the likelihood of congestion from the proximity of the Station Road proposed quarry site through Moreton Station and through Crossways is much more likely than the Traffic Impact Assessment (AM Peak) has projected.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 56

Also Highways England refers to the conclusion that there will be less traffic on the network as only two sites will be operating in the future and it asks for clarification. Would the Councils please clarify?

1. The Traffic Impact Assessment (AM Peak) (MSDCC – 35) states on page 4 in the Executive Summary that: *Total quarry related traffic is predicted to reduce as in future only two quarries will be working simultaneously rather than the current three.*
2. The Executive Summary also states that: *The worst case scenario (SC5) contained 81.3% more trips than the base 2016 year.*
3. The worst case scenario is the one applicable to Crossways as it envisages a future housing growth: *of 2,800 dwellings around Crossways* (Executive Summary). As the Encirclement Map shows, housing growth around Crossways and Moreton is planned and proposed to be in excess of 2500 houses.
4. It should be noted that within about 5 years in the next review of the Local Plan it is very likely that even more houses could well be proposed for Crossways bringing the total to more than 3000 houses.
5. It is planned in the MSP Pre-Submission Draft that only one quarry at a time will access the B3390.
6. The Woodsford Extension Proposed quarry will use the existing access to the Woodsford Quarry and the vehicles are planned to travel west and not through Crossways and along the B3390 road.
7. Only the Station Road and Hurst Farm proposed quarries will access the B3390 road and since they are planned to operate sequentially there will only be one quarry accessing the B3390.
8. It is the dramatic increase in car traffic due to the cars from the more than 2500 new houses that will create the greatly increased road traffic on the B3390.
9. The 2011 census results indicate that the ratio of cars to houses in Crossways is 1.4. Crossways currently has about 1100 houses and therefore this equates to about 1540 cars.
10. The increase of 2500 house will raise the total number of houses to about 3600 and the number of cars to between 3600 and 5040 (@1.4 per house).
11. By comparison the 40 hgvs entering and 40 hgvs leaving either the Station Road or Hurst Farm proposed quarries on a daily basis hardly registers.
12. There are far more non-quarry lorries on the B3390 road than quarry lorries.
13. The reduction in traffic in the question may refer to the statement in the Executive Summary that: *Traffic flows on the B3390 north of Crossways and A352 west of Owermoigne have reduced over the last ten years'.*

14. Whilst traffic on the B3390 may have reduced over the past 10 years, the Traffic Impact Assessment for the future projects a dramatic increase in traffic on the B3390: *The worst case scenario (SC5) contained 81.3% more trips than the base 2016 year (Executive Summary).*

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 57

I understand from representations that there is a proposal to designate a Dorset National Park within the lifetime of the MSP and that it would include the area covered by these three sites. What is the position with this proposal and does it need to be referenced in the MSP?

1. The proposal to create a Dorset National Park is merely a proposal at the moment.
2. It is very instructive to study an Ordnance Survey map which shows the boundary of the recently established South Downs National Park. The boundary makes significant detours to exclude features such as villages, roads and other features not deemed worthy of inclusion in the National Park.
3. Thus whilst a Dorset National Park might well include the Jurassic Coast and AONBs, the boundary may well be drawn to exclude the large village of Crossways and the surrounding quarry sites.
4. It is by no means certain that the Dorset National Park will be created in the period of the MSP Pre-Submission Draft, but if it is the example of the South Downs National Park indicates that Crossways and the area containing Cluster 4 would be very unlikely to be included.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 58

The DGs indicate that AS-25 and AS-26 will not be worked simultaneously. How is this likely to work in practice and does it have implications for working the two sites within the Plan period?

1. The outline proposal for AS-25 and AS-26 indicates that the processing plant will be located on AS-26 and that AS25 will be operated first.
2. The transfer of material from AS-25 to the processing plant may be either by conveyor or by road.
3. The Woodsford Quarry has plans to transfer material from the proposed extension AS-19 and from the approved eastern section of the quarry to the processing plant at the western end of the existing quarry by conveyor.
4. In the case of AS-19 the conveyor will cross over the Woodsford – Moreton road and also over the Crossways – Woodsford road. In the case of the eastern section of the approved quarry only the conveyor over the Crossways – Woodsford road would be necessary.
5. Thus in theory and probably in practise it will be possible to operate the Station Road quarry with the processing plant on the Hurst Farm site because almost exactly the same arrangement has already been approved for the Woodsford Quarry eastern and western sections.
6. The Woodsford Quarry already uses a conveyor system to transfer material back to its processing plant as the extraction and restoration process move eastward.
7. The use of road vehicles to transfer material would increase the traffic on the B3390 between the Station Road and Hurst Farm sites and would be more problematic. This is because of the greatly increased traffic on the B3390 due to the housing developments in Moreton and Crossways and the fact that at the point at which lorries would enter the B3390 the traffic is usually traveling at about 50mph or more.
8. The option to locate the processing plant on the Station Road site first and transfer it to the Hurst Farm site is possible.
9. The *Site Assessment of AS25 – Station Road* states that the *Expected Life of Operation is c. 15 years*.
10. The MSP Pre-Submission Draft states on page 13 in paragraph 3.9 that the: *If the Mineral Sites Plan is adopted in 2018, a 15 year plan period would end in 2033.*
11. If the Station Road proposed quarry is approved and the MSP is adopted in 2018 it will take at least 2-3 years if not more to process the planning application, establish the relevant plant on site and the processing plant on the Hurst Farm site, and the conveyor (if used) between the Station Road and Hurst Farm sites.

12. It is probable that the Station Road will not start producing aggregate until about 2021 or later. The 15-year operating period would therefore last until about 2036 or later.
13. This would mean that allowing say up to a year for the run-down of the Station Road site and build up of the Hurst Farm site, the latter would not start extraction operation until about 2037 or later.
14. Thus whilst the Hurst Farm site processing plant will start producing in about 2021 or later, the site will not start extraction operations until about 2037.
15. *The Site Assessment of AS26 – Hurst Farm* states that the *Expected life of operation is c. 16 years*.
16. If Hurst Farm starts operation in 2037 it will theoretically end operations in 2053 or later.
17. Thus approval of the MSP Pre-Submission Draft in 2018 is likely to mean quarry operations in Moreton until 2053 or later.
18. Since the Redbridge Quarry, also on land owned by the Station Road and Hurst Farm land owner, has been in operation since the early 1950s, these three quarries will span over a hundred years.
19. This is yet another example of the fragility and lack of supply of aggregate in Dorset. Despite DCC's professed very wide area of search and therefore theoretical availability of aggregate in Dorset, the actual availability of sites and therefore of extraction has and is increasingly limited to a very small number of landowners and locations.
20. Question 59 indicates that both the Station Road and Hurst Farm sites contain about 30% more aggregate than previously stated. Simplistically this would increase the period of extraction for both sites by about 30% meaning that the Station Road site period of operation would increase from 15 to 19 years and the period of operation for Hurst Farm would increase from 16 to about 21 years.
21. On these figures the Hurst Farm site would not start extraction operations during the period of the approved MSP Pre-Submission Draft.
22. A further factor which will extend the life of the quarries is that according to the Halletec report extraction will be to a depth of about 10m BGL (MSPEXT-09 page 2, 4th paragraph) and that restoration will *...use imported inert restoration materials...* (MSPEXT-09 page 2, last paragraph).
23. The AS25 landowner, Mr Frampton, also owns the land on which the Redbridge Quarry is operated and which uses imported inert restoration materials. This has meant that parts of the Redbridge Quarry which should have been restored by 2014 have still not been restored. Other parts of the site have been officially programmed to take at least 5 years to restore including the importation of inert material, with possible completion by December 2023. Large parts of the site are used as a dumping ground for inert material as can easily be seen from Redbridge Road.
24. Extremely dubious fires have been lit on site at regular intervals which burn even during periods of torrential rain, ice and prolonged covering by snow, and even on Christmas day, all of which has been documented, photographed, sent to DCC and raised at the DCC Regulatory Committee on at least 2 occasions when restoration Planning Applications have been submitted. Fires were lit adjacent to trees and bushes and left unattended during the hottest times of the recent heatwave. The fires were within

about 50 yards of the nearest dwelling with at least 17 other dwellings in close proximity. This was reported in writing to DCC and images recorded.

25. Given that Mr Frampton's Redbridge Quarry is about half the size of the proposed Station Road quarry, the use of inert material for restoration will probably mean that the proposed Station Road quarry will take at least 10 to 15 years to restore based on the timescales for Mr Frampton's Redbridge Road quarry.
26. Based on the operation of Mr Frampton's Redbridge Road quarry it is also likely that the Station Road quarry will be used to process inert material for the restoration of the Hurst Farm quarry site.
27. The Hurst Farm site may complete extraction by 2061 and therefore adding a further 5 years for inert material restoration, the site may complete by 2066.
28. On completion of restoration of the Hurst Farm site, completion of restoration of the Station Road site may take a further 5 years using inert material with completion by 2071.
29. But based on the operation and restoration of Mr Frampton's Redbridge Road quarry, these timescales could well move right.
30. Thus the Station Road quarry could be in operation from 2022 to 2071, at total of about 50 years.
31. From extensive experience of Mr Frampton's Redbridge Road quarry, these are optimistic timescales.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 59

According to the Halletec site investigation of June 2018 the sand and gravel resource for AS-25 and AS26 appears to be present throughout the whole site and includes both Poole Formation and River Terrace sand and gravel of commercial quality. I understand that the figures represent an increase of about 30% over previous estimates, which did not show the Poole Formation resource.

- a) *Should MSP Policy MS 1 be modified to reflect the increase and subdivision of resource?*
- b) *Do the DGs require any modification as a result of this investigation?*

Should MSP Policy MS 1 be modified to reflect the increase of resource?

1. Yes, the MSP Policy MS-1 should be modified to reflect the increase in resource available.

Should MSP Policy MS 1 be modified to reflect the subdivision of resource?

2. Applying the subdivision of resource should only be incorporated if the same is applied to all other references to aggregates in all documents dealing with aggregates including the Mineral Strategy aggregates section.
3. This would include sub-dividing Dorset's annual aggregates total and a reappraisal of which sites are selected and allocated in Policy MS-1.
4. The Pre-Submission Draft would need to be withdrawn and the revised MSP incorporating the revised sub-divided annual aggregates target and the sites allocated to achieve the sub-divided totals.
5. This in turn could mean a more finely tuned use of the allocated sites such that in some cases only Poole Formation sand and gravel are extracted and the River Terrace sand and gravel are not extracted or are put back into the land because it is not required to meet the River Terrace sand and gravel annual target.
6. Thus including a sub-division of sand and gravel reserves into Poole Formation and River Terrace in Policy MS-1 will mean a major re-working of the MSP targets and which sites are allocated and all the site assessments of the nominated sites.
7. A major amendment to the Mineral Strategy would also be necessary to reflect the new desire to reflect the subdivision of aggregates into Poole Formation and River Terrace reserves.
8. This process will probably set the MSP examination back by at least 1 to 2 years.
9. If the target is to adopt the MSP in 2018 then aggregates should not be sub-divided into Poole Formation and River Terrace minerals.

Do the DGs require any modification as a result of this investigation?

10. The answer to this question depends on the answer to the section of the first question about sub-dividing aggregates into Poole Formation and River Terrace..
11. The change from merely considering aggregates to considering Poole Formation and River Terrace as separate minerals is profound and will affect almost all aspects of aggregates in the MSP process and the Mineral strategy.
12. As such changing from considering just aggregates to considering Poole Formation and River Terrace as separate minerals is too profound a step at this stage in the approval of the MSP Pre-Submission Draft and its adoption in 2018 and should not be considered.

Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)

**ii) Mineral Site Clusters (shown on Fig 4 of the SA)
Cluster 4: AS19 Woodsford Ext, AS25 Station Rd, AS26 Hurst Fm**

Question 60

Should the DGs for each site make reference to this cluster of three?

1. No.
2. Station Road AS25 and Hurst Farm As26 will not operate at the same time.
3. From my rough calculation in my answer to question 59, Station Road will now have an operational life of about 19 years and Hurst Farm about 21 years as a result of increasing the reserves by 30%.
4. The *Site Assessment of AS19 – Woodsford Extension* states: *Expected life of operation: approximately 10 years.*
5. Thus Woodsford Extension will only operate for about half the time of Station Road and Hurst Farm
6. Woodsford Extension will not operate at the same time as Hurst Farm.
7. The Woodsford Extension is some distance from Station Road and cannot be seen from Station Road.
8. The proposed cluster of three does not include the far larger and approved Woodsford Quarry which will extend from beyond the west of Crossways right up to Moreton Station settlement. It will also be in operation for about 10 years or more after the Woodsford Extension proposed quarry has ceased operation.
9. Woodsford Quarry will have a far greater impact on Crossways and Moreton than Woodsford Extension and Hurst Farm.
10. The Station Road proposed quarry presents a far greater threat to Moreton than the Woodsford Quarry because it is right in the middle of Moreton, but it will combine with the Woodsford Quarry to form the northern encirclement of Moreton Station Settlement and Crossways.
11. By comparison with the proposed Station Road quarry, the Hurst Farm and relatively small Woodsford Extension proposed quarries will have very limited impact on Moreton and Crossways.
12. Thus, linking the Station Road, Hurst Farm and Woodsford Extension quarries as a cluster of 3 is illogical, and serves no purpose.
13. More profoundly, it takes attention away from the dramatic impact which the proposed Station Road quarry would have on Moreton and Crossways.

14. It is the proposed Station Road quarry which should be deleted because of its tremendous cumulative impact on Moreton, Moreton Station and Crossways.
15. Crossways is planned by West Dorset and Purbeck Councils to grow by over 2500 dwelling resulting in a total number of houses in Moreton and Crossways of about 3750 which, at a minimum of 2 persons per dwelling equates to 7500 people.
16. The proposed Station Road quarry is right in the middle of Moreton, will directly affect thousands of people, impact directly on historical features in Moreton and the Moreton Conservation Area, will directly impact on Dorset's number one industry of tourism by blighting Moreton, 2 adjacent caravan parks and a 1000 house holiday centre and be contiguous with a major traffic congestion point at the level crossing at Moreton Station.
17. Hurst Farm will have a minor impact on the surrounding dwellings but virtually none on Moreton itself. Woodsford Extension has a comparatively short period of operation, is not adjacent to a significant settlement such as Moreton Station, Moreton or Crossways or a major road like the B3390.
18. Thus, there is very little to link the three sites and hence they should not be combined into a cluster of 3