

**Schedule of comments made to the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan**

The following schedule includes all comments received to the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. The schedule also includes an initial officer response and where appropriate proposed modification. A separate modifications schedule is available **WPDCC55**.

The schedule also refers to a separate report detailing responses to issues raised to site allocations. **See WPDCC53**

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 4	Paragraph	1.1				Crown Estate	Mr Robin Warner			Noted	None
PS D-WP 71	Paragraph	1.1		Yes	Yes	Gillingham Town Council	Sylvia Dobie			You support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 254	Paragraph	1.1		Yes	Yes	Purbeck District Council	Ms Anna Lee	Purbeck District Council considers that the Waste Plan is sound and legally compliant.	n/a	You support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 214	Paragraph	1.1			Yes	Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft dated December 2017. We consider the plan and its supporting documents to be sound. We do however wish to make a few points in the following paragraphs and some of these recommend minor amendments to the plan. We also provide our more detailed comments on each of the proposed sites at the end of this letter.		You support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 304	Paragraph	1.1				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Thank you for the hard work you have put into a well-written plan. As environmentalists, we would have preferred more of a slant towards zero waste and the circular economy but we are happy that you have taken environmental considerations into account in line with Government policy and considered related things like co-location and proximity as well as things like pollution and disturbance to nature. Even at this late stage, we feel that its open to you, on behalf of the Waste land-use planning authorities, to go a bit further (down the sustainability route) than you have. Thank you not only for implementing our suggestion that waste sites can be included as an overlay on the Dorset Explorer map on <a href="http://explorer.geowessex.com/">http://explorer.geowessex.com/</a> , but for doing it so well . We also suggested neighbourhood recycling points but this may have been a bit too busy on the map. We also suggested putting to the map publishers that		Consideration will be given to the inclusion of waste facilities in close proximity to the county boundary on Dorset Explorer.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								extending this map some 8 to 12 miles over the border would also be useful as many of us live close to other counties and may use their waste facilities. You call the site plans Insets, which we like. The Minerals Plan calls them inserts.			
PS D-WP 285	Paragraph	1.1		Yes		Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	As far as DWT is able to assess, we believe that the document is legally compliant, and therefore all comments relate to the soundness of the Plan.		Noted	None
PS D-WP 264	Paragraph	1.18				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Draft Waste Plan, Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations, 2010 (HRA). This document will need to be updated to refer to the new regulations as cited above. Natural England has previously provided minor textual modifications to the HRA directly to the author. The authority should note that Poole Harbour SPA was substantially extended in December 2017. Natural England advise that there are no features or modifications to the new SPA area which would require a further consideration under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 in addition to the assessments already carried out.		Your helpful comments are noted. Reference to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations will be updated as appropriate.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 111	Paragraph	2.2				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	General comments, recommendations, and advice The relevance of this nationally designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to this consultation is set out in Annex A to this response. Annex B lists the organisations that make up the Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership Board. The Local Authority partners have formally adopted the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Management Plan 2014 " 2019. It is accessible on our website at <a href="http://www.ccwwdaonb.org.uk/publications/aonb-management-plan/">http://www.ccwwdaonb.org.uk/publications/aonb-management-plan/</a> . The Plan is a material planning matter. This consultation response has been prepared under delegated authority. AONB site visit to Bridport. The AONB Team appreciated the opportunity to visit the Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Centre at Bridport. It enabled us to see and appreciate the form, scale, and operations of a combined HRC and WTC. That has been very helpful in enabling the AONB to view the proposals within the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan knowing the sort of development that is envisaged. The AONB appreciates the opportunities to participate in the evolution of this draft Waste Plan and the meetings and discussions involved in that process. The Cranborne Chase AONBs responses to this consultation fall into four elements; the tone of the draft Plan, the AONBs position in principle in relation to waste handling and treatment in an AONB omissions, and its without prejudice comments on the potential Blandford site. The Tone of the Draft Plan As I set out in my email of the 15 th January 2018 this AONB is very concerned that, at the early stages of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan, it is not clear that the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty applies to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NPPF paragraph 115). Paragraph 2.6 of the pre-Submission Draft Plan states "The New Forest National Park is situated to the eastern boundary of the Plan area. The Waste Plan Authority has a statutory responsibility to provide the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park. Unfortunately the document does not, at that early stage, make it clear that that highest level of protection also applies to the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Without that additional, and directly relevant, information, the Pre-Submission document is misleading. That is particularly the case for readers		Consideration will be given to the addition of a reference to AONBs within Paragraph 2.6 to provide further clarity.	Additional Modification

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>who are not experts in balancing the weight given to conservation and development issues. The document, through that omission, gives the reader a perception that the highest level of landscape and scenic protection does not apply to the county of Dorset and its Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, as the National Park is to the east, and outside the County boundary. Clearly that incorrect impression could significantly colour any readers view of the proposals for waste development that impact on the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and their response to the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. Furthermore, it is particularly relevant that the Minister, Jake Berry MP, the Under Secretary of State for Housing, Communities, and Local Government confirmed on 9 th January 2018 that ~ the Government are committed to retaining this protection, and it will not be weakened through our planning reforms (Hansard vol. 634). This AONB is, therefore, strongly of the view that the basic tone of the document at the critical introductory stage fails to give a full and fair representation of the national importance, and level of protection, afforded to Dorsets AONBs. Clearly paragraph 2.6 needs to be corrected and that could be done by the addition, after ~National Park of the words ~and the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, as the consultation has been progressing with this error, this AONB is of the opinion that the error needs to be corrected and then the consultation re-run so that all respondents have the opportunity to reconsider their responses in light of the full and fair information Whilst the AONB welcomes the Objective 4 Quote of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan the achievement of that objective requires a full understanding of the significance of the Countys nationally important landscapes. &lt;See other comments relating specifically to Policies and Inset 2&gt; To conclude, I read in the National Planning Policy for waste Plan, that positive planning plays a pivotal role in delivering this countrys waste ambitions through this countrys waste ambitions through helping to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without harming the environment. The harm to this AONB in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan is, therefore, contrary to the NPPW.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 287	Paragraph	2.2				New Forest National Park Authority	Ms Helen Patton	The Authority is pleased to note that our comments made on the previous consultation document (Draft Waste Plan September 2015) have been taken on board in this latest consultation document. As a consequence, the Authority does not have any further comments to make.		Your support is noted.	None
PS D-WP 327	Paragraph	2.29		Yes	Yes	WHWhite	Mr Brett Spiller	Context and guiding principles (Chapters 2 and 3) WHW welcomes the identification of established recovery and recycling facilities at the Site Control Centre, as shown in the map at figure 3 of existing waste management facilities in Dorset. WHW welcomes the definition of strategic facilities set out in paragraph 2.29, as well as the importance ascribed to the economic role of waste management infrastructure in paragraphs 2.30-2.33, which are too often overlooked. In a similar vein, WHW is pleased to see reference to the circular economy at paragraph 3.17. WHW notes that the plan area is close to achieving net self-sufficiency and would venture that net exports are, in the main, associated with disposal (with Blue Haze landfill located just across the border in Hampshire); specialist treatment; and in providing contingency during planned and unplanned plant shut downs. The waste hierarchy and proximity principle remain cornerstones of national waste planning policy (as annexed to the Waste Management Plan for England) and are duly reflected in Policy 1 titled 'Sustainable waste management'. WHW considers Policy 1 to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. WHW welcomes the encouragement given to the co-location of waste management facilities in paragraphs 3.20-3.21, as it is WHWs experience that this can help to foster collaboration and innovation, thereby helping waste ascend the hierarchy. WHW also welcomes the recognition given to end products and the opportunity to establish local distribution networks in paragraphs 3.22-3.23, which will undoubtedly help to deliver a circular low carbon economy. For these reasons, Policy 2 titled 'Integrated waste management facilities' is considered to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 9	Paragraph	2.34				Northamptonshire County Council	Mr Mark Chant	Thank you for consulting Northamptonshire County Council in relation to the Draft Mineral Sites Plan and Draft Waste Plan. The Council is pleased to note that our comments have been taken on board from the previous round of consultation. The Hazardous Waste Interrogator shows that just under 850 tonnes of Hazardous Waste is removed from Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and received in Northamptonshire. The Hazardous Waste Interrogator does not provide the end location for the waste but please note that East Northamptonshire Resource Management Facility, the hazardous facility in Northamptonshire only has permission to 2026 and there is considerable uncertainty about it continuing beyond this date. Therefore you should work on the basis that this facility can only be assumed to operate until 2026. Should you require any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.		Your comments are noted. The Waste Plan recognises that there is a need to regularly monitor the availability of capacity to manage hazardous waste outside the Plan area.	None
PS D-WP 19	Paragraph	3.3			No	Individual	Ian Benson	The document states that recycling is to be carried out as much as is "feasible". There seem to be no specific targets for recycling plastic bags, plastic laminated with card, or plastic in general.	I think that there should be specific targets for recycling plastic bags, plastic laminated with card, or plastic in general.	The WPA has liaised with the three waste management authorities throughout the preparation of the Waste Plan. Where possible up to date recycling targets have been taken into account when projecting waste arisings.	None
PS D-WP 98	Paragraph	3.14	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	You have said that waste should be managed as close as possible to where it is produced, and your plan does not do that.	To make it "managed as close as possible to where it is produced"... you would need to site the bulky waste transfer closer to Poole and Christchurch, and by trying to site it at Woolsbridge, you are moving it further on to the Horton Road which is unsafe for HGV traffic. You are not adhering to the proximity principle in Policy 1, and as you already have planning permission approval for Bulky waste transfer at Mannings Heath in Poole, you are also not adhering to that	Your comments are noted. The Waste Plan aims to facilitate a network of waste management facilities to address the identified needs. Waste should be managed as close as possible to where it is produced. The preparation of the Waste Plan has involved an extensive search of suitable, available sites. The sites contained in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan are considered to be the best available and in general terms comply with the proximity principle.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									policy. Furthermore due to the available land at Mannings Heath, you would also be able to adhere to Policy 2 and provide integrated waste management facilities.		
PS D-WP 306	Paragraph	3.17				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Section titled Circular Economy The whole section is titled Circular Economy and that is what your otherwise very good Policy 1 is intended to achieve, so please include the word circular in the policy itself. We suggest it will work proactively with applicants to promote the circular economy and to find solutions .... Alternatively, after Proximity - facilities that adhere to the proximity principle through being appropriately located relative to the source of the waste. You could write something like Circular economy - facilities that enable material use to be prolonged by repair or renovation, and/or then by recycling using parts of the waste stream as raw materials for other processes, returning them to the cycle. In Para 3.17 Also, you may wish to add an illustration in Para 3.17, such as this one from the European Environment Agency: (See attached representation) Note the permission was for another instance, so this figure cant be copied for publication without permission. The circular economy and consideration of plastic use is even more important now that China is not accepting the stuff.		Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to amending Policy 1 to include reference to the Circular Economy.	<b>MM3.1</b>
PS D-WP 99		Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	It is unsound because you are not being truthful about what facilities you intend to try to build at Woolsbridge. You have said you only want a bulky waste transfer/treatment works, but you have also said in your policy that you want to ..."incorporate different type of waste management activities at the same location, or are co-located with complementary activities..." which means that you will also allow the incinerator to be built without further reference to the local population.	Try telling the truth and not trying to hide behind your policy.	The Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan includes land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for the development of a transfer station/bulky waste management facility. Other sites are allocated to address the need for residual waste management. The allocated sites are considered the best available sites to address the identified needs.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 265	Paragraph	4.1				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	General advice Objective 2 indicates that waste should be managed as close to the point of origin as possible. However there is little evidence to show that the authority is actually taking this objective seriously whilst at the same time avoiding sensitive environmental issues such as the AONB and designated sites. There are no new facilities proposed at strategic locations to serve the conurbation rather there is a continued reliance on locations which were originally allocated according to other priorities such as minerals requirements. This could and should be afforded more weight by the authority to reduce environmental impacts more comprehensively.		Your comments are noted. The preparation of the Waste Plan has involved an extensive search of suitable, available sites. The search for strategic facilities to manage residual waste was initially centred on the south-east Dorset conurbation where the greatest quantities of waste are produced. Available land in this location is scarce and is in demand from other non-waste developments such as employment and housing development. As a result the Waste Plan site allocations are existing waste facilities, proposed for intensification. These sites are also likely to be more deliverable than other green field sites without support from waste companies.	None
PS D-WP 328	Paragraph	4.1		Yes	Yes	WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	Vision and objectives (Chapter 4, page 25) The proposed Vision appropriately reflects both the opportunity and ambition of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and is fully supported. The six stated objectives are also fully supported and are considered in-keeping with national planning policy for waste. WHW fully supports the stated vision and looks forward to assisting in its realisation.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 100	Paragraph	4.3	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	You say that facilities will be ..."located to minimise adverse impacts on the local road network..." but this is not the case	You are aware that the Horton Road serving the Woolsbridge site is not suitable for the volume and size of the HGV necessary to facilitate a bulky waste transfer/treatment site. You have already admitted in your draft waste plan site options that this site ..."for a strategic bulky waste facility it is in a poor location resulting in waste travelling greater distances..." something that in your policy 1	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									above, you have said is not acceptable. Your policy is therefore flawed and you need to reconsider the fact that there are two other sites that would be suitable for your plans.		
PS D-WP 246	Paragraph	4.3	Yes	Don't Know	No	Railfuture, Wessex Branch	Mr Anthony Smale	Objective 5 mentions the promotion of sustainable transport modes but there is little attempt to expand on this anywhere in the Plan.	There are obvious benefits to the County from actively encouraging trans-shipment of waste by rail. Reduction in heavy lorry mileage will reduce the maintenance cost of the road network. It will also contribute towards reductions in road accidents, traffic congestion, noise and pollution. In the notes which follow, we set out some of the ways the County could promote sustainable transport.	Objective 5 recognises that opportunities for transporting waste by rail or water are limited. Policy 12 'Transport and Access' requires applicants to explore sustainable transportation.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 49	Paragraph	5.1			No	East Dorset District Council	Mr George Whalley	This response is made on behalf of East Dorset District Council on the Pre Submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017. The Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the preparation of the Waste Plan. The Councils representations have been framed in relation to the Tests of Soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which consider a plan to be sound that is: Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National Policy The Council has also considered whether the Pre Submission Sites Plan is legally compliant and prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. The Spatial Strategy: Chapter 5, The Spatial Strategy sets out a need for the relocation of the Wimborne household recycling centre to serve the East Dorset Area. However, within Chapter 8 this is to be achieved through a criteria based policy and no suitable, deliverable site option has been identified to address this issue which is a short term requirement. Therefore, this is not considered a sound approach as it is uncertain that it can be effective and deliverable. The Spatial Strategy also refers to the provision of a bulky waste treatment facility to be located at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as set out in Policy 3 and Inset 1. The Council has set out detailed representations regarding this proposed allocation in Chapter 6, Policy 3. The proposed allocation is not considered effective, deliverable or consistent with national policy.		The WPA, in consultation with EDDC, has undertaken an extensive search for available land, suitable for allocation for a HRC to serve Wimborne and Ferndown to replace the existing facility. It has not been possible to allocate a specific site. However, the WPA is confident that a site will become available during the Plan period within the existing Uddens and Ferndown Industrial Estate or within allocated employment land known as Blunts Farm. The Waste Plan contains a criteria based policy against which an application will be assessed against.	None
PS D-WP 83	Paragraph	5.1	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	You have decided to use Woolsbridge industrial estate despite the fact that planning permission already exists (2013) for a bulk waste transfer at Mannings Heath in Poole. By your own admission, the Mannings Heath site has no significant sustainability issues, and is strategically well located on employment land. You have said of Woolsbridge that it is in a poor location for a strategic bulk waste facility, and would result in waste travelling greater distances. You have also said that the site at Blunts Farm is strategically well located and is allocated for employment use and the A31 provides HGV access. Woolsbridge has no HGV access as the Horton Road is not a suitable route.	You need to re visit both the Mannings Heath site and Blunts Farm site which are by your own admission suitable for the bulk waste transfer/treatment site. Both of these sites have access according to the Dorset Advisory Lorry route map. You are required to consider the capacity of the existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste, and in choosing	Planning permission has been granted for bulky waste management at Mannings Heath but has not come forward. This site has also been allocated for the treatment of residual waste (RDF/SFR) to assist in addressing the shortfall in capacity. An objection has been received from the landowner of Blunts Farm for the development of waste uses, therefore there is uncertainty over deliverability.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									Woolsbridge, you have clearly not followed this policy.		
PS D-WP 329	Paragraph	5.1				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	Spatial strategy (Chapter 5, page 27) The spatial strategy is supported insofar as it relates to strategic and local recycling facilities; green waste composting; food waste treatment; bulky waste; landfill disposal; the management of special types of waste; and inert waste management. With respect to residual waste management, WHW would question the extent of the projected shortfall (as explained below).		Your support is welcomed. Comments related to residual waste projections will be addressed later in this report.	<b>MM7.1 to MM7.30</b>
PS D-WP 322	Paragraph	5.1				Christchurch Borough Council	Mr George Whalley	The Spatial Strategy: The Spatial Strategy includes a strategic approach towards Residual Waste Management. The strategy identifies a need for strategic residual waste treatment facilities to be addressed through new capacity in South East Dorset. The Spatial Strategy identifies the need to intensify / redevelop 4 existing operations to meet needs over the plan period. This includes the following: Inset 7: Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley Inset 8: Canford Magna, Poole Inset 9: Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole Inset 10: Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke . The Eco site has been assessed to have an additional capacity of 160,000 tpa of residual waste. The site at Binnegar Environmental Park has an assessed additional capacity for 100,000 tpa of residual waste. The site at Canford Magna, Poole is proposed for site intensification and the management of an increased tonnage of non-hazardous waste with additional capacity of c25,000 tpa. The site at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole is identified for site intensification and the management of non-hazardous waste through the preparation of Refused Derived Fuel (RDF) or Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF). In order to meet requirements over the plan period DCC have acknowledged that not all 4 sites will be required. In view of the constraints of the Eco site including, impact on European habitats (nitrogen deposition on		The Waste Plan provides a flexible approach to addressing the need for residual waste management across the Plan period. All sites have issues that will need to be addressed through a detailed planning application before permission can be granted. The WPA is confident that the allocated sites are appropriate to address the waste management needs of Dorset. Allocating a range of sites provides flexibility and assurance that the waste management needs of Dorset will be met. Modifications have been made to clarify that the allocated sites (Inset 7 to 10) could be brought forward to manage non-hazardous waste. This could include recycling and/or residual waste.	<b>MM7.1 to MM7.30</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								the heathlands), Airport safeguarding and transport it is clear that the Eco site at Parley should be deleted in favour of the other 3 sites which will meet plan requirements. The Council sets out detailed representations in relation to the Inset 7 site in response to Chapter 6, Policy 3. The Spatial Strategy sets out an approach toward the management of inert waste and the need to deal with a shortfall of around 272,000 tpa of non-recycling capacity by the end of the plan period. It is proposed that the shortfall in capacity for the recovery and/or disposal of waste will be dealt with through the allocation of sites in the Minerals Sites Plan. It is noted that the restoration visions for proposed allocations AS-09 Hurn Court Farm Quarry and AS-13 Roeshot do not refer to dealing with inert waste so the Council concludes that these sites will not be used for this purpose.			
PS D-WP 84	Paragraph	6.1	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	you have failed to consider the effects of a bulk waste transfer/treatment site on the amenity of local residents, as you have said that there will be 19,000 to 23,000 tpa rising by 1% per annum. This means that there will be increased HGV movement over and above that which you have predicted which will increase pollution levels. The Horton Road is a class C road which is 18 feet wide and not suitable for HGV traffic of the volumes predicted.	Any use of the Woolsbridge site would require a section 106 agreement moving traffic out of the site via the A31 through Oak Field Farm. The authority has not done this already and has not mentioned it at any stage. The authority has not tested this aspect of their plan. Sites at Mannings Heath and Blunts Farm have access to the road network but have been dismissed by the authority - why?	Land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate has been assessed on the basis of a 30,000tpa facility. This is greater than the 23,000tpa that is projected to arise at the end of the Plan period. This allows for flexibility and ensures that the impacts of potential development have been adequately assessed. Issues raised with regards to the traffic impacts of development can be found in a separate report providing detailed responses to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report
PS D-WP 92	Paragraph	6.1	No	Yes	No	Individual	Dr Maurice Nield	Horton Road is just not suitable for more heavy goods vehicles. It is too narrow, providing only small clearance between passing HGVs, and there is little scope for widening the road without losing the well used paved footpath. From the A31, Horton Road goes through residential areas, and it is also heavily used by visitors and holiday traffic going to campsites, shops, Moors Valley Country Park, the Castleman Trailway and Ringwood Forest, all before getting to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The road is also well used by cyclists and the pavement is popular with pedestrians, many of	An alternative access road for Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would be needed.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								whom are accompanied by dogs and / or children; NOT a good mix with HGVs.			
PS D-WP 1		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	Yes	Don't Know	Yes		Mr Nick Armitage	I believe you have the options on question 2 the wrong way around.		Noted	None
PS D-WP 11		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mr Geoffrey Porter	The current condition of Horton Road shows considerable structural instability with extensive areas of crocodile crazing as the result of structural failure and substantial reconstruction is required for the structure to take additional heavily laden HGVs. The carriageway is now wide enough for vehicles to overtake cyclists safely against oncoming traffic. The road and footway is also extensively used by local elderly dog walkers and youngsters with parents visiting the local holiday camp and camping sites and the Moor Valley Park leisure area. Moor Valley access to Horton Road is very busy during holiday seasons.	To make the site suitable a direct link from the A31 to the Industrial Estate is required.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report
PS D-WP 15		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	Yes	Yes	Yes	Ferndown & Uddens BID Ltd	Mr Kevin Poulton	The Ferndown and Uddend BID Board supports the allocated sites.		Your support is welcomed	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 18		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know	Individual	Mr John Evans	Binnegar so-called Environment Park is on the site of the exhausted Binnegar Quarry. This was previously heath-land in the Frome Valley. No doubt when permission was given for the quarry restoration of the heaths was promised and Raymond Brown (the quarry operators) have sought positive PR from their restoration plans. However, what we see in reality is partial restoration since a minerals recycling plan has already been constructed on the site (possibly as part of the quarry-infill to extract minerals from the waste prior to infill of the quarry). That is understandable and justified if this facility exists only for the life of the infill; but is it intended that this facility remains even after the quarry has been filled? This plan also proposes construction of an inert waste Thermal Treatment Plant to produce electricity. While this seems environmentally sensible it is doubtful that this is what was envisaged as 'restoration' of the heathland when permission for the quarry was given. It is this type of development creep that concerns local residents when faced with the prospect of new quarries (as in the Minerals Site Plan) i.e. what is now farmland, heath-land or meadow becomes quarry with a promise of 'restoration', but we have no confidence that the reality will be some other development e.g. waste plants (as at Binnegar) housing (as is likely at Woodsford Quarry) and what has been housing and lakes at Silverlake, Warmwell.	Site the Thermal Treatment Plant where the inert materials are currently deposited or collected. Greater control of quarry restoration promises	Your comments are noted. Binnegar Environmental Park already has the benefit of permanent planning permission for waste operations. Future development of waste facilities could partly utilise the existing buildings.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 20		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mr Alan Davies	The use of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate (Inset 1) does not meet the requirements of Section 4 Objective 2 in that it is not located as close as practicable to the origin of waste in order to reduce mileage. Neither does it meet Objective 4 to safeguard and enhance local amenity particularly in respect of economic assets, tourism, health and wellbeing of the people living within the environs of the Horton Road between A31/A338 roundabout and Tree Legged Cross. Horton Road is a rural road bounded by extensive vegetation and large tree growth. The narrow carriageways bounded by these trees cause vehicular traffic to pass with minimum clearance between opposing lanes, and dangerously close to pedestrians who have to negotiate the pavement when gaining access to shops and whilst waiting at bus stops. Sometimes wide vehicles overlap the kerb with their bodywork just inches away from a pedestrian's shoulder, and the side wind can make one recoil and stagger. The road pavements are narrow and telegraph poles are located in the pathway which can reduce the effective width to just 1 metre. Horton Road is the main access point to Moors Valley Country Park, and is the main crossing point for the Castleman Trailway which attracts thousands of visitors to the area. Cyclists, mothers and children all congregate along these sites, and the traffic crossing is a major cause of congestion on the road. Shoppers come to park their vehicles at the adjacent shop next to the crossing, causing further traffic disruption, as do vehicles accessing and leaving the junctions of Woolsbridge Road and Lions Lane. Tailbacks occur at peak times especially in holiday periods. Industrial traffic and heavy vehicle usage has increased noticeably in recent years. Additional housing development continues unabated and local traffic demands more road space as a result. The road is not furnished with any street lighting and a large care home provides for many elderly residents. A new cemetery is proposed for the area adjacent to Horton Road, and the Sheiling School access is nearby. Additional heavy articulated vehicles serving the bulky waste facility is a dangerous prospect and should not be contemplated.	If there is to be industrial expansion at Woolsbridge Estate then an alternate direct route to the A31 is essential, preferably to the south joining at existing roundabouts.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 28		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Vail Williams LLP	Mr Ben Christian	<p>Policy 3 " Sites Allocated for Waste Management Development. This policy includes the proposed allocation of part of the land to the south of Brickfields Business Park which is in SAMs ownership. Inset 3 of the Draft Waste Plan provides the detail behind this proposed allocation. Policy 3 - Sites Allocated for Waste Management Development The relevant text of policy 3 is as follows: "The Waste Plan identifies Allocated Sites, as identified on the Policies Map, for waste management development to address the shortfall in waste management capacity and identified needs for new and improved waste management facilities. Proposals within the Allocated Sites, for the proposed uses set out in Insets 1 - 13, are acceptable in principle and will be permitted where it is demonstrated that they meet all of the following criteria: a. the proposal complies with the relevant policies of this Plan; b. the relevant Development Considerations have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority; c. there would not be an unacceptable cumulative impact, from the development, in combination with existing waste management operations; and d. possible effects (including those related to proximity, species and displacement of recreation) that might arise from the development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Inset 3 - Land at Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham is a proposed allocation in Policy 3, along with other sites, for the development of local waste management facilities for the transfer and recycling of waste. Inset 3 details that the Councils aim is to redevelop part of the site as a Household Recycling Centre approximately 1-1.5 hectares of land plus up to an additional 0.5 hectares for a waste vehicle depot. The proposed allocation of part of Brickfields Business Park Southern extension is to replace the Shaftesbury Household Recycling Centre due to its limited capacity. It is understood there is also an oil and water treatment facility in Shaftesbury, but it is unknown if this is also proposed to be moved to Brickfields. This should be made clear before proposing any allocation to ensure, in accordance with Policy 3 parts c and d, as the potential impacts are understood. Part 2 (Deliverability/Viability) of Site Assessment Inset 3 (Brickfields Business Park,</p>		<p>See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.</p> <p>The Waste Planning Authority has been liaising with North Dorset District Council regarding progress on the southern extension masterplanning but were not aware the landowner had stated they were unwilling to make space available for the facility until other users for the site were identified.</p> <p>The need for recycling facilities is identified in the Concept Statement for the southern extension, set out in the North Dorset Local Plan (2016). Additionally, the North Dorset Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014) identifies within its 'Schedule of Infrastructure Currently Programmed/ Needed to Support New Development' the need for a waste transfer station/household recycling centre at Gillingham.</p> <p>It is hoped that a new household recycling centre could be provided within the planned southern extension to provide for the needs of the existing and planned residential properties of the area.</p> <p>There is no proposal to relocate the oil and water treatment facility. This is operated by a private company (Yellowstone Environmental Solutions) and is completely independent from the household recycling centre (operated for Dorset Waste Partnership-DWP).</p>	See separate report.



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Gillingham) states "the land owner has confirmed their interest to the principle to the proposed use. SAM does not recall making this statement and does not support the proposed allocation or use of its land for a Household Recycling Centre or any other Waste Management Development. SAM expressed its reasoning for non-support of this allocation in correspondence with Nicola Laszlo in March 2015: "Sigma-Aldrich considers the Household Recycling Centre to have the potential to sterilise part of the site for various users and until users are identified for the rest of the site are unwilling to commit space for the Household Recycling Centre. SAM, however does remain supportive of other employment uses on its land to the south of Brickfields Business Park as per the allocation within the North Dorset Local Plan, subject to SAMs final approval of specific uses and their locations. This objection to the proposed allocation of Household Recycling Centre or any other Waste Management Development is based on the unknown nature of said operations close to operations of SAM and further concerns laid out in the rest of this representation. SAM does not support the proposed allocation or use of any part of its land for a Household Recycling Centre or any other Waste Management Development and also reserves its legal rights of control over the type, location and operation of employment uses proposed within the envelope of employment uses as per the North Dorset Local Plan.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 50		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development			No	East Dorset District Council	Mr George Whalley	<p>This response is made on behalf of East Dorset District Council on the Pre Submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017. The Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the preparation of the Waste Plan. 1.1 The Councils representations have been framed in relation to the Tests of Soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which consider a plan to be sound that is: Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National Policy 1.2 The Council has also considered whether the Pre Submission Sites Plan is legally compliant and prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Policy 3 " Sites allocated for waste management development: 3.0 Policy 3 of the Pre Submission Waste Plan (contained in Chapter 6) proposes allocations as identified on the Policies Map for waste management development. Inset 1 of the Waste Plan sets out detail of the proposed allocation at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross, East Dorset. The land considered for a waste allocation includes the 5ha southern extension to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate which is allocated in the 2014 adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses (Policy VTWS6). 3.1 The site at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is proposed in the draft Waste Plan to be allocated for waste transfer and/or the transfer or treatment of bulky waste. The proposed allocation states that up to 1ha of land would be required for waste transfer and a further 1ha of land for the treatment of bulky waste. 3.2 The Council is raising the following issues of soundness in relation to the proposed site allocation: Consistency with National Policy Consistency with the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (2014) Transport Impact Conflict with Existing Planning Permission Consistency with National Policy 3.3 The Pre Submission Draft Minerals Sites Plan is not consistent with National Policy As it ignores the requirement in the NPPF regarding the need to meet local needs for economic development and the provision of employment land. Further detail of the precise impact on employment land supply is set out below within this representation. 3.4 Paragraph 6 of the NPPF states that the purpose of the planning</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF refers to the three dimensions of sustainable development which are economic, social and environmental, with the economic role defined as: contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure. 3.5 Amongst the core land-use planning principles included in Paragraph 17 of the NPPF is the expectation that planning should proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and meet then meet the housing, business and other development needs of the area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. 3.6 Paragraphs 18 and 19 of the NPPF sets out the Governments commitment to securing economic growth to create jobs and prosperity and the significant weight that should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. Planning should operate to encourage sustainable growth and not act as an impediment to it. 3.7 The Draft Waste Plan ignores the NPPF through not taking into account the need to meet the economic needs of the area on key employment sites of strategic significance. The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (2014 adopted): 3.8 Policy KS5 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 80ha of employment land to come forward in Christchurch and East Dorset over the plan period to meet projected requirements for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses. Policy VTSW6 of the Core Strategy allocates land at Woolsbridge (13.1ha) for employment uses, which includes B1, B2 and B8 uses with some ancillary support services for these employment uses. The Woolsbridge site is of strategic significance for South East Dorset and forms part of a key market centre for industrial development as identified in the Workspace Strategy (2016). 3.9 The existing Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is also included in adopted Core Strategy Policy PC1</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>where a flexible approach is adopted towards accommodating non B uses. This does not apply to the VTSW6 employment allocation which is allocated only for B1, B2 and B8 uses with some ancillary support services. Therefore the proposals for a waste facility which is a Suis Generis use (located within the VTSW6 Core Strategy allocation) are contrary to the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy (2014) because they are not B1, B2 or B8 employment uses. In addition to the direct loss of 2ha of employment land on the VTWS6 Core Strategy employment allocation there is potential that development of the 2ha may also prejudice the remaining 3ha of land (in this Core Strategy allocated land parcel) coming forward for employment development for B1,B2 and B8 use classes. 3.10 Policy 3 of the Pre Submission Draft Waste Plan states that: Proposals within the Allocated Sites, for the proposed uses set out in Insets 1-13, are acceptable in principle and will be permitted where it is demonstrated that they meet all the following criteria: the proposal complies with the relevant policies of this Plan; the relevant Development Considerations have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority; there would not be an unacceptable cumulative impact, from the development, in combination with existing waste management operations; and possible effects (including those related to proximity, species and displacement of recreation) that might arise from the development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. 3.11 The Council objects to this wording as it ignores the need for compliance with the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy including Policies KS5 and VTSW6. In order to be sound this policy needs to be amended to include a further bullet point to refer to compliance with policies in the district and borough Local Plans which comprise the development plans for the respective areas. The following wording is suggested to be added to the draft policy: the proposal complies with relevant policies in adopted Local Plans within the plan area. Transport Impact: 3.12 The councils are concerned about the traffic impact of the range of uses proposed and HGV movements, particularly given the proximity to the A31 Strategic Road Network. In addition to impact on the</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>A31 any proposals will need to assess their impact on the new signalised junction onto Ringwood Road which is proposed as part of the recently consented employment planning application. There is a need for a robust transport assessment to be undertaken to determine the precise impact and mitigation required. Inset 1 regarding the proposed allocation at Woolsbridge sets out development considerations but these do not include the need for a detailed transport assessment. As it stands the proposal is not considered sound as it is not clearly effective or deliverable. 3.13 Chapter 12 of the draft Waste Plan sets out development management policies which include Policy 12 Transport and Access . This policy sets out requirements for transport assessments and mitigation measures where required. However, the Council does not consider it appropriate to leave an assessment of transport impact to the planning application stage. This work should be undertaken at the plan making stage to determine whether the allocation is effective, deliverable and therefore sound. This has not been undertaken. Conflict with Existing Planning Permission: 3.14 Outline planning permission (Ref 3/15/0556/OUT) was granted by East Dorset District Council in March 2017 for the construction of a mixed employment development with a maximum floorspace of 33,400sqm for Office, Research &amp; Development, Light Industrial, General Industrial or Storage &amp; Distribution use (including trade counter) (use classes B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 &amp; B8) and a small element of floorspace under use classes A1, A3, A5, D1 and D2. Engineering operations to form new access junctions from Old Barn Farm Road and new internal roads. (Outline application with access and scale parameters to be determined at outline stage and layout, appearance and landscaping to be reserved for subsequent approval.) 3.15 The Outline approval sets out that development will be permitted in accordance with the submitted approved plans which include an illustrative masterplan layout and illustrative site layout for Sites A and B. The approved masterplan and layout do not include any provision for waste uses. The outline permission also restricts permitted uses to those set out above which do not include the Waste Plan proposed uses. 3.16 The Council has now received the initial reserved matters application for Site B which is where the Waste Plan proposes the location</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								of waste facilities. Therefore, the Waste Plan proposals are unsound because they are not effective and undeliverable due to the recent planning consent and schedule of reserved matters applications.			
PS D-WP 114		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	This AONB also has concerns about Policies 3 and 4, in relation to traffic and disturbance to the tranquillity of the AONB. To a considerable extent those concerns could be offset by clarification in the policy that HGVs associated with waste collection and transport would be restricted to primary routes and, possibly by formal routeing agreements, kept away from rural roads. This AONB would be happy to discuss the rewording of the policies to accommodate these issues.		Your comments are noted. The issues of routing agreements is considered too detailed for inclusion in Policy 3 and 4. However, Policy 3 and Policy 4 both contain criteria to ensure that applications comply with all relevant policies of the Waste Plan. Policy 3 also refers to the 'Development Considerations'. Policy 12 is relevant to Transport and Access and requires proposals to have direct access or suitable links with the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network, where possible. Paragraph 12.29 states that HGVs should be encouraged to use the strategic road network and refers to routing agreements. It is considered this paragraph could be amended to strengthen the wording.	<b>MM12.1</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 89		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands	Janet Healy	The Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands are so relieved that Policy 3 has dropped this site. We believe this exclusion of the Green Belt triangle of woodland south of the A31 to be legally compliant and sound. Objective 4: To safeguard and enhance local amenity, landscape and natural resources, environmental, cultural and economic assets, tourism and the health and well-being of the people. The latter is so important. We have not included our response to the Draft as that is doubtless still on file, but it is good that this area is now recognised for its importance as an area of recreation with wider links via the Castleman Trailway that runs through it. The Friends have much improved and enhanced its amenity value with the help of the Forestry Commission.		Your support is noted.	None
PS D-WP 138		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	Yes	Yes	No	The Lulworth Estate	Mr James Weld	Background The Waste Plan 2006 contained reference to a site (within Inset 3) of land to the south of the Winfrith Technology Centre, now referred to as Dorset Green and more lately The Dorset Innovation Park. The proposed use was as a Mechanical Biological Treatment plant, with Refuse Derived Fuel. There have been a number of stages to the new plan consultation. In the Draft Waste Plan 2015 which commenced 15th July, Dorset Green was identified as a potential site suitable for a waste transfer facility and/or waste vehicle depot to serve Purbeck. Dorset Green, Winfrith The details of this site were summarised on page 240 of the Draft Waste Plan (2015) - see attachment. Pre Submission Draft Waste Plan 2017 Test: Is the Plan sound? Contention: No Reason: Not justified - given information outlined below to update evidence base. 'Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development', does not now identify the Dorset Green or the land immediately to the south of it as a potential development site. A number of factors imply that consideration should in fact be given to this site: 1) DCC have acquired Dorset Green from the HCA and have control. They are promoting the site as the Dorset Innovation Park. The site now benefits from Enterprise Zone Status. 2) The Lulworth Estate are now in control of a continuous plot of land from the A352 to the south, which could provide an alternative access/egress route, to avoid mixing waste vehicle movements with regular traffic accessing and egressing from the Dorset Innovation Park. See Plan 1 below; all areas shaded		Your comments are noted. Site has been included in the list of Omission Sites.	See schedule of Omission Sites <b>Ref WPOMO2</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								(blue and yellow) are now in the ownership of the Lulworth Estate. (See attachment). One of the key occupiers on the Dorset Green site is Tadebe who already deal with waste management of radio-active material. Their location is identified in Plan 2 below. It may be preferable from a park management perspective to have them using an alternative access/egress route, as identified by the dotted black line in Plan 2 below. 4) The site as outlined in black in Plan 2 below is also now available and deliverable as a potential development site. (See attachment) Conclusion Dorset Green/Dorset Innovation Park and the land just to the south of it, is not being considered as a possible waste site in the current draft plan. Recent changes in land ownership, together with the Lulworth Estate's capacity to provide land for access to the south, provide sufficient justification for the site to be reconsidered, as a viable and deliverable site.			
PS D-WP 266		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England welcome the text drawing applicants attention to the need to comply fully with policy 18 as is summarised in the HRA. Our detailed comments on the Individual allocations are provided below.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 280		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Wessex Water	Mr Dave Ogborne	Waste Draft Plan Wessex Water is working across the region, planning capacity to satisfy Local Plan growth and meet new environmental standards. We are planning extensions to sewage works at Gillingham and Maiden Newton, where we have requested safeguarding provisions. Sewage works form critical infrastructure serving the community and are generally located within environmentally sensitive areas. We acknowledge these circumstances and generally seek policies that protect these assets from encroachment and land use conflict. This infrastructure needs space to operate and expand as catchment growth requires greater capacity. Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development - We support the allocations at Gillingham and Maiden Newton to meet planned catchment growth and new environmental standards. These allocations are necessary to meet the requirements of the areas Local Plans.		Your support is welcomed	None



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 296		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	From Previous Draft Plan DWT supports the withdrawal of the following sites from the Pre-Submission Draft. WP01 Ferndown Area of Search (Blunts Farm) WP10 Wider area of land at land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 314		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Policy 3 " Sites allocated ... Says: Proposals within the Allocated Sites, for the proposed uses set out in Insets 1 - 13, are acceptable in principle and will be permitted where it is demonstrated We suggest: Proposals within the Allocated Sites, for the proposed uses set out in Insets 1 - 13, are acceptable in principle and may be permitted where it is demonstrated This gives the Planning Committee some wriggle room where a site is locally unpopular.		Your comments are noted, however the current wording reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development, set out in the NPPF. For plan-making this means that positive policies that seek opportunities to meet the needs of the Plan area.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 191		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	Yes	Yes	No	Suez R & R UK Ltd	Ms Annemarie Wilshaw	The plan identifies four existing management facilities (insets 7 to 10) suitable for intensification and re-development to manage non-hazardous waste. Policy 3 supports proposals within allocated sites for the proposed uses set out in insets 1 to 13. The "Proposes uses tabulated within Insets in Appendix 3 would therefore appear to be critical to the compliance if a proposal with Policy 3. The assessment for each of the four sites have been led by the specific proposals put forward by the site owners, rather than the sites being assessment for the same range of residual waste treatments. There is no evidence provided to justify restricting future waste management processes to those put forward at the site allocation stage. In in case of Mannings Heath for example, the allocation appears to be restricted to preparation of RDF or SRF. Whilst promoted by SUEZ in the plan process for RDF/SRF, as a key existing waste management facility allocated for intensification and redevelopment, it should remain open for an application to come forward for other residual waste treatment options, such as thermal treatment, without being automatically out of compliance with Policy 3. The assessment has provided no evidence or justification to support restricting the intensification and re-development of the Mannings Heath site to preparation of RDF/SRF only. Similarly, some of the criteria to support such sites such as the East Parley site at Inset 7 seem to rely on information and assessments being undertaken at a later date which are critical to whether the site is viable for certain residual waste treatment activities (e.g. Appropriate assessment). It therefore would appear unjustified to restrict activities at some sites and not other.	The wording of Policy 3 should be changed to read "Proposals within the Allocated Sites, for the allocated uses as described in this Policy proposed uses set out in Insets 1 -13 , are acceptable in principle. The surrounding text in section 6 should be amended to make clear that the four identified existing permitted waste sites are allocated for intensification and re-development and are not intended to be restricted to the specific uses assessed in the insets. Specifically, the third sentence of paragraph 6.6 should read "Insets 1 - 13 include maps showing the site boundaries and other relevant information such as details on appropriate waste uses put forward at the time of allocation and the relevant development considerations. Also in section 7 the first sentence of paragraph 7.67 should read "The Waste Plan allocates three four specific sites for the provision of facilities for the management of residual non-hazardous waste plus additional capacity at the existing MBT facility at Canford Magna. The capacity of each site and its potential for increased throughout	The Waste Plan provides a flexible approach to addressing the need for residual waste management across the Plan period through the allocation of a series of sites including land at Mannings Heath.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>would be appropriately determined at the application stage and would depend upon the technology and numerous other factors “ all that has been assessed in the Insets are specific proposals put forward by site owners at the allocation stage and clearly there needs to be more flexibility allowed by the allocations in the plan.</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 300		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development	No		No	FCC Environment (UK) Ltd	Mr David Molland	<p>INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY We write to make representations to the consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. FCC is one of the largest resource management companies in the UK, employing more than 2,400 staff and operating more than 200 facilities in England, Scotland and Wales. Today, FCC Groups business portfolio is highly diversified. The core businesses are environmental services and waste management, construction of large infrastructure and cement production. The representations relate to Policy 3 " Sites allocated for waste management development of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan and consider issues of "Soundness (that is whether the current Strategy is justified, effective and consistent with national policy) with the Plan in its present form. In short, FCC consider the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan (2017) to be "Unsound because the current Strategy fails to allocate enough deliverable, suitable sites necessary to meet the identified shortfall in residual waste treatment capacity over the Plan period. FCC, working with the landowner, wish to promote an alternative site for residual waste treatment uses. The Site is located at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross, identified in the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan under Inset 1. The Site is available, deliverable and suitable for the development of a large-scale, strategic residual waste management facility. The allocation of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Site, either in addition to or instead of the allocated Sites would address the shortcoming of the Plan and make it "Sound. WHY THE PLAN IS UNSOUND Introduction There is currently only one facility in the Plan area that treats non-hazardous waste, this is a mechanical biological treatment (MBT) facility at Canford Magna. Waste is currently being sent outside of the Plan area to energy from waste facilities in Hampshire and Slough. The Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan identifies a shortfall in residual waste treatment capacity of 227,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) at the end of the Plan period. The Plan seeks to address this shortfall through the allocation of sites for the management of non-hazardous waste, either through the intensification or re-development of existing facilities. However, FCC contend that three of the four sites allocated under Policy 3 are unlikely to be</p>	Alternative, deliverable non-Green Belt Sites should be allocated for waste management development in order to provide the necessary flexibility and to ensure that residual waste management needs can be met over the Plan period. An alternative available, deliverable and suitable site exists at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross. The site is included at Inset 1 of the Plan for general waste transfer, and bulky waste transfer/treatment. The Site was previously considered for a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and Residual Waste Treatment Facility, However, those uses were discounted in the preparation of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. The Officers reasons for de-selecting the Site were that four other sites have been allocated to provide capacity for the management of non-hazardous waste, during the Plan period. It states the allocated sites were being actively promoted by waste operators and that no issues of deliverability had been identified that cannot be addressed through	Your comments are noted. Site has been included in the list of Omission Sites.	See schedule of Omission Sites Ref <b>WPOM03, WPOM04, WPOM05</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>suitable and deliverable for the development of new or improved strategic recovery facilities, and thus the Plan as presently drafted, does not provide an appropriate strategy to meet the identified residual waste management need. The three sites are considered in turn below. Consideration of Policy 3 Allocated Sites Inset 7 " Eco Sustainable Solutions, Chapel Lane, Parley The Plan indicates there is scope to re-develop and intensify waste management uses on the Eco Sustainable Solutions site and increase the capacity to manage larger quantities of waste. The current proposal is to replace the permitted Anaerobic Digestion plant with a waste to energy recovery plant. Although at this stage the form of technology is not specifically identified the Site is located in the Green Belt, where there is a presumption against inappropriate forms of development. The redevelopment of the Site for waste to energy uses would be considered "inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances could only be justified if it can be demonstrated that no suitable non-Green Belt sites exist. Furthermore, the "Development Consideration for Inset 7 requires that proposals for the Site should demonstrate that there would be no further harm to the openness and purpose of the Green Belt. Depending on the technology and design of a waste to energy recovery plant for the site this could involve development which is much larger than the existing or consented uses, particularly in terms of the heights of the buildings, and will require an emission stack which (depending on the technology and assessment work) is likely to be a minimum of 30-70 metres in height. Taking this into account the Proximity of the Site to Bournemouth Airport could potentially give rise to concerns with aerodrome safeguarding. This will undoubtedly result in further harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and thus any proposal that comes forward on this site for strategic waste to energy uses will need to address the Development Considerations listed under Inset 7. Accordingly, any proposal for a waste to energy plant on the site may not comply with Policy 3 (b) of the Plan and thus would not be deliverable. The allocation of this site conflicts with national planning policy on Green Belt. Inset 8 " Land at Canford Magna, Magna Road,</p>	<p>mitigation. The site allocations were considered to be strategically better located than Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. FCC, one of the largest resource management companies in the UK, supports the allocation of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Site. For the reasons set out within this letter, FCC challenges the Councils position on the deliverability of the allocated sites and does not accept that mitigation can be put in place for large scale inappropriate development in the green belt, or the Councils assertion that they are strategically better located than the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Site, is available, suitable and deliverable. The Site benefits from a suitable Employment Policy Allocation, has outline planning permission for employment uses, offers good potential for combined heat and power, is not constrained by Green Belt policy and is flat, levelled and available for immediate development. The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Site is approximately 5 hectares in size and could accommodate a waste</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Poole The site at Canford Magna, Poole is an existing waste management facility located entirely within the South-East Dorset Green Belt. The Pre-Submission draft of the Waste Plan proposes an extension to this allocation to address the identified shortfall in capacity for treatment facilities during the plan period. The allocation proposes to provide only a small amount of capacity (25,000tpa) which is not adequate to significantly address the identified shortfall. The supporting documentation associated with the allocation notes that the existing waste site is identified in Pooles Development Plan under Policy SSA26 “Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. However, this designation does not include the 0.66ha extension proposed as part of the Pre-Submission Waste Plan and therefore the extension remains unallocated Green Belt land. Notwithstanding this, consultation on the pre-submission version of Pooles new Local Plan closed in September 2017. When the plan is adopted (examination spring/summer 2018), it will supersede all existing policies, including Policy SSA26. The Plan does not propose that the site is allocated as a “Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. It is considered that additional “inappropriate development on this site within the extended area of the waste allocation may have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and be at odds with the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The allocation of this site is not consistent with national planning policy on Green Belt and does not provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable non-Green Belt sites. Inset 9 “ Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole This small site, only 1.6 hectares, comprises an existing waste transfer station dealing with the receipt, bulking and transfer of commercial and industrial waste. The site consists of a group of waste processing, workshop, maintenance and office buildings surrounded by open parking and storage. Whilst the site might provide opportunities for the development of facilities for the management of non-hazardous waste, these are likely to replace existing local scale recycling uses and would not fulfil a strategic residual treatment role. Test of Soundness The Plan as presently drafted is not Justified, Effective or Consistent with National Policy . Each test of soundness is considered in turn below: Justified The Plan is not the most appropriate strategy, when</p>	<p>management facility capable of providing much of the identified shortfall in residual waste capacity. The allocation of a non-Green Belt site which is eminently available, deliverable and suitable will address the current shortcomings with the Plan, ensuring that it is Justified, Effective and Consistent with National Policy.</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. The Plan identifies three Sites for the provision of new facilities for the management of residual waste, plus additional capacity at the existing MBT facility at Canford Magna. Whilst the Plan suggests that the total potential capacity within the four allocated sites would exceed the identified needs of the Plan area, and is intended to provide flexibility, there are material shortcomings (with three of the Sites as identified in this letter). One site is of an insufficient size for strategic waste uses and is incapable of making any real contribution to residual waste management capacity. Two sites are located in the Green Belt, where there is a policy presumption against inappropriate development. The allocation of these sites is not consistent with national planning policy on Green Belt and does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable non-Green Belt alternatives. Effective For the reasons explained above, the strategy within the Plan to provide an additional 227,000 tpa through the current allocated sites is not deliverable. Consistent with National Policy The Plan, as presently drafted, would not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF, namely because it promotes the development of Green Belt sites over available, suitable and deliverable non-Green Belt sites.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 330		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	<p>Allocated sites (Chapter 6, page 31) WHW welcomes the allocation of sites within the plan. Planning Practice Guidance states: "Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the "what, where, when and how questions)". As such, the allocations should bestow a degree of certainty and provide the owners / operators with the necessary confidence to invest in site infrastructure. Local waste management facilities for the transfer and recycling waste will invariably assist in ensuring efficient collection regimes, particularly in the more rural / peripheral parts of the plan area and are duly welcomed. The suggestion that a standardise recycles collection regime might be put forward as part of a 25- year plan to improve the UKs environmental standing might well have implications for the need for such facilities; thus, the flexibility offered by the plan would appear prudent. Land within or adjoining established employment areas would seem a natural starting point and WHW supports the strategy to deliver a network of local facilities designed to meet the modern day needs of both the customer and operator. WHW readily acknowledges that the WPA has undertaken an exhaustive search for potential sites capable of accommodating strategic residual waste management facilities. The focus on South East Dorset is in-keeping with the proximity principle, as the houses and businesses making up the Poole-Bournemouth-Christchurch conurbation present the main source of waste arisings in the plan area. WHW notes that the WPA undertook an initial call for sites and has sought to test a wide range of options through public consultation. Notwithstanding this, physical constraints (with the sea on the southern side of the conurbation), together with environmental and ownership constraints have served to restrict credible options. The sites presented on inset plans 7-10 are all in established waste management use and purported to offer scope for intensification. WHW supports the intent of Policy 3 titled "Sites allocated for waste management development insofar as it is designed to provide certainty on deliverability. Criteria (a)-(b) are duly noted and the inclusion of site insets 1-6, 8, 11-13 are supported. However, the extent to which the policy will</p>		<p>The Waste Plan provides a flexible approach to addressing the need for residual waste management across the Plan period. All sites have issues that will need to be addressed through a detailed planning application before permission can be granted. The WPA is confident that the allocated sites are appropriate to address the waste management needs of Dorset. Allocating a range of sites provides flexibility and assurance that the waste management needs of Dorset will be met. Modifications have been made to clarify that the allocated sites (Inset 7 to 10) could be brought forward to manage non-hazardous waste. This could include recycling and/or residual waste.</p> <p>See also separate schedule of responses to site allocations and schedule of Omission sites.</p>	See separate report and schedule of Omission Sites Ref <b>WPOM01</b>



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>prove effective, with such heavy caveats on the sites at Eco Sustainable Solutions (inset 7) and Binnegar Environmental Park (inset 10) remains to be seen “ a point I return to below. The established Site Control Centre has been identified as inset 8. Inset 8 is fully supported, albeit the scope for offering further capacity is potentially underplayed, with only 25,000tpa identified. This relates solely to latent capacity within the MBT facility operated by New Earth Solutions which is likely to be liberated over the plan period. WHW confirms that the intensification of the established waste management activities is readily deliverable. The extension land is readily available and deliverable, and would allow for the introduction of complementary activities to enhance the value of end products and potentially a modest increase in the overall capacity of the Site Control Centre. The whole of the Site Control Centre lies within the SE Dorset Green Belt, but constitutes previously developed land. The identification of the site is entirely consistent with national policy which, as acknowledged at paragraph 12.104, allows for limited infilling, partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites. The HRA accompanying the Pre-submission Plan, concluded that the intensification and extension of the Site Control Centre would not give rise to any significant effects (and was screened out accordingly) but only after a site visit and detailed discussions (see pages 10 and para. 7.4.2 on page 14 of the HRA). In contrast, there would appear to be significant uncertainty as to the deliverability of additional capacity at Eco Sustainable Solutions and / or Binnegar Environmental Park. I would make the following observations: Eco Sustainable Solutions (inset 7): WHW is concerned that the allocation would: ¢ Lead to the displacement of existing In-Vessel Composting ["IVC"] , its cessation described under ~ description of potential development in the Site Assessment for inset 7 dated December 2017). The IVC offers capacity to treat green waste further up the hierarchy. It is unclear as to whether the Pre-submission Plan has taken the loss of such capacity into account. The inset would seemingly pave the way for a 160,000tpa EfW. Thus, in displacing an IVC facility, the allocation would also appear contrary to the aims of the Plan, i.e. to ensure that waste ascends the hierarchy. Thus, there would appear to be an inherent contradiction with Development</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Consideration 6 on inset 7. ☐ Result in a stack height (estimated to be a minimum of 100m high at para 3.2.3 of Eunomia s Site Identification report dated January 2016) which might conflict with the aerodrome safeguarding zone. This is highlighted within the Site Assessment, dated December 2017 and Sustainability Appraisal accompanying the Pre-submission Plan. This could prove an absolute constraint, thereby prejudicing deliverability. WHW believes that it would have been possible to reach a definitive view on this prior to allocation. It is very difficult to see how consideration 9 could be satisfied, as the height of the fuel bunker, boiler and 100m+ high stack would go far beyond the existing and extant built envelope (particularly in terms of height). ☐ Have a potential adverse impact on the integrity of the designated Dorset Heathlands SPA/SAC and the protected species therein, particularly when considered in combination with other committed developments in and around Bournemouth Airport. One might typically expect elevated levels of nitrogen loading and deposition in and around an airport, perhaps more significantly from ground-based traffic than air traffic. WHW is concerned that whilst the proposal might displace the IVC and consented AD plant (albeit collectively of a lower capacity), this would not necessarily provide the sufficient headroom for an EfW. WHW acknowledges that emissions will be influenced by the specification of any future plant and any associated emission abatement plant. ☐ Fail the sequential test. Consideration 10 also implies that the sequential test would apply, thus alternative sites outside flood zones 2 and 3 would first have to be considered. In contrast, all of the alternative prospective residual waste allocations lie within flood zone 1. The above has led to a long list of critical Development Considerations being imbedded within inset 7, creating uncertainty over both the sites sustainability (which is scored amber in the Site Assessment dated December 2017) and deliverability. Binnegar Environmental Park (Inset 10): WHW is concerned that the allocation would: ☐ Be located some distance to the west of the Bournemouth / Poole conurbation (the main source of waste arisings). Whilst it is conceivable that direct deliveries by RCV could take place, this would result in excessive turn-around times; increased emissions; and inefficient fleet</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>management (relative to the envisaged spatial strategy). The capacity of the A351 between the Bakers Arms roundabout and Wareham is heavily constrained, particularly in the summer months. It is acknowledged that Purbeck District Council has a transportation strategy in place to address congestion, but this is likely to result in HGVs being routed via Bere Regis. RCVs collecting waste arising from households and businesses on the western fringe of the conurbation would endure a 50k m+ roundtrip. As acknowledged in the WPAs Sustainability Appraisal, "this site is in a poor location for an area-wide facility. One might speculate that this contributed to poor performance of the materials recycling facility (in terms of throughput) and its eventual "mothballing". The text under WP19 implies that the consented facilities provide a fall-back position, at least in terms of capacity; albeit, despite having been granted in 2010, there is no evidence to suggest that the composting facility and inert recycling facility would be brought forward. Whilst the statement "There would be no change in the maximum consented throughput" is factually correct, the reality could be a sizeable increase relative to the existing position. WHW concurs with the WPAs view that the poor location is likely to temper the scale of any future facility at Binnegar. Whilst it is recognised that the potential facility could be serviced from the immediate area and outlying waste transfer stations, in diverting tonnage, the WPA could inadvertently prejudice the business case for investing in new facilities within South East Dorset that are much better placed to take advantage of heat and power connections. c Have a potential adverse impact on the integrity of the designated Dorset Heathlands SPA/SAC and the protected species therein. WHW is concerned that whilst the Pre-submission Plan purports to be technology neutral, assumptions have necessarily been made in the HRA are duly reflected in the Development Considerations. The above has led to critical Development Considerations being imbedded within inset 10, creating uncertainty over the sites sustainability (which is scored amber in the Site Assessment dated December 2017). The HRA identified that the development and operation of residual waste treatment facilities at Eco -Sustainable Solutions, Parley (inset 7) and Binnegar Environmental Park (inset 10) would potentially give rise to likely</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>significant effects on the relevant sites (page 11 of the HRA). It goes on to explain that the likely effects comprise: ~sites where potential proximity effects are related to gaseous emissions from the allocated site affecting the European sites and in the case of Binnegar Environmental Park: site where potential species effects are related to those on species typical of the European sites, due to habitat loss. As explained on pg.13 of the HRA, the prospective operators were asked for further information about how energy emissions from any energy plant would be controlled but goes on to state: at this time, the information is still being prepared and is not available for inclusion in this assessment . Whilst potential mitigation measures are mooted, WHW is all too aware that none are straight forward and that their feasibility and effectiveness cannot be assured without further technical evaluation. Similarly, no baseline data in respect of populations of protected species and potential impacts upon flight paths and or foraging areas has been assembled, and therefore not applied. This could prove an absolute constraint with details of the scope for mitigation sparse. The HRA purports that Policy 3, in combination with the development considerations on the inset plans and Policy 18, collectively serve to present suitable mitigation (page 14 of the HRA). However, the HRA screening appears to be heavily reliant on the fail-safe that development shall not take place without any respective planning application first being subject to HRA. WHW suggests that to merely defer the test to the application stage cannot constitute a mitigation measure. As such, the approach is inconsistent with the DCLG guidance (noting the summary presented on page 4 of the HRA). WHW contests the statement within the Sustainability Appraisal Report (page 93 of the SA) that concludes: ~The detailed criteria contained within this policy along with the detailed development management policies and development considerations (referred to in the Policy) should mitigate all the issues raised and provide a network of sustainable waste management facilities. WHW contends that the WPA has failed in its duty to apply the precautionary principle and take the plan forward only on the basis that there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of European Sites, without otherwise rendering the plan s ~enabling role in delivering a network of sustainable waste management facilities impotent. As it stands,</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Policy 3 is considered ineffective and unjustified, particularly when the latent capacity within the Dirty MRF at the Site Control Centre at Canford is taken into account (see comments on Residual waste, Chapter 7, paragraphs 7.54-7.68, pages 50-52 below). Concern is also expressed that the allocation of land at Mannings Heath (inset 9) could serve to displace established recycling capacity to the detriment of the waste hierarchy, but it is recognised that difficult choices will need to be made in arriving at a holistic solution to meeting the needs of the area. For the reasons set out above, WHW respectfully suggests that Policy 3 is unsound, but that this could be remedied by means of a main modification to exclude reference to Eco Sustainable Solutions (inset 7) and Binnegar Environmental Park (inset 10). In the interests of improving the plan, WHW would also encourage the allocation of a site for an organic waste treatment plant within Policy 3, specifically the allocation of land adjoining the Site Control Centre at Canford in Poole, as set out in appendix D and justified below under Organic food waste (Chapter 7, paragraphs 7.44-7.53 ). WHW does, however, accept that its omission would not in itself compromise the soundness of the Pre-submission Plan. Policy 4 titled ~Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan is considered to be positively prepared and consistent with national policy. It is evident that should Binnegar and Eco Sustainable Solutions be excluded from Policy 3, they could still be considered under Policy 4 so long as identified constraints (currently presented as Development Considerations) are capable of being overcome.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 323		Policy 3 - Sites allocated for waste management development				Christchurch Borough Council	Mr George Whalley	<p>Policy 3 " Sites allocated for waste management development: 3.0 Policy 3 of the Pre Submission Waste Plan (contained in Chapter 6) proposes allocations as identified on the Policies Map for waste management development. Policy 3 states that: Proposals within the Allocated Sites, for the proposed uses set out in Insets 1-13, are acceptable in principle and will be permitted where it is demonstrated that they meet all the following criteria the proposal complies with the relevant policies of this Plan; the relevant Development Considerations have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority; there would not be an unacceptable cumulative impact, from the development, in combination with existing waste management operations; and possible effects (including those related to proximity, species and displacement of recreation) that might arise from the development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. 3.1 The Council objects to this wording as it ignores the need for compliance with the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. In order to be sound this policy needs to be amended to include a further bullet point to refer to compliance with policies in the district and borough Local Plans which comprise the development plans for the respective areas. The following wording is suggested to be added to the draft policy: the proposal complies with relevant policies in adopted Local Plans within the plan area. 3.2 Policy 3 and Inset 7 of the Waste Plan also sets out the detail of the proposed allocation at Eco Sustainable Solutions, Chapel Lane, Hurn, Christchurch. 3.3 The Eco site is an existing waste management facility that incorporates a range of activities including inert recycling, green waste composting, road sweeping recycling and recovery, wood recycling and biomass. There is an extant permission for the site that permits the development of a facility for Anaerobic Digestion and Solid Recovered Fuel Facility. 3.4 The proposed use set out in the draft allocation is for the intensification of the site including the management of non-hazardous waste. At face value it appears that the proposed allocation is now non " specific, however it is clear from the Development Considerations listed in Inset 7 that the intention of the allocation is still to pursue a Solid Fuel</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report.

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Recovered Facility. This is clear because the listed development considerations refer to the following: The issues of appropriate stack height, colour and lighting must be addressed with regards to aerodrome safeguarding and minimising landscape impacts. The listed aerodrome safeguarding considerations are not comprehensive and also need to refer to the impact of disturbed air within a key aerodrome circuit and effects on radar performance. The councils object to any further increase in capacity in relation to the impacts set out below. Airport Aerodrome Safeguarding Impact Impact on European Sites Transport Impact Impact on Strategic Flood Alleviation Measures Odour from the Site Alternative options for provision Airport Aerodrome Safeguarding Impact: Further development of the site on Chapel Lane, Hurn should not take place prior to confirmation that the design for a "management of non-hazardous waste facility will avoid any potential adverse impacts on aerodrome safety. The proposal in the Draft Plan includes a stack height of approximately 100m which raises immediate concerns in terms of airport safeguarding. The proposed allocation has not demonstrated that the likely effects of such a facility on both the operation of Bournemouth Airport and the development of the Strategic Employment site to be capable of mitigation. It is not an appropriate or sound strategy to allocate this site for the intended purpose when it has not yet been demonstrated that planned processes will not give rise to adverse impacts on aerodrome safeguarding. In order to be able to allocate this site detailed design considerations would need to have been agreed at the plan making stage such as stack heights to determine no adverse effects. The statutory Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority has not been convinced that adverse effects can be mitigated and the Council understands there is still a standing objection from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and Manchester Airports Group (MAG). The Council understands that if the allocation remains in the draft Waste Plan with aerodrome safeguarding matters unaddressed then MAG will refer the matter to the CAA / Secretary of State. It is not acceptable or a sound approach to leave such critical considerations to the planning application stage because its has not been demonstrated that the allocation is deliverable. In respect of impacts on the development of the strategic</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>employment site, environmental effects that detract from the ability to attract businesses to it or traffic impacts that detract from the ability to access it should be controlled, mitigated or eliminated. Impact on European Sites: The site is located in very close proximity to the Dorset Heaths SPA / SAC / Ramsar Site and the Council is concerned about any adverse impact on these sites and particularly the adjacent heathlands. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) undertaken for the recent planning permission on the Eco site identified possible impacts from gaseous emissions (nitrogen deposition) on the adjacent heathlands which would be greater with an increase in size of the SFR. The HRA undertaken for the Waste Plan has also identified the potential for significant effects on European sites relating to the gaseous emissions. The proposed operator has been asked for further information about how emissions from an ~energy from waste plant would be controlled to ensure no impact on the adjacent European sites. Unfortunately this information has not been forthcoming or assessed as part of the HRA so it is not clear that adverse effects can be avoided and this cannot be left to the planning application stage. Potential mitigation measures that have been considered to date include raised stack heights but this would not comply with Aerodrome Safeguarding requirements and would be undeliverable. In order to allocate the site in the Waste Plan it has to be demonstrated that the allocation is deliverable at the allocation stage in order to be sound. It has not been demonstrated that impacts on European sites can be mitigated and in combination with Aerodrome Safeguarding concerns the site cannot be allocated. Transport Impact: It is understood that Eco are proposing to replace the currently permitted AD unit with a ~Waste to Energy recovery plant to receive and process a proportion of the Countys residual waste. It is proposed in the draft plan that the current planning permission be amended to allow the site to receive and recycle / recover bulky waste. The proposed operations would raise the total permitted tonnage throughput of the site to 530,000 tonnes per annum from the currently permitted 260,000 tonnes per annum. The proposed doubling of tonnage throughput to the site will have a significant impact on the number of vehicular movements to the site. The draft plan has</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>stated that this will result in an increase from 560 to 840 movements per day on average. This impact on the B3073 corridor would need to be mitigated and has not been considered as part of the current planned improvements to the B3073. A transport impact assessment is required to determine the impact on the network and how this will be mitigated. At the Pre Submission stage no transport impact assessment has been undertaken so it is not clear what the precise impact will be and whether it is capable of mitigation. This is not a sound approach as it needs to be demonstrated at the plan making stage that the allocation is effective and deliverable.</p> <p>Impact on Strategic Flood Alleviation Measures: Manchester Airport Group is currently in the process of developing a flood mitigation strategy for the airport strategic employment site. These proposals will need to avoid any adverse up stream effects on flood risk mitigation measures that are required to develop the strategic employment site. This issue is not set out in the Development Considerations and needs to be considered at the plan making stage to ensure the proposed allocation is effective and deliverable.</p> <p>Odour from the Site: The existing site has a history of odour issues and the proposed increase in capacity is likely to further exacerbate these issues. In this respect, sensitive receptors to the site include the following: Sports facilities (330m south of site); Portfield Primary School (800m south of site); 1 residential property within 250m; 127,500 residential properties within 5 miles; and Bournemouth Airport (1.25km south east of site). Development consideration 7 refers to the provision of suitable controls to minimise odour from the site to acceptable levels. It has not been demonstrated at the plan making stage how this will be achieved in order for the allocation to be effective and deliverable.</p> <p>Alternative Options for Provision: The Spatial Strategy includes a strategic approach toward Residual Waste Management. The strategy identifies a need for strategic residual waste treatment facilities to be addressed through new capacity in South East Dorset. The Spatial Strategy identifies the need to intensify / redevelop 4 existing operations to meet needs over the plan period. This includes the following: Inset 7 " Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley Inset 8 " Canford Magna, Poole Inset 9, Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								Inset 10, Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke In order to meet requirements over the plan period DCC have acknowledged that not all 4 sites will be required. In view of the constraints of the Eco site including, impact on European habitats (nitrogen deposition on the heathlands), Airport safeguarding and transport it is clear that the Eco site at Parley should be deleted in favour of the other 3 sites which will meet plan requirements. The proposed allocation of the Eco site is not effective and deliverable or justified as the site is not required to meet needs over the plan period. The site was originally included in the Draft Waste Plan (2015) in line with the planning application that was being considered for the reconfiguration of the site. Planning permission has now been granted for the introduction of a new plant and processes including a solid recovered fuel processing plant. Now that permission has been granted this proposed allocation should be deleted from the draft waste plan.			
PS D-WP 85	Paragraph	6.8	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	Other more viable sites have not been considered and I wonder why the authority is fixated on Woolsbridge when by its own admission it has said it is "in a poor location..."	The existing road network is not suitable for access to the Woolsbridge site and the plan is therefore defective. There are two other sites that should be considered these are at Mannings Heath and Blunts Farm. You have not said why you are not considering these two	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									sites in your Draft Waste Plan Site Options, especially as Mannings Heath already has planning permission for a bulky waste transfer facility. It does not specify why that has not been built.		
PS D-WP 211	Paragra ph	6.8	No	Yes	No	Ankers and Rawlings	Mr Michael Hirsh	1.0 Introduction : 1.1 Ankers and Rawlings (A&R) and its related companies own the greater part of the land at Woolsbridge which is identified in the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy 2014 at Policy VTSW6 as an extension to the existing industrial estate. In turn this land has now been identified in part in the Pre-submission Draft Waste Plan for local waste management facilities for the transfer and recycling of waste at Policy 3 of the Plan. 1.2 In addition Ankers and Rawlings and its related companies also own the freehold of existing land and buildings at Woolsbridge and on the Ferndown Industrial Estate in the vicinity of the Blunts Farm site. Ankers and Rawlings is also a land owner of residential and mixed-use sites within the plan area some of which are actively being developed at present. 1.3 A Company subsidiary of A&R also operates a skip hire and recycling of waste business. 1.4 The extent of the land showing the existing industrial estate and the two areas of extension of land for employment purposes is provided and shown on the map used by East Dorset District Council for the allocation of the land under policy VTSW6 and the Green Belt boundary has been adjusted accordingly. It is the south area of land that has been identified in the Waste Plan for a site for waste transfer and bulk treatment. 1.5 Whilst the Waste Plan has been going through its various iterations A&R has invested heavily in the various consultants necessary to obtain the necessary information to enable two planning applications to be submitted and approved. The first, for part of the east allocation (known as Site A) and the whole of the south area (Site B) is in outline (EDDC Ref: 3/15/0556/OUT) and is dated 31 March 2017 and is described on the decision notice as: Outline application for the construction of a mixed employment development with	1) The plan in the document showing the allocation should be revised to include a red verge around both the existing estate and the allocations identified in the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy 2014 at Policy VTSW6. 2) The wording in relation to the allocation at Policy 3 currently reads: Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross to which should be added: this allocation is also suitable in principle for other waste related uses dependent on criteria and impact based analysis against any future planning application. 3) There is a need for a supplementary text about the flexibility of future uses: Additional sentences to paragraph 6.6 should advise: At the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate there is the potential, subject to assessment against criteria and impact based analysis at the planning	Your comments are noted. Site has been included in the list of Omission Sites.	See schedule of Omission Sites Ref, <b>WPOM03</b> <b>WPOM04</b> <b>WPOM05</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>a maximum floor space of 33,400msq for Office, Research and Development, Light Industrial, General Industrial or Storage &amp; Distribution use (including trade counter) (use classes B1a, B1b, B1c, B2 &amp; B8) and a small element of floor space under use classes A1, A3, A5, D1 &amp; D2. Engineering operations to form new access junctions from Old Barn Farm Road and new internal roads (Outline application with access and scale parameters to be determined at outline stage and layout, appearance, and landscaping to be reserved for subsequent approval) Addendum to Transport Assessment Received 23/10/2015. Submitted with this representation is a copy of the East Dorset District Councils Planning Committee Agenda for the 6 March 2016 where at page 14 is the Committee Report that led to the issue of the permission (delayed by the negotiations on the accompanying S106 Agreement). This explains the level of detail and understanding about the site at that time. It will be seen that there was a full Environmental Statement and considerable work done on traffic and transport issues. 1.6 Most of the reserved matters that are required as pre-requisites before commencement have also been submitted and approved. A first unit on the north part of the Site A has also been Submitted and approved for a company who intend to run a plant hire business from the site. Plan: Based upon Map 11.7 from the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 -- Core Strategy 1.6 At approximately the same time as the application in outline was being determined A&amp;R secured the purchase of most of the balance of the eastern allocation (thus extending Site A), known as Oakfield Farm. This enabled work to progress and be submitted for a detailed application for roads and sewers on the large majority of the east allocation which was now owned by A&amp;R. This too has been granted permission (EDDC Ref: 3/16/1298/FUL) by notice dated 21 March 2017. The notice describes the development as: Construct new junction with Ringwood Road and estate road to serve the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. Submitted with this representation is an extract from the East Dorset District Council Planning Committee Agenda of the 21 March 2017 with the officer report explaining the merits of the scheme that led to the grant of the permission. Of particular interest in relation to highway matters is that, following a negotiation with the Dorset County Highways team and</p>	<p>application stage for other related waste uses (given the current fallback position of industrial and commercial planning permissions. In this respect, given the restrictions imposed by South East Dorset Green Belt it is logical to facilitate use of this land for future waste operations provided the area beyond the estate and existing occupants of buildings are not adversely affected.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>District planning officers, a new junction, not envisaged in the Core Strategy has been agreed to form the new main entrance to the industrial estate. The Old Barn Farm Road junction will not now be improved by the introduction of traffic lights in favour of this new junction (thus saving important oak trees on the Old Barn Farm Road junction) 1.7 Again, the pre-commencement conditions have largely been submitted and approved. It will be appreciated that there are obvious common matters such as drainage that benefit from comprehensive strategies across the entire land holding and officers from both the District and the County have been involved as well as consultee agencies. 1.8 In relation to deliverability, A&amp;R will start on the infrastructure of the estate during 2018 and are in on-going discussions with waste companies. However, A&amp;R is also actively considering the utilisation of the site by its own waste group. There is inevitably a chicken and egg situation where there remains uncertainty due to the planning position as well as a degree of uncertainty about the current markets for waste and indeed waste to energy. 2.0 Representations in support 2.1 A&amp;R support the concept of a Waste Plan and are willing to consider, positively, the use of land at Woolsbridge for waste related uses. 2.2 Ankers and Rawlings would like to work with the relevant authorities to provide positive solutions for waste not only by facilitating the use of land at Woolsbridge but in addition by making better use of their skip and recycling waste facility and being innovative in relation to waste to energy plants potentially both at Woolsbridge and on other land in the Companys ownership. 3.0 Representations by way of objection 3.1 The notation of only the south part of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for a local waste management plant is over-restrictive and inflexible and the plan is unsound in this respect and is not justified on the facts. 3.2 There is no major logical distinction in the current context between the two proposed areas of expansion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The Plan also ignores the opportunity to redevelop existing buildings on the Industrial Estate. The logical way to identify the site is to draw a red line around both the allocations and the existing estate and then provide an explanatory text. 3.3 By way of amplification the original site assessment carried out by the County has been, in most key respects, overtaken by the detailed</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>analysis and work in relation to the two planning permissions that were issued by East Dorset District Council and the subsequent reserved matters; in summary: The highway impacts will be determined by the fall-back position provided by the amount of floorspace envisaged in the two permissions and the associated traffic generation. The new junction proposal takes away any physical limitation caused by the original traffic light improvement proposal for Old Barn Farm Road. Waste traffic, depending on the location of the facilities may not have to travel through the old estate to get to a site. There are no water source protection or flood risk issues that remain unresolved. The level of detail now available and with Dorset County Councils land drainage team and the Environment Agency means that concerns about constraints relating to drainage, pollution and flood risk are misplaced. Landscape matters have been carefully considered as part of the application process by the District Council. It is not considered that a landscape problem arises from the eastern area as far as new buildings are concerned, in part due to the revised access provision now being through this area and the fall-back position related to the proposed commercial buildings. The bio-diversity issues and the mitigation in relation to impacts on the designated SSSIs have been resolved with the County ecologist and Natural England. (Indeed, the eastern allocation is less sensitive than the south allocation in this respect). Transport miles may be relevant in relation to some waste uses but it needs to be understood that there is no restriction on the origin and destination of goods coming from and going to the existing estate and the employment allocated land. This is surely a matter to be resolved against a detailed application in due course and not against an allocation, given the fall-back position. 3.4 The limitation of the Woolsbridge Estate to a local waste management plant is over-restrictive in terms of uses. The Plan identifies, proposed Policies 5 and 6 that are criteria-based and against which applications will be judged. To then, in addition, influence the introduction of new facilities further by tightly restricting the proposed waste operation at Woolsbridge appears an unnecessary and counter-productive proposal. It tends to undermine the principles of sustainable development set out at paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Framework and in particular the economic role where there is a need to ensure sufficient land is available of the right type in the right places and the right time to support growth and innovation. The issue at the heart of this matter is the flexibility needed to adapt to rapid change in an industry where innovation is continuous and Government policy and public opinion requires the ability to respond. 3.5 To summarise, the allocation of all land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be welcomed and supported by the County Council, as there is a willing landowner looking toward longer-term Government policy to enable a variety of Waste Solutions within the Plan area. A significant amount of the typical site impacts environmental constraints for a waste operation have already been reviewed and dealt with positively as part of the recent planning application submissions. Whilst there are some items that would require further investigation at a detailed planning stage, the delivery risk has been significantly reduced and Woolsbridge clearly is an active site which is deliverable to the Waste Market in the plan period. 3.6 Various waste operators have been in discussion with the Ankers &amp; Rawlings about the possible use of the site for a waste process. The typical response is that those operators are awaiting clarity of the Waste Plan and Government Policy prior to committing to any long-term investment for waste use at the site. As an example, a letter expressing both support and frustration from The Waste Group dated the 15 January 2018 is submitted. This operator is considering the site, but the funding relies on reducing the risk associated with the site allocation and County support. 4.0 Representations concerning the objection by Christchurch and East Dorset District Council dated the 18 th January 2018 in Relation to Policy 3 - Sites allocated for Waste Management. 4.1 The District Councils policy response is myopic. Its policy team believes, without any evidential basis, that because the land is already zoned in the District Councils plan for a range of commercial and industrial uses, that a sui-generis allied use is unacceptable. The basis for land allocation relates back in large measure to providing jobs. Employment in waste is no different from employment in industries that happen to fall into convenient use classes for industry and warehousing; it is a nonsense to believe otherwise and the Council have not substantiated this position with any evidence.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>4.2 There is of course an inherent failing in the planning system if the two Councils concerned with plan making are not making seamless decisions. The net result here is that A&amp;R are caught in the middle of the two opposing points of view. It is entirely possible to positively arbitrate an outcome provided the site allocation for Woolsbridge is more flexible [as is proposed in this representation] and the Districts Policy Team have to recognise that employment in the waste industry provides similar job opportunities to those employed in the range of uses identified in the Council Core Strategy Policy VTWS6. 4.3 Submitted in support of this representation is the Bournemouth Dorset and Poole Workspace Strategy 2016. The author of this strategy also wrote the District Councils objection. It will be seen that this Strategy document was the result of an officer working group and included those in both the relevant authorities. It is perverse that a "greedy and known requirement for land for waste processing industries was not positively considered as part of the known requirements. It is not a "footloose industry and it is an obvious failure to comprehend the needs for employment of this land use in Dorset. 4.4 Against the background of the known waste requirement and in an area heavily constrained by Green Belt and other physical and notational constraints it is unreasonable to expect such uses to be put on any other land use allocation. The Councils representation fails to explain how such a use can be accommodated positively. 4.5 It is disingenuous for the District to object on transport grounds when the sites transport capacity and generative issues are well understood as a result of the recent planning permissions. 4.6 Factually, once the Waste Plan is approved that would supersede the zoning of the Core Strategy 2014. However, if the zoning in the Waste Plan is made more flexible there is every reason to believe it can be delivered. Clearly, as a matter of law reserved matter approvals and details could be granted by the District Council on parts of the Woolsbridge allocations without it being contrary to a suitable policy relating to the delivery of waste operations. There are four pdf documents which will be submitted separately in support: Public Reports Pack for the East Dorset District Council Planning Committee of the 8 March 2016 Extract from the Public Reports Pack for the East Dorset District Council Planning Committee of the 21</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>March 2017 Wast Group Letter of Support date 15 January 2018 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Workspace Strategy 2016.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 14		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	Yes			Ferndown & Uddens BID Ltd	Mr Kevin Poulton		The Ferndown & Uddens BID Board believe that Policy 4 should only be applied if an associated allocated site has, due to a justified change of circumstance, no realistic prospect of becoming available during the plan period. It should not be used as a way of circumvention the plan making and site allocation process.	Your comments are noted.	None
PS D-WP 51		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan				East Dorset District Council	Mr George Whalley	This response is made on behalf of East Dorset District Council on the Pre Submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017. The Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the preparation of the Waste Plan. 1.1 The Councils representations have been framed in relation to the Tests of Soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which consider a plan to be sound that is: Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National Policy 1.2 The Council has also considered whether the Pre Submission Sites Plan is legally compliant and prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Policy 4 “ Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan: 3.17 Chapter 6, Policy 4 sets out a criteria based policy for how applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan will be determined. 3.18 The policy as currently drafted states that, “Proposals should be located: e) within allocated or permitted employment land which allows for Class B1, B2 and/or B8 uses; or. 3.19 This policy wording needs to be amended to avoid conflicts with adopted Local Plan allocation policies and strategic economic strategy so as not to prejudice the ability to meet projected employment land requirements. In order to achieve this I would suggest the following wording to be added to the existing draft policy: e) within allocated or permitted employment land subject to compliance with adopted Local Plan policies.		Your comments are noted, however the current wording reflects National Planning Policy for Waste which provides guidance on the identification of suitable sites. Priority should be given to ‘...sites identified for employment uses...’  Paragraph 6.2 clarify that proposals must comply with all relevant policies of the statutory development plan (including the Waste Plan and the Local Plan).  A modification is also proposed to clarify within Chapter 2 that planning applications will be judged against the Waste Plan, national policy and any relevant local planning policy documents.  See also separate schedule of responses to site allocations.	<b>MM2.1</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 90		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan				Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands	Janet Healy	Policy 4: Sites not allocated in the Waste Plan. We think that this is "legally compliant and "sound. Obviously we had concerns that this could resurrect our Green Belt triangle of woodland, but the proposals both for waste management and location do seem to exclude it. We would like to take this opportunity to say we do recognise the difficulty in meeting all the requirements of "sustainable waste management. We do think that the manufacturers have a duty to help by reducing the amount of packaging on food and goods, especially that which is not, or is difficult, to recycle.		Your comments are noted.	None
PS D-WP 267		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England welcome the text drawing applicants attention to the need to comply fully with policy 18 as is summarised in the HRA.		Your support is welcomed.	None
PS D-WP 320		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	Yes	Yes	No	East Dorset Environment Partnership	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	The document fails all four tests of soundness. i) Policy KS5 of the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy identified 80ha of employment land for B1, B2 and B8 use. No representations were made by DCC during the development of the Core Strategy that additional land would be required for waste facilities. Because of significant under-provision in the SE Dorset conurbation, any loss of the allocated 80ha would reduce this provision further. As with the Woolsbridge site, any reduction in the amount of employment land available to meet identified need in SE Dorset would be contrary to NPPF. ii) EDEP maintains its previous objection to the proposals for waste facilities on the Blunts Farm Employment allocation, Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy Policy FWP8. We note and welcome that it has been withdrawn from the Draft Waste Plan	Delete para e)	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 321		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan		Yes	Yes	Easte Dorset Environmental Partnership	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	EDEP maintains its objections to proposals for waste facilities on Green Belt land adjacent to Blunts Farm (previous comments appended). We note and welcome that it has been withdrawn from the Draft Waste Plan.	No changes recommended	Your support is noted.	None
PS D-WP 324		Policy 4 - Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan				Christchurch Borough Council	Mr George Whalley	Policy 4 "Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan: Chapter 6, Policy 4 sets out a criteria based policy for how applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan will be determined. The policy as currently drafted states that, "Proposals should be located: e) within allocated or permitted employment land which allows for Class B1, B2 and/or B8 uses; or. This policy wording needs to be amended to avoid conflicts with adopted Local Plan allocation policies and strategic economic strategy so as not to prejudice the ability to meet projected employment land requirements. In order to achieve this I would suggest the following wording to be added to the existing draft policy: e) within allocated or permitted employment land subject to compliance with adopted Local Plan policies.		Your comments are noted. It is considered that Policy 4 is consistent with National Planning Policy for Waste. When determination of any planning application, full consideration will need to be given to the proposals compliance with relevant Local Plan policies.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 52	Paragraph	7.1				East Dorset District Council	Mr George Whalley	This response is made on behalf of East Dorset District Council on the Pre Submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017. The Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the preparation of the Waste Plan. The Councils representations have been framed in relation to the Tests of Soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which consider a plan to be sound that is: Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National Policy 1.2 The Council has also considered whether the Pre Submission Sites Plan is legally compliant and prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Forecasts and the need for new facilities: 4.0 Within Chapter 7, the Council supports the time horizon for the projection of need for new waste facilities to 2033 as this is consistent with the Christchurch and East Dorset Plan period and will take into account the same growth considerations. The Council does not intend to comment in detail on the projected figures for waste arisings and the need for new waste facilities. The issues that the Council is raising in its representations are not affected by the latest projections and needs assessment. However it is noted that the Local Economic Forecasting Model (2015) has been used to assess the rate of economic growth to 2033. The latest model that was available at the beginning of 2017 is the 2016/17 LEFM. In order to assess economic growth accurately the latest model should be used in order to be justified and sound. 4.1 Identified Need 5 identifies the need for a waste treatment facility and the proposal to locate such a facility at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The Councils representations in relation to this are set out in detail in response to Policy 3.		The latest published local economic forecasting model was used at the time of preparing the projections. The projections for commercial and industrial waste (CIW) and construction, demolition and excavation (CDE) waste have been reviewed in light of the 2016/2017 LEFM. For CIW this results in an increase in the projected tonnage at 2033 of just under 20,000 tonnes. This is not considered to be significant for the Plan, since the four sites allocated for management of non-hazardous waste (Insets 7-10) make more than sufficient provision to meet the projected shortfall. For CDE waste, using the 2016/17 LEFM results in a decrease in the projected tonnage at 2033 of around 140,000tpa. This could be considered a significant difference in estimated arisings, although this would not change the approach taken to addressing the shortfall in the Plan. Given the significant change in the forecast for CDE waste based on the updated LEFM, it is proposed to build in updated projections for both CDE waste and CIW using the 2016/2017 LEFM.	<b>MM7.1 to MM7.30</b>
PS D-WP 86	Paragraph	7.1	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	Because you have not considered how many sites you will need, and are only focussing on Woolsbridge as your bulky waste site.	You are aware that there are two other sites that are strategically better than woolsbridge, and you have said that it is likely that one facility would be adequate, so you are clearly not considering any other sites.	Your comments are noted. A range of sites have been fully considered during the preparation of the Waste Plan.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 331	Paragraph	7.8		Yes	Yes	WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	<p>Forecasts and the need for new facilities (Chapter 7, page 37) The growth projections set out at paragraph 7.8 would, in WHW's opinion, appear reasonable. As highlighted in table 2, the projections suggest that an additional 170,000tpa of non-hazardous waste (municipal and C&amp;I arisings) would be generated by 2033. It is noteworthy that the Government has recently consulted on "Planning for the right homes in the right places", which included proposals for a standard housing methodology. The consultation was accompanied by an illustration of what the proposals could mean for individual local planning authorities. Bournemouth Borough Council has suggested that this could translate to a doubling of its housing needs, whilst other local authorities would see a more marginal impact. Whilst the Government has yet to report back on the findings of the consultation, the fact that the debate is taking place serves to re-affirm the need for flexibility. WHW is pleased to see reference to the consented extension (ref: APP/14/01648) to the Dirty MRF building at the Site Control Centre which could facilitate the receipt of a wider range of waste types (potentially including Dry Mixed Recyclates ["DMR"] for separation and onward dispatch to re-processors). Construction of the extension commenced in October 2017, but in the absence of a tangible DMR contract, it is likely that the facility will continue to be devoted to treating a broader range of non-hazardous waste streams. It is understood that the full 175,000tpa capacity has solely been apportioned to recycling (see paragraph 7.17 of the plan), but WHW considers that the mainstay would more appropriately be apportioned to residual waste recovery, a point to which I return below.</p>		<p>It is agreed that flexibility is important to the success of the Waste Plan. Monitoring the Waste Plan, following adoption, will be important to ensure that any changes to housing needs are considered. Any identified significant changes in waste arisings may result in the need to revise the Waste Plan and/or part of it.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to how the capacity within existing facilities has been apportioned, particularly with regards to recycling and residual waste management capacity.</p>	<p><b>MM7.1 to MM7.30</b></p> <p>See also schedule of responses to key issues.</p>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 332	Paragraph	7.46				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	Organic food waste (Chapter 7, paragraphs 7.44-7.53, pages 48-49) The shortfall in organic food waste treatment capacity, estimated to be c.57,000tpa by 2033, is duly noted. It is proposed that additional treatment capacity be brought forward by means of a criteria-based policy (Policy 6), rather than by means of allocation. WHW does not oppose this approach per se, but is concerned that the absence of an allocation is a true reflection of the difficulty in identifying a suitable site, casting doubt on the effectiveness of the Plan. From a spatial perspective, there is evidently a lack of food waste treatment capacity in South East Dorset (the main source of food waste arisings). This is compounded by the fact that the operator of the waste facility at Parley has indicated that the consented Anaerobic Digestion ["AD"] plant will not be built out (as explained at paragraph 7.48). WHW put forward a prospective site for an AD plant adjoining the Site Control Centre as part of its response to consultation on the Issues and Options Document and submitted supporting comments when it was featured in the 2015 draft plan (an extract from New Earth Group s response, sent on behalf of WH White Limited, forms appendix [C]). The WPA dismissed this option on the basis on impact upon the South East Dorset Green Belt. As acknowledged at paragraph 12.106, National Planning Policy for Waste affirms the importance of Green Belt but goes on to state "Local planning authorities should recognise the particular locational needs of some types of waste management facilities when preparing their Local Plan . No suitable sites have been identified outside of the Green Belt through the Local Plan process and it is evident that, even if they had been, they would be located some considerable distance from the main source of waste arisings in South East Dorset. Given that Bournemouths fleet of RCVs undertake co -collection rounds and therefore currently need to drop off municipal residual waste at the Site Control Centre, a co-located AD plant would offer scope to reduce transport miles. An AD plant in this location would also benefit from established infrastructure, not least the access roads, weighbridge and circulation space, as well as service connections and the ability to export electricity to the local distribution grid and / or inject gas directly into the main that runs through the Site		Your comments are noted. Site has been included in the list of Omission Sites.	See schedule of Omission Sites Ref <b>WPOM01</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Control Centre. There would also be scope to bring forward a reception point within the existing extent of the Site Control Centre, thus minimising the built footprint of the proposed AD plant. The sealed nature of the AD process limits scope for fugitive emissions and there would be sufficient space to bring forward substantive planting to provide enclosure and deliver biodiversity enhancement. Borough of Poole has also resolved to grant planning permission for a heat distribution network as part of a new 16,000sqm business park to the east of the Site Control Centre (see appendix B of this response). The construction of the AD plant would also provide an opportunity to connect into any future heat network. Should the Inspector be minded to explore suitable opportunities for the identification and allocation of a facility to provide additional organic waste treatment capacity, we would respectfully request that land adjoining the Site Control Centre be considered as an omission site. WHW considers that its inclusion would be justified and improve the effectiveness of the Plan. WHW has revisited the proposal and has refined the area that would be required to accommodate such a plant “ please see illustrative layout plan and supporting Sustainability Appraisal at appendix [D].</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 333	Paragraph	7.55				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	Residual waste (Chapter 7, paragraphs 7.54-7.68, pages 50-52) WHW welcomes the reference to the MBT facility (at paragraph 7.56) and the Low Carbon Energy facility (at paragraph 7.59) that are co-located at the Site Control Centre. It is envisaged that latent capacity within the MBT plant will be liberated over the life of the plan, potentially yielding an additional 25,000tpa over and above the limit established in the consolidated IED Permit. WHW is confident that the Low Carbon Energy facility will be fully built out during the early part of the plan period, helping to reduce HGV movements. Whilst the presence of the established Dirty MRF is noted, its existing role in treating residual waste is not explicitly acknowledged in either the supporting text or in the 'capacity (recovery and landfill) all facilities' section in table 7. Rather, it currently appears to have been positioned solely as providing 'recycling capacity (see paragraph 7.17 of the plan). The facility already receives residual waste streams and no increase in the overall throughput capacity is proposed, so the Pre-submission Plan arguably miscategorises the established facility. A copy of the relevant planning permission(s) forms appendix [A] of this consultation response and I would draw specific attention to the wording of condition 6 which allows for 'recycling, sorting, separating and recovery of waste'. For the avoidance of doubt, I can also confirm that the Environmental Permit allows for the receipt of residual waste. The distinction between the different types of material recovery facilities is aptly drawn in subsequent paragraph 8.15 stating: 'Materials recovery falls under the Waste Framework Directive definition of 'recovery'. For the purposes of this Plan, materials recovery facilities that deal with recyclates only are covered by Policy 5 and proposals for such facilities should be considered against the criteria of this policy. Other types of materials recovery facilities that deal with mixed wastes, often known as 'Dirty MRFs' are covered by Policy 6 (Chapter 9). The established MRF is benefitting from new investment, with new buildings being erected to provide greater enclosure and the installation of more advanced sorting and processing equipment. Whilst it was originally intended that some of the latent capacity within the upgraded MRF be given over to the sorting and separation of municipal DMR, this is unlikely to be		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	<b>MM7.1 to MM7.30</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>forthcoming in the absence of an underpinning contract (as perhaps recognised in the issues at paragraph 7.1 of the WPAs Background Paper 1). The WPA expresses confidence in the delivery of at least one of the consented MRFs, however this might prove to be misplaced. The renewed Dirty MRF at the Site Control Centre is and will continue to be capable of treating a variety of waste streams (aided by the increased enclosure). This could entail the processing of incoming residual municipal waste as well as C&amp;I waste arisings, allowing for the segregation of readily recoverable recyclates and organic fraction. The remaining material would be processed to form a Refused Derived Fuel ["RDF"] for use in energy production. It is noteworthy that Syn-gas has also recently submitted a planning application to allow the Low Carbon Energy facility to received RDF from the Dirty MRF. Given the opportunity presented by the established and upgraded Dirty MRF to treat residual waste, it is WHWs opinion that the reported shortfall in capacity may have been overestimated by as much as 148,750tpa (equivalent to c.85% of the throughput capacity of the established / upgraded MRF). Table 7, page 51 and identified need 7, page 52 should be updated accordingly. Thus, whilst WHW recognise that the WPA has progressed the Plan with all good intention, changes in circumstance have led to spurious consideration of established capacity. Thus, the Pre-submission Plan is not consistent with the final bullet of the national planning policy for waste in that it fails to consider the extent to which the capacity of existing operational facilities would satisfy any identified need .</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 249	Paragraph	7.81	No	No	No	Mineral and Resource Planning Associates	Mr J Cowley	<p>Not Legally Compliant 1 The Plan is not legally compliant because no consultation in this Plan was undertaken with M B Wilkes Ltd on the potential of Henbury in the review of allocated sites in the adopted 2006 Waste Local Plan and the ability of Henbury to meet requirements identified in this Plan. The "Unsound Nature of the Plan 1 Henbury was allocated in the 2006 Plan as a site for various material recovery and recycling operations in relation to inert and construction and demolition waste and for landfill of inert wastes and for the production of recycled aggregate. Such operations were in place at the time and have been extended since to include a variety of recovery and recycling activities. Substantial capacity for expansion of such operations exists with the landfill space available on-site to take final residues. 2 The potential of the existing facilities and the scope for their continuation and expansion to meet the forecast demand for such facilities has been ignored in the Plan. The "review of 2006 allocations in the Plan merely suggests a further review and makes no assessment of the potential of the site. 3 The Plan proposes (Inset 8) intensification of use of an existing site at Canford Magna in connection with a recycled aggregates facility at the adjacent Whites Pit (Mineral Sites Plan Policy MS4). Henbury should also be considered as a similar facility, perhaps on a smaller scale. Henbury is better located to serve the western fringe of the urban area as well as rural Dorset to the north and west. Like Whites Pit it is located in the Green Belt but benefits from being totally screened from views due to topography and screening. 4 The Plan is therefore unsound because: A Not Positively Prepared: The potential at Henbury has not been objectively assessed and waste management may therefore not be delivered sustainably. B Not Justified: The exclusion of Henbury is not justified by any supporting documentation. C Not Effective: The Plan is therefore not effective D Not Consistent with National Policy: Because the Plan is ineffective. 5 This could be resolved by giving Henbury similar status to Whites Pit/Canford Magna. 6 It should be noted that Henbury is not on the map or schedule of waste facilities to be safeguarded. This requires amendment.</p>		<p>Your comments are noted. There have been several opportunities during the preparation of the Waste Plan for waste companies and landowners to put forward sites for allocation.</p> <p>The Mineral Sites Plan includes provisions for safeguarding aggregates recycling facilities and currently includes land at Henbury Plantation. However, it is understood that planning permission expired in September 2016. If planning permission is granted for an extension of time for this recycling operation, it would continue to be safeguarded.</p> <p>Inert landfill sites are not proposed to be safeguarded. They are not seen as essential to the delivery of the strategy as inert recycling facilities will allow for the management of inert waste, further up the waste hierarchy.</p>	Omission Site Ref <b>WPOM06</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 334	Paragraph	7.81				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	Inert waste (paragraph 7.83) WHW welcomes the identification of the existing inert recycling facility at Whites Pit in figure 6. WHW welcomes the statement at paragraph 7.83 cross referencing the Minerals Sites Plan.		Your support is welcomed	Noted
PS D-WP 53	Paragraph	8.1				East Dorset District Council	Mr George Whalley	This response is made on behalf of East Dorset District Council on the Pre Submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017. The Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with the preparation of the Waste Plan. The Councils representations have been framed in relation to the Tests of Soundness as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which consider a plan to be sound that is: Positively Prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National Policy 1.2 The Council has also considered whether the Pre Submission Sites Plan is legally compliant and prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate requirements. Recycling: 5.0 Within Chapter 5 "Spatial Strategy there is reference to the relocation of the Wimborne household recycling centre to serve the East Dorset area in order to bring it up to modern standards and manage increased quantities of waste. The Council welcomes that capacity issues with the existing HRC in Wimborne have been recognised but are concerned that no clear suitable option has been identified for relocation of the existing HRC. 5.1 Within Chapter 8 "Identified Need 2 an approach is set out to enable the development of household recycling and transfer facilities centres to manage locally authority collected waste, to meet specific localised needs. The Draft Waste Plan proposes to achieve this through a combination of allocations and a criteria based policy (Policy 5). As there is no allocation for a new HRC to replace the existing Wimborne facility reliance is placed on the criteria based Policy 5 which introduces uncertainty for how and where a new HRC facility to serve Wimborne will be provided. A criteria based policy provides a useful instrument but does not remove the uncertainty of how immediate additional capacity requirements for Wimborne will be met as identified in the Spatial Strategy. Therefore, this approach is not considered sound as its uncertain whether it is effective and deliverable.		The Waste Planning Authority has undertaken an extensive search of sites suitable for the development of a HRC in the Wimborne/Ferndown area. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to allocate an available, deliverable site at this time. The WPA has been made aware that as Blunts Farm is developed business currently located at Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates may choose to relocate to Blunts Farm, opening up opportunities for the development of a waste facility. Suitable sites will therefore be able to be fully considered against the criteria based policy. In the absence of a specific site allocation it would be possible to add to the criteria-based approach, if this is deemed helpful, by identifying an area of search for a HRC to replace the Brook Road facility.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 101	Paragraph	8.4	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	In relation to bulky waste and the storage and transfer, you appear to be focussing in on only one site i.e Woolsbridge, but you are not considering Mannings Heath which also has permission in place for such activities.	You need to re assess the options, and state why you are not putting Mannings Heath forward instead, although you know it has permission, is a large enough site to co-locate facilities, and is strategically well located for the purpose.	The owners of the Mannings Heath site are promoting the site for the management of residual waste. If allocated, permitted and subsequently developed for this purpose then this site will not be available for the management of bulky waste. The allocation of land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate provides flexibility to enable a site to come forward for the management of bulky waste.	None
PS D-WP 335	Paragraph	8.14				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	Materials Recovery Facilities (Chapter 8, paragraphs 8.14-8.19, pages 61-62) WHW welcome the description MRFs outlined in paragraphs 8.14-8.19 which serve to aid interpretation.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 186	Paragraph	8.2		Don't Know	Don't Know	Piddle Valley Parish Council	S Paulley	Piddle Valley Parish Council do not want to see an increase in traffic through the Valley and London Row should be prohibited from any vehicles.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	<b>MM AS11.2</b>
PS D-WP 188	Paragraph	8.2				Piddle Valley Parish Council	S Paulley	Piddle Valley Parish Council are concerned with all the potential impacts as listed in Policy 13.		Policy 13 provides a list of possible impacts that will need to be satisfactorily, avoided or mitigation to an acceptable level through an application.	None
PS D-WP 190	Paragraph	8.2				Piddle Valley Parish Council	S Paulley	Piddle Valley Parish Council are concerned with having additional traffic through Valley and vehicles associated with Bourne Park should be prohibited from using London Row. Piddle Valley Parish Council are concerned with all the potential impacts on those listed in Policy 13 - Amenity and quality of life		Policy 13 provides a list of possible impacts that will need to be satisfactorily, avoided or mitigation to an acceptable level through an application.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 29		Policy 5 - Facilities to enable the recycling of waste				Vail Williams LLP	Mr Ben Christian	<p>Policy 5 " Facilities to Enable the Recycling of Waste</p> <p>The relevant text of policy 5 is as follows: Proposals for recycling facilities, including household recycling centres, waste transfer stations, material recovery facilities dealing with recyclables, waste management centres, bulky waste treatment facilities, wood and metal recycling facilities and composting facilities, will be permitted where it is demonstrated that they meet all of the following criteria: For all recycling and transfer facilities: a. the operation of the facility will support the delivery of the Spatial Strategy, contributing to meeting the needs identified in this Plan; b. they will not displace the management of waste which is already managed, or likely to be managed, by a process which is further up the waste hierarchy than that being proposed, unless the Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that the proposal would result in benefits sufficient to outweigh the displacement; c. proposals will provide for all operations including the reception, handling, processing and storage of waste to take place within an enclosed building unless there would be no proven benefit from such enclosure and demonstrate that the proposed operations will be compatible with existing or proposed neighbouring uses; and d. possible effects (including those related to displacement of recreation, proximity and species) that might arise from the development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. For household recycling centres and waste management centres the proposal must also: f. be designed to incorporate the separate circulation of household and commercial vehicles; and g. where there is space to do so, make provision for a covered area for the collection of items that could be re-used; and h. display interpretation boards that actively inform householders on measures that they can take to prevent and re-use materials. Taking the text of Policies 3 and 5 in to consideration SAM would like to raise highways and quality of life matters as of primary importance to their operations.</p>		Your comments are noted.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 115		Policy 5 - Facilities to enable the recycling of waste				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	Whilst the AONB supports the concept of Criteria Policies it notes that there is no criteria for protecting the local landscape identified in Policy 5 (page 65). That omission is also noticeable in Policy 6, page 72.		Any application would be assessed against all relevant policies of the Waste Plan, including the development management policies set out in Chapter 12. Policy 14 - Landscape and design quality provides policy on conserving and enhancing the landscape.	None
PS D-WP 336	Paragraph	9.1				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	As previously indicated, identified need 7 is overestimated. Materials recovery and mechanical biological treatment (paragraphs 9.6-9.11, pages 67-68) WHW welcomes the description of MRFs and MBTs outlined in paragraphs 9.6-9.11, which serve to aid interpretation. Thermal Treatment (paragraphs 9.17-9.21, pages 69-70) WHW welcomes the description of Thermal Treatment outlined in paragraphs 9.17-9.21 which serves to aid interpretation. Policy 6 titled "Recovery facilities (page 72) requires proposals for the recovery of non-hazardous waste to comply with six criteria. WHW considers the criteria to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 325	Paragraph	9.1				Christchurch Borough Council	Mr George Whalley	Chapter 9 Recovery: Chapter 9 sets out the need for facilities for the treatment of food and residual waste. Identified Need 7 estimates a shortfall of 227,000 tpa in capacity for managing non-hazardous residual waste at the end of the plan period. The draft plan sets out that there is a need for the provision for facilities to manage residual waste through Insets 7 to 10. The Council has set out detailed representations in response to the draft Spatial Strategy and Policy 3 which state that the proposed strategy is not justified as the four facilities set out in Insets 7 " 10 are not required.		Your comments are noted and dealt with elsewhere in this report. See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	None
PS D-WP 102	Paragraph	9.17	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	You have said that incineration can be more industrial in nature and give rise to higher traffic movements, and the most appropriate locations for these facilities are on employment land or within already developed areas. As such you should be considering other sites for bulky waste transfer/treatment as you will wish to co-locate incineration with that activity	More suitable sites for bulky waste/treatment and co-located incineration would be Mannings Heath or Blunts Farm which are both strategically located, and both are on large areas of employment land and well served by a suitable HGV road network	Your comments are noted. The Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan includes a range of sites considered the best options to address the identified waste management needs.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 315		Policy 6 - Recovery facilities				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Similarly in Policy 6: Proposals for the recovery of non-hazardous waste, including materials recovery, mechanical biological treatment, thermal treatment, anaerobic digestion and biomass facilities, will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that they meet all of the following criteria:		Your comments are noted, however the current wording reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development, set out in the NPPF. For plan-making this means that positive policies that seek opportunities to meet the needs of the Plan area.	None
PS D-WP 326	Paragraph	10.1				Christchurch Borough Council	Mr George Whalley	Chapter 10: Disposal: Chapter 10 refers to Identified Need 9 which identifies a need for the provision of localised inert waste recovery and disposal facilities to meet an identified shortfall and facilitate a good spatial distribution. It is intended this is to be achieved through a criteria based policy (Policy 8) in the Waste Plan. It is noted that the restoration visions for proposed allocations AS-09 Hurn Court Farm Quarry and AS-13 Roeshot do not refer to dealing with inert waste so the Council concludes that these sites will not be used for this purpose.		Your comments are noted. The WPA is not aware of any specific proposals for the importation of inert waste for the restoration of Hurn Court Farm, however if an application were to be submitted it would be considered on its merits against the relevant policies. With regards to Roeshot, we are aware that there may be the need for the importation of inert material to ensure natural drainage is provided on site that may be lost through the change of the sub strata. This is subject to planning permission being granted.	None



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 205		Policy 7 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	Yes	Yes	No	Suez R & R UK Ltd	Ms Annemarie Wilshaw	The plan acknowledges the ongoing need for landfill capacity (identified need 8) and aims for the plan area to be self-sufficient. It identified the two remaining non-hazardous landfill sites within the plan area, Beacon Hill and Trigon, as being currently mothballed whilst having remaining capacity. The approach taken is to safeguard the remaining capacity in these two existing landfills, but only until their respective planning permission end dates (2019 and 2027 respectively), and since it is not known if and when market conditions will make re-opening of these landfill sites viable, neither are assumed as existing capacity (paragraph 7.60). Having acknowledged that there is a need for landfill capacity, this approach could lead to new landfill sites potentially coming forward in the latter half of the plan period under criteria based policy 7. Paragraph 10.22 talks about sending residual waste out of the Plan area for landfill and accepts this approach, contrary to the stated aim for the plan area to be self sufficient. There is no consideration of the alternative approach, which would be to husband the remaining capacity in the two existing landfill sites and allow them more time in which to complete to their approved designed final levels. Premature closure of a site could mean that it is not restored in accordance with the originally permitted landform, and closure before it is filled could mean the restoration and long-term aftercare are not properly funded. That is, enforcing closure before the site is filled may lead to greater long-term harm to the environment and result in an unsatisfactory landform to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The plan is therefore considered unsound because it is not justified, not having considered the reasonable alternatives and not having provided evidence to justify the approach taken. It could also be considered that the plan is not effective in that the capacity at the two existing landfill sites will be "guillotined" at their respective existing permission end dates and there are no allocated sites to provide the identified need for landfill capacity.	Policy 7 should include support for extensions of time frames for existing landfill planning permissions subject to conformity with other policies of the development plan. The surrounding text, specifically paragraph 10.20, should support completion of existing landfills to their permitted capacity rather than to the expiry of their planning permissions. The third sentence of paragraph 10.20 should be changed to read "To encourage self-sufficiency, completion of both sites to their approved capacity is supported are safeguarded until expiry of their planning permissions."	Your comments are noted. The importance of the remaining capacity at mothballed landfill sites is important if Dorset is to work towards self sufficiency. Consideration will be given to amending the Plan to ensure that remaining capacity is safeguarded throughout the Plan period. This approach can then be reviewed as the Plan is reviewed.	<b>MM13.1</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 337		Policy 7 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste		Yes	Yes	WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 7 titled "Final disposal of non-hazardous waste to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 207		Policy 8 - Inert waste recovery and disposal		Yes	Yes	Suttle Stone Quarries	Mr Simon Clabburn	Policy 8 is sound. The use of mineral sites to help satisfy the need for inert material disposal by recovery of a site as part of that sites restoration is sensible. Swanworth Quarry currently contributes to Dorset's need for inert waste disposal. An extension to Swanworth stone quarry is proposed in the Mineral Sites Plan with restoration of the extension by 'recovery' with inert waste. This would help to meet Dorsets' identified shortfall (point 10.28) in suitable inert waste recovery sites over the plan period.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 338		Policy 8 - Inert waste recovery and disposal		Yes	Yes	WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 8 titled "Inert waste recovery and disposal to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 137	Paragraph	11.21	Yes	Yes	Yes	??	Mr Philip Matthews		I believe this section, and that on Winfrith, are justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The sections on radioactive waste address all relevant issues including the scope for in situ disposal. It may be worth noting that the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) is developing a Radioactive Waste Strategy that seeks to manage all radioactive waste in relation to its properties as well as its classification. It may also be worth noting the ongoing work on Proportionate Regulatory Controls that will govern the regulation of any residual radioactive waste	Your support is welcomed	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									once the nuclear license for Winfrith is surrendered. However both the Radioactive Waste Strategy and the PRC work is still developing so the final framework is not yet clear.		
PS D-WP 339		Policy 9 - Special types of waste				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers the criteria set out in Policy 9 titled "Special types of waste" to be pragmatic. Policy 9 is supported.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 256	Paragraph	11.29		Yes	Yes	Purbeck District Council	Ms Anna Lee	The Council has two minor suggestions to make in regard to the proposed policy 10 (Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site). The supporting text for this policy states (at paragraph 11.42) that the Dorset Innovation Park contains 35 hectares of potentially developable land. Purbeck District Council estimates that this sites contains approximately 50 hectares of potentially development land, and therefore suggests that this figure is updated before the plan is adopted. The supporting text for policy 10 includes various references to Magnox as the nuclear site licence holder. This contract is currently being retendered and the licence holder may change, subject to the outcome of the tendering process. As such, the supporting text may need updating prior to adoption of the plan. It is also worth noting that the retendering requirements may delay the 2023 interim end state completion date.		The area of the Dorset Enterprise Zone will be updated. It is proposed to refer to the Interim End State being achieved before the end of the Plan period. It is considered that Policy 10 could refer to 'the site license holder' as opposed to Magnox, although reference to Magnox will be retained in the supporting text.	<b>MM11.1</b> <b>MM11.10</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 268		Policy 10 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England welcome the intention to restore the site to heathland including former areas of mire vegetation.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 216		Policy 10 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Winfrith Nuclear site With regards to the Winfrith nuclear site, which is currently undergoing decommissioning, we note that a very comprehensive description of the site and its aims are given. We consider that the following text, or similar, could be added into Policy 10 (page 88), possibly in part 'a': ~ In relation to materials not destined for off-site disposal or treatment it will also need to be demonstrated by Magnox that the reuse of material does not pose a risk to sensitive receptors. . However, we would be guided by Dorset County Council on whether this wording is considered appropriate.		The Waste Planning Authority is considering a number of modifications to Policy 10 to provide greater clarity on this matter.	<b>MM11.10</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 238		Policy 10 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site	Yes		No	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Mr Owain Griffiths	<p>We are writing to you on behalf of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (the NDA) and Magnox Limited (Magnox), in respect of the current consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan Consultation. GVA is the appointed property advisor for the NDA and Magnox, and provides planning advice across the NDAs UK-wide estate. This representation is made in respect of the NDA site at Winfrith in Dorset (the Winfrith site), which is operated by Magnox (the Site Licence Company) on the NDAs behalf in order to carry out the decommissioning of the site (including waste management and, where appropriate, land remediation). Decommissioning is a long, on-going process that will continue into the plan period. Context</p> <p>The NDA is the strategic authority responsible for managing the effective and efficient clean-up of the UKs nuclear legacy, which includes the Winfrith site. The decommissioning of the site is governed by national strategies which are subject to regular review and consultation. Magnox translates these strategies into its own Integrated Decommissioning and Waste Management Strategy, the latest version of which was published in June 2016. The Winfrith site is expected to reach its interim end state in 2023; however prior to this date, certain new development proposals may be required in connection with the decommissioning, waste management and land remediation processes and the NDA continually seeks for these to be provided for, and supported by, the development plans relevant to its sites. Magnox retains a close working relationship with Dorset County Council (DCC) and has already provided an overview of the applications that are likely to come forward in the coming years to ensure the site can reach interim end state. Previous Representations</p> <p>As you will be aware, GVA submitted a representation on behalf of the NDA and Magnox to the previous draft Waste Plan consultation in September 2015. Since preparation on the New Waste Plan began, however, no formal representations have been made, but given Magnoxs working relationship with DCC, informal correspondence and comments on the Plan have been provided at various stages. Prior to this consultation period, Magnox were provided with the draft wording of Policy 10 (Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith) and were able to make comments, which DCC responded to. While it is noted that certain</p>		<p>The Waste Planning Authority is considering a number of modifications to Policy 10, and the supporting text, to take into consideration the representations received by the NDA and Magnox and ongoing discussions. With regards to Policy 10, it is considered that a modification can be made to criterion a to recognise on-site recovery or disposal of waste originating from the decommissioning of the site.</p> <p>The Waste Planning Authority considers that criteria c - f should be retained but with some amendments.</p> <p>It is proposed to include further guidance on what the Waste Planning Authority would like to see in terms of master planning and explanatory text regarding the provision of community benefits, in order to assist interpretation of Policy 10. It is also intended to remove the policy requirement for the production of an SPD.</p> <p>The Waste Planning Authority intends to liaise further with the NDA/Magnox.</p>	<b>MM11.1 to MM11.12</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>comments have been directly taken into account in the preparation of the Pre-Submission Draft document, other comments have not been addressed. The NDA and Magnox are therefore using the formal consultation period to provide the appointed Inspector with the organisations views on the Draft document. Response to Pre-Submission Draft Consultation The representation to the current Pre-Submission Draft consultation is set out below. The NDA and Magnox is supportive of the specific section of the Plan devoted to Winfrith nuclear research and development facility under Chapter 11 " Other wastes and facilities, and more importantly, the provision of a site specific policy for the decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith (Policy 10). Chapter 11 " Supporting text to Policy 10 Paragraph 11.30 notes that Magnox are working to achieve interim end state by 2023. While this is the case, decommissioning programmes are subject to regular review and can change. We would suggest that by 2023 is amended to "within the plan period. Paragraph 11.30 also notes that de-licensing will take place at final end state, when it may in fact take place at interim end state. We would suggest that the words (de-licensing) are removed. In addition to the above, paragraph 11.31 also refers to de-licensing . We would suggest changing this to "release from regulatory control given that the potential impending changes to environmental regulation of nuclear sites may remove de-licensing requirements. Paragraph 11.40 states that the disposal of waste on site should be restoration-led, enabling the land to be used more effectively for another use, and should use the minimum amount of waste to achieve the stated purpose. EA guidance requires licence holders to "optimise rather than "minimise waste. Therefore, it is suggested that the last part of this sentence is removed, i.e. the words: ", and should use the minimum amount of waste to achieve the stated purpose. It is also suggested that paragraph 11.44 is removed. Justification for this is provided in the following section. We have also picked up the following very minor grammatical errors: ", 11.32 " The NDA require s ", 11.39 " This involves minimising the amount of waste that needs to be disposed of ", 11.40 " "intended after - use Proposed Policy 10 " Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith It is requested that the following minor changes are made</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>to the policy wording for clarity, and to ensure consistency with NDA strategy (which represents national strategy for decommissioning, radioactive waste management and land remediation within the NDA estate) and national planning policy (suggested changes made in red): The Waste Planning Authority will work with Magnox, Purbeck District Council and statutory regulatory bodies to support the restoration decommissioning of the former Winfrith Nuclear Research and Development Facility and restoration to its end state of open heathland with public access where this does not conflict with any on-going management responsibilities. In fulfilling this role the Waste Planning Authority will have regard to the following objectives: a. For any waste disposal that is not destined for appropriate nuclear or other specialist off-site treatment or disposal routes, comprising principally inert waste (although certain radioactive waste will also be considered where it is appropriate and practical) , consideration should be given to on-site reuse or disposal where it would support the sites restoration, on condition that this does not conflict with the site's intended end state or otherwise create unacceptable impacts; and b. The on-site storage of Low Level Waste and Intermediate Level Waste from legacy uses or decommissioning activities in existing or newly constructed safe facilities will continue until such times as the decommissioning programme and wider national waste management strategy allow for its movement to longer term storage, management or disposal facilities ; c. Use of the rail sidings should be maximised where it is feasible to do so, both for the export of materials and for the importation of equipment needed for decommissioning of the site, and their retention post-decommissioning should be considered in the interests of securing a longterm rail freight opportunity; d. The potential for access via Dorset Innovation Park should be investigated, in consultation with stakeholders, to minimise pressure from decommissioning traffic and waste movements upon Gatemore Road and to secure greater use of the A352, in the interests of highway safety and amenity. Restoration should also take account of how the sites configuration and access arrangements will establish a logical eastern boundary with Dorset Innovation Park; e. The restoration programme should have regard to the opportunity for land at the northern end, which lies</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>within the Dorset Innovation Park Enterprise Zone boundary, to be considered for uses which contribute to the Innovation Parks status as a strategic employment site; and f. All development subject to Environmental Impact Assessment should involve substantive preapplication engagement with the Waste Planning Authority and should be informed by a sitewide masterplan. A Supplementary Planning Document will be produced by the Waste Planning Authority to provide further details, guidance and principles for the decommissioning of the whole site for its next planned use. This will seek sustainable outcomes for the local community in accordance with the policies of this Plan, having regard to the on-site designation and proximity of European designated nature conservation habitat, potential mitigation approaches, and legacy opportunities and, if appropriate, community benefits . In respect of clause (a), Magnox welcomes policy provision supporting the re-use/disposal of waste onsite where it supports the sites restoration. While it is noted that the policy relates principally to inert waste (as opposed to exclusively), it is suggested that the policy should also make reference to the re-use/disposal of radioactive waste onsite where it is appropriate to do so. The Council are aware of the emerging policy<sup>1</sup> and regulatory guidance concerning site remediation and site end states. The Environmental Regulators draft guidance<sup>2</sup> will require Magnox (and other Nuclear Site Licence holders) to review the site-wide waste management approach to identify and deliver an optimised site end state. This includes consideration of options for in-situ disposal of existing subsurface structures and the approach to managing land contamination. This guidance should inform the policy context for radioactive waste management at Winfrith, and the suggested change to the policy is considered appropriate in this context in order to ensure the plan is sound and consistent with national policy. Magnox agreed the wording of clause (b) with DCC during informal discussions and is satisfied with this part of the policy. Clauses (c), (d) and (e) are considered to be aspirational and/or focussed on economic redevelopment, which is not a matter to be covered in the Waste Plan and would be more appropriately addressed by Purbeck District Council (PDC) in its Local Plan Review. In this respect, it is not considered that these criteria are positively</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>prepared as they do not seek to meet objectively assessed development needs. If these matters are to be included in the Waste Plan, it is considered that they should not be included within the policy itself, but perhaps noted as aspirations or considerations in the supporting text. The NDA and Magnox feel clause (f) is superfluous in the context of the policy. Substantive preapplication engagement is best practice for major developments anyway, particularly where Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) may be required. Reference to a site-wide masterplan is also not necessary. Magnox has provided the local and waste planning authorities with a schedule of likely applications already. Of the remaining projects, a series of building demolitions have been detailed, prior to much larger scale end-state works to include re-profiling, landscaping, surface water management, and making safe the voids (in-fill or in situ-disposal). Given the late stage decommissioning is at, a masterplan is considered to be excessive. Equally, the restoration of the site to open heathland is not considered to require a masterplan. Following the meeting that took place between Magnox and the local and waste planning authorities on the 10th January 2018, we would echo our clients view that a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to provide further details, guidance and principles for the decommissioning of the whole site for its next planned use is not required. As mentioned above, the site is at an advanced stage of decommissioning (having begun the process in 1990) and the introduction of an SPD at this stage would add little value to the determination of planning applications. The forthcoming endstate planning application will involve significant local and stakeholder consultation; will be accompanied by an Environmental Statement, and will suitably and effectively contextualise and justify the proposals, readying the site for its next planned use. For the reasons described above, it is not considered that paragraph 11.44 needs to precede Policy 10 and can be removed. Notwithstanding the above position, should DCC consider the preparation of a SPD fundamental for the determination of the few remaining applications to be submitted, then it should be prepared in conjunction with PDC as the local planning authority and Magnox will seek to cooperate by providing any information required, over and above that already distributed to the</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Councils. In respect of including the provision of community benefits within the policy, DCC has indicated to Magnox in separate correspondence that this is referring to non-statutory community benefits, such as those which are voluntarily offered and not necessary in planning terms. The NDAs position on such community benefits is that there are other mechanisms, outside planning legislation and policy, already in place to ensure that the community hosting an NDA facility can receive social and economic benefit. These measures fall within NDAs statutory duties under the Energy Act 2004. Furthermore, the preferred end state for Winfrith of open heathland with public access is considered to offer substantial social benefits to the local community. It is therefore requested that the reference to other community benefits made in the policy is removed. Conclusion This representation has been made by GVA on behalf of the NDA and Magnox in response to the current consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. In summary, the NDA and Magnox are supportive of the proposed allocation for the Winfrith Site but consider that changes to the wording of the site-specific policy are necessary to align with national guidance and to ensure the soundness of the Plan. If you require any clarity in respect of the enclosed representation, then please contact us. 1 Discussion paper on the regulation of nuclear sites in the final stages of decommissioning and clean-up (November 2016) (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/discussion-paper-on-the-regulation-of-nuclear-sites-in-the-final-stages-ofdecommissioning-and-clean-up">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/discussion-paper-on-the-regulation-of-nuclear-sites-in-the-final-stages-ofdecommissioning-and-clean-up</a>) 2 Guidance on Requirements for Release of Nuclear Sites from Radioactive Substances Regulation (February 2016) (<a href="https://consultation.sepa.org.uk/operations-portfolio/grr/">https://consultation.sepa.org.uk/operations-portfolio/grr/</a>)</p>			
PS D-WP 340		Policy 10 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW notes the criteria set out in Policy 10 titled "Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith Nuclear Licensed Site but proffer s no further comment owing to the specialist nature of this licensed site.		Noted	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 341		Policy 11 - Waste water and sewage treatment works				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW notes the criteria set out in Policy 11 titled "Waste water and sewage treatment works but proffers no further comment owing to the specialist nature of such works.		Noted	
PS D-WP 113	Paragraph	12.1				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	Omissions The AONB is also concerned that the Councils Duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 is not mentioned. General duty of public bodies etc. E+W This section has no associated Explanatory Notes (1) In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. (2)The following are relevant authorities for the purposes of this section" (a) any Minister of the Crown, (b) any public body, (c) any statutory undertaker, (d) any person holding public office. This is a particular omission as it relates to councils and councillors in their decision making affecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Furthermore this Duty is not mentioned in the Sustainability Assessment in relation to the sustainability objectives, or in Table 16. Despite the statements in Chapter 12 the Plan does not explicitly state that paragraph 116 of NPPF is quite clear that planning permission should be refused for major developments in AONBs and National Parks except in exceptional circumstances and where they can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. A consideration of the Assessment should include not only the need for development and the impacts of permitting it but also the scope for developing elsewhere outside of the designated area, or meeting the need in some other way.		Include reference in SA report to Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Paragraph 12.49 will be amended to reflect this.	Additional modification
PS D-WP 342	Paragraph	12.1				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	The plan encourages promoters of prospective development to seek pre-application advice and undertake stakeholder and community engagement. This is very much in the spirit of the NPPF and fully supported by WHW. WHWs site at Canford is permitted and licenced and does not require any further Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Nevertheless, the explanations of EIA, planning conditions and contributions are useful additions to		Your support is welcomed	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								help to ensure that the plan is accessible to a wide audience.			
PS D-WP 103	Paragraph	12.9	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	You have not considered a CIL or Section 106 agreement at Woolsbridge	In order to allow the Woolsbridge site to operate a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility you would need to open a road across Oak Field Farm to the A31 which is a suitable HGV route to the site. You have not said that you are even considering this action, even though you have said that "...waste would have to travel greater distances..." to access this site.	Planning permission has already been granted by East Dorset District Council for a new access into the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate.	None
PS D-WP 305	Paragraph	12.21				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	As this is an area plan, we believe that you have the authority to give National Nature Reserves, SSSIs and SNCIs the same extra protection that you afford SACs and RAMSAR sites. In your inset documents, please make it clear that you value these sites.		Paragraph 12.82 of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan lists the features of biodiversity and geological interest to be given protection for the purposes of Policy 18 'Biodiversity and geological interest'. This includes National Nature Reserves, SSSI and SNCI's. It is considered that this provides an appropriate level of protection.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 30		Policy 12 - Transport and access				Vail Williams LLP	Mr Ben Christian	Highways - Access The text of policy 12 (Transport and Access) is as follows: Proposals for waste management facilities which could have an adverse impact as a consequence of the traffic generated will be permitted where it is demonstrated, through a Transport Assessment that: a. a safe access to the proposed site is provided; and b. the development makes provision for any highway and transport network improvements necessary to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of a highway, railway, cycle way or public right of way. Where they are in the control of the developer, improvements will be delivered in a timely manner; Where possible, proposals should have direct access or suitable links with the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network. Where this is not possible, appropriate routes to the strategic road network should be utilised. Where necessary transport improvements will be provided to overcome any significant, adverse impacts, on the strategic, primary and/or local road network. Sustainable transportation should be explored and used where possible, practical and environmentally acceptable. This could include minimising distances travelled by road and maximising the use of alternative transport modes to road transport. Where proposals are likely to generate significant employment opportunities they should enable the use of public transport where practical. Policy 12 part b and the "Access Considerations section, on page 2 of Inset 3, states that access will be achieved via the proposed link road being created as part of the southern extension to Gillingham (allocated in the North Dorset Local Plan). It is our suggestion that this has not been considered in full when proposing the allocation of a Household Recycling Centre or other employment uses within the Brickfields Business Park Southern Extension. It is proposed that further assessment should be undertaken to look at the access from the link road to the site. The link roads suggested route is to terminate approximately 0.2miles south of the employment allocation (see Concept Plan [Figure 9.3] in North Dorset Local Plan). The journey along the B3092 from the link road junction to the employment allocation should be carefully considered as this is a narrow road and potentially unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles. Whilst access may be achievable for users of		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>the site from the south and east of Gillingham via the new link road, this is unlikely to be the chosen route for users from the centre and north of Gillingham. These users are considered likely to access the site via Gillingham town centre, along the B3092 and the narrow railway bridge on the B3081. No assessment of this appears to have been undertaken. It should also be noted that a consortium for the residential allocation to the east of the site have drafted a master plan framework for their portion of the Gillingham Southern Extension as outlined in Policy 21 of the North Dorset Local Plan. SAM have not been involved in the drafting of this master plan framework and therefore details on connectivity between the two areas has not been fully explored. It is also not apparent as to whether the cumulative impacts on the highways from this the Brickfields Southern Extension and the extension to the Sewage Treatment works in Gillingham have been undertaken. This is a requirement under Policy 3 (part c) and Policy 2. Policy 12 requires direct or suitable links with the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network (Figure 10) where possible. From a review of Figure 10 it is evident that Gillingham is not close to a strategic or primary lorry route. Detail does not appear to have been provided for how the 1000 one-way movements per annum of HGVs will be achieved without access to the strategic or primary lorry routes. It is considered that this should be investigated before proceeding with this allocation in Gillingham. In conclusion, it is considered that further highways work is required, or if completed should be displayed, to justify the access to the site given the apparent capacity challenges on the highways network as identified by the Local Highways Authority and Highways England in the Traffic/Access section within the Site Assessment (Part 1- Sustainability Appraisal). For clarification purposes, SAMs foregoing comments regarding Highways "Access" only apply to SAMs review of Highways and Access as they relate to employment uses other than a Household Recycling Centre or any other Waste Management Development. As previously stated, SAM does not support, and declines, the proposed allocation or use of its land for a Household Recycling Centre or any other Waste Management Development.</p>			
PS D-		Policy 12 - Transport				Cranborne Chase &	Mr Richard Burden	There is no reference to the Dorset Rural Roads Protocol or the sustainability of the rural character of		Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to the	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
WP 116		and access				West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty		AONB roads or tranquillity of the AONB in Policy 12. Including such matters would improve that policy.		inclusion of reference to the Dorset Rural Roads Protocol.	
PS D-WP 67		Policy 12 - Transport and access	No	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Graham Habgood	A Traffic assessment also needs to consider the adverse impacts on villages and residents en-route to waste facilities caused by the movement of large goods vehicle that fail to use the advisory routes, instead choosing to use 'rat-run' short cuts, as in the case of the many LGVs using Rectory road Piddlehinton, to get to the existing site at Bourne Park (Inset 11)	The plan should contain a commitment to protect rural communities by looking at methods of prohibiting/restricting LGVs from using non advisory routes and linking failure to comply with site licence regulations.	Your comments are noted. The WPA will give further consideration to expanding the existing development consideration regarding access to the site.	<b>MM AS 11.2</b>
PS D-WP 167		Policy 12 - Transport and access				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN), which within Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole comprises a ~20 mile stretch of the A31 (between A35 and B3081), and ~46 miles of the A35 (between Monkton Wyld and Poole), as well as a short length of the A303 between the B3092 and B3081 junctions. It is on the basis of these responsibilities that we have provided the following comments. We are generally concerned that the potential traffic impacts of any sites that are proposed to be allocated in the waste plan should be assessed during the plan-making stage. The imperative to identify these improvements at this early stage is set out in government policy. Paragraph 15 of DfT Circular 02/2013 states that: "In order to develop a robust transport evidence base [for local plans], the Agency [Highways England] will work with the local authority to understand the transport implications of development options. This will include assessing the cumulative and Individual impacts of the Local Plan proposals upon the ability of the road links and junctions affected to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in terms of capacity and safety. Paragraph 18 states that "Capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as		General comments are noted. See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report.

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>fresh proposals at the planning application stage. The Highways Agency (now Highways England) will work with strategic delivery bodies to identify infrastructure and access needs at the earliest possible opportunity in order to assess suitability, viability and deliverability of such proposals, including the identification of potential funding arrangements. Undertaking suitable assessment of transport impact at the plan-making stage avoids sites being chosen where: ¢ the traffic impact of the proposed development on the operation of nearby junctions is not known; or ¢ proposals for access or transport mitigation are untested and uncosted. Responses to Local Plan consultations are also guided by other pertinent policy and guidance, namely the NPPF and The Strategic road Network: Planning for the Future “ a Guide to working with Highways England on Planning Matters. Our specific comments are as follows. We have previously commented on the Draft Waste Plan Update 2016 consultation document, as well as the Waste Site Options in Blandford and Purbeck document, and the comments provided within this letter should be read alongside those as there are some issues and themes that are common throughout. Since our last response, 13 sites have been allocated in the pre-submission Waste Plan that could address the waste management needs of the Plan area. For completeness, our response also comprises those sites previously commented on. Due to the number of sites and for ease of reference, our comments are shown in the form of a table attached to this letter. Site allocations are highlighted in yellow. In line with our previous comments, and following our review of the Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft we consider that there are only a few sites that may require further consideration in terms of their impact on the SRN, as outlined above in respect of the mineral sites and in the attached table in respect of the waste sites. This is obviously without prejudice to the planning process and any information that is submitted to support an application by any of these, or other, mineral sites. Comments have been attached to specific Site Allocations - See Appendix 3</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 247		Policy 12 - Transport and access	Yes	Don't Know	No	Railfuture, Wessex Branch	Mr Anthony Smale	Policy 12 requires proposals to have direct access to lorry routes with no mention of railway routes and ports. Figure 10 shows the road network but does not show railways or port facilities.	In Policy 12, after Dorset Advisory Lorry Network insert [comma] railhead or port facility. In next sentence, after strategic road network insert [comma] railhead or port facility. Figure 10 needs to show railways (with railheads) and port facilities.	Opportunities to move waste by rail or via port facilities are considered to be rare within the Plan area, given the availability of suitable facilities and the rural nature of the Plan area. However, Policy 12 encourages applicants to explore and utilise sustainable methods of transport such as rail or sea where possible, practical and environmentally acceptable.	None
PS D-WP 343		Policy 12 - Transport and access				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 12 titled "Transport and Access to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The supporting text (paragraphs 12.20-12.37) is particularly welcome as it aptly summarises potential challenges and opportunities. It also goes some way to demystifying the operational requirements of the waste industry. The inclusion of figure 10 titled Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Map is supported as it provides clarity and removes any ambiguity.		Your support is welcomed.	None
PS D-WP 407		Policy 12 - Transport and access			No	Bourne Leisure c/o Lichfields	Ms Helen Ashby-Ridgway	The Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan states at Policy 12 " Transport and Access: Proposals for waste management facilities which could have an adverse impact as a consequence of the traffic generated will be permitted where it is demonstrated, through a Transport Assessment that: a. a safe access to the proposed site is provided; and b. the development makes provision for any highway and transport network improvements necessary to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of a highway, railway, cycle way or public right of way. Where they are in the control of the developer, improvements will be delivered in a timely manner. Bourne Leisure is concerned that draft Policy 12 point b. states that proposals for waste management facilities are only required to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of a highway, railway, cycle way or public right of way. The Company notes that any adverse impacts on the transport network can be detrimental to the tourist industry, as transport safety and capacity issues can prevent tourists from visiting or returning to the area, thereby having a detrimental impact on the local economy. Bourne Leisure therefore considers that proposals for waste management	Bourne Leisure considers that draft Policy 12 should be amended as follows: Proposals for waste management facilities which could have an adverse impact as a consequence of the traffic generated will be permitted where it is demonstrated, through a Transport Assessment that: a. a safe access to the proposed site is provided; and b. the development makes provision for any highway and transport network improvements necessary to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of a highway, railway, cycle way or public right of way.	Your comments are noted, however the WPA considers that Policy 12 provides adequate protection to the road network from waste developments.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								facilities should be required to mitigate or compensate for any adverse impacts, not just significant adverse impacts, on the transport network, particularly due to the nature of the traffic likely to be required for waste development. The Company concludes that, as drafted, Policy 12 does not comply with the justified test of soundness, as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based upon proportionate evidence. However, Bourne Leisure considers that draft Policy 12 could be made sound if the suggested amendments outlined in Section 5 below are applied.	Where they are in the control of the developer, improvements will be delivered in a timely manner. Bourne Leisure considers that this deletion would provide compliance with the justified test of soundness for draft Policy 12, as it represents the most appropriate strategy, compared to the reasonable alternatives.		
PS D-WP 104	Paragraph	12.38	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Deirdre Barber	You have not considered how the quality of life of the local residents in and around Horton Road will be affected by your proposal to use Woolsbridge.	Local residents have not been informed about your proposal to use Woolsbridge, no one at the meeting on Saturday 13th January 2018 had any idea what you were up to. Everyone agreed that their quality of life would be affected by noise and pollution given off from HGV's travelling to and from the site. There was great concern about the suitability of the road width where accidents have been frequent, and school children and visitors to Moors Valley park will also be affected by this.	Your comments are noted. However, the WPA consider that the Waste Plan contains an appropriate level of protection to the amenity and quality of life of residents whilst promoting the development of waste facilities to address the needs that have been identified.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 408	Paragraph	12.38			No	Bourne Leisure c/o Lichfields	Ms Helen Ashby-Ridgway	The Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan states at paragraph 12.43: Applications must demonstrate that such matters have been carefully considered and that impacts can be avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to the proximity of sensitive receptors. As well as dwellings, sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, schools, hospitals, prisons, churches, visitor attractions and recreational areas. Proposals should also take account of planned development in the vicinity. Bourne Leisure considers that draft paragraph 12.43 should specifically recognise holiday accommodation within its list of sensitive receptors. Holiday accommodation, and caravans in particular, can be particularly sensitive to adverse impacts in relation to waste management facilities. The Company notes that tourists can be deterred from visiting or returning to an area by such impacts, which would have a negative impact on the local economy, in reducing visitor expenditure and leading to the loss of local jobs. Bourne Leisure regards draft paragraph 12.43 as not compliant with the justified test of soundness, as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy when compared to the reasonable alternatives (i.e. recognising the particular sensitivity of holiday accommodation). However, the Company considers that this draft paragraph can be made sound through the amendment suggested in Section 5 below.	Bourne Leisure considers that draft paragraph 12.43 should be amended as follows: Applications must demonstrate that such matters have been carefully considered and that impacts can be avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to the proximity of sensitive receptors. As well as dwellings, sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, schools, hospitals, prisons, churches, visitor attractions, holiday accommodation and recreational areas. Proposals should also take account of planned development in the vicinity. Bourne Leisure considers that this addition would provide compliance with the justified test of soundness for draft paragraph 12.43, as it represents the most appropriate strategy, compared to the reasonable alternatives.	It is considered that reference could be made to holiday accommodation within paragraph 12.43, although the list of sensitive receptors is intended to provide examples rather than an exhaustive list.	Additional Modification

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 31		Policy 13 - Amenity and quality of life				Vail Williams LLP	Mr Ben Christian	Quality of Life The text for policy 13 (Amenity and Quality of Life) is as follows: Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where it is demonstrated that any potential adverse impacts on amenity arising from the operation of the facility and any associated transport can be satisfactorily avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to sensitive receptors, specifically addressing all, but not limited to, the following considerations: a. noise and vibration; b. airborne emissions, including dust; c. odour; d. litter and windblown materials; e. vermin, birds and pests; f. lighting, loss of light; g. loss of privacy; h. visual impact; i. site related traffic impacts; and j. stability of the land at and around the site, both above and below ground level. The matter of Amenity/Quality of Life is the primary reason for SAMs objection to a Household Recycling Centre on the southern extension to Brickfields Business Park, land under their ownership. SAM consider that the operation of a Household Recycling Centre adjacent to their operations would create an unacceptable Quality of Life for SAMs staff and may affect their operations. SAM as landowner, reserves its legal rights to refuse the creation of any development that is considered to have a potential adverse impact on its land or current or future operations.		Your comments are noted. However, the WPA consider that the Waste Plan contains an appropriate level of protection to the amenity and quality of life of sensitive receptors whilst promoting the development of waste facilities to address the needs that have been identified.	None
PS D-WP 344		Policy 13 - Amenity and quality of life				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	In a similar vein, WHW considers Policy 13 titled ~ Amenity and quality of life to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy (notably appendix B of National Planning Policy for Waste).		Your support is welcomed	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 406		Policy 13 - Amenity and quality of life			No		Ms Helen Ashby-Ridgway	NB: Bourne Leisures objection to draft Policy 13 also applies to draft Policies 4, 5, 6 and 11, which each cover a different type of waste management facility / waste development. However, the Company intends that the suggested amendments to draft Policy 13 below would cover all types of waste management facility (or waste development as we have proposed above), and so no additional changes would be required for these other draft policies. The Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan states at Policy 13 “Amenity and quality of life: Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where it is demonstrated that any potential adverse impacts on amenity arising from the operation of the facility and any associated transport can be satisfactorily avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to sensitive receptors, specifically addressing all, but not limited to, the following considerations: a. noise and vibration; b. airborne emissions, including dust; c. odour; d. litter and windblown materials; e. vermin, birds and pests; f. lighting, loss of light; g. loss of privacy; h. visual impact; i. site related traffic impacts; and j. stability of the land at and around the site, both above and below ground level. Bourne Leisure is concerned, firstly, that draft Policy 13 does not explicitly state that it applies to all types of waste-related development. As currently worded, it is unclear and could be interpreted as only applicable to facilities for the management of waste, e.g. a waste sorting centre or landfill. The draft policy should be stated explicitly as applying to all waste-related development. Second, the Company considers that this draft policy does not provide adequate protection for neighbouring uses against any adverse impacts of waste-related development. The Company notes that tourism uses in particular are sensitive to adverse impacts, as tourists can be deterred from visiting or returning to an area as a result, which would have a negative impact on the local economy, in reducing visitor expenditure and leading to the loss of local jobs. This draft policy does not provide assurance that waste-related development proposals will not have a detrimental effect on sensitive receptors. Instead, it should be worded to ensure that the impact of the proposed development is acceptable “ and should not just require that any adverse impacts can be mitigated to an acceptable level, which is	Bourne Leisure considers that draft Policy 13 should be amended as follows: Proposals for any type of waste development or waste management facilities will be permitted where it is demonstrated that they protect the amenity of residents, visitors, tourists and businesses against any adverse impacts any potential adverse impacts on amenity arising from the operation of the facility and any associated transport can be satisfactorily avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to sensitive receptors, specifically addressing all, but not limited to, the following considerations: a. noise and vibration; b. airborne emissions, including dust; c. odour; d. litter and windblown materials; e. vermin, birds and pests; f. lighting, loss of light; g. loss of privacy; h. visual impact; i. site related traffic impacts; and j. stability of the land at and around the site, both above and below ground level. Bourne Leisure considers that this addition and amendments would provide compliance with the consistent with national policy test of soundness for draft Policy 13, as it provides specific	Your comments are noted. However, the WPA consider that the Waste Plan contains an appropriate level of protection to the amenity and quality of life of sensitive receptors whilst promoting the development of waste facilities to address the needs that have been identified.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								extremely difficult to define and determine. One of the core planning principles, presented by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 17, bullet point 4, is that planning should always seek a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings . As drafted, Bourne Leisure considers that emerging Policy 13 does not meet the consistent with national policy test of soundness because it does not reflect the need to protect the amenity of neighbouring land uses. However, Bourne Leisure considers that emerging Policy 13 could be made sound if the suggested amendments outlined in Section 5 below are applied.	protection for sensitive receptors.		
PS D-WP 118		Policy 14 - Landscape and design quality				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	This AONB is concerned that in the Sound Assessment Check List (Policy 14) the important NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116 are omitted. It is noticeable that the check list jumps from paragraph 109 to paragraph 117. Clearly Paragraphs 115 and 116, relating to the highest level of protection, being applied to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the presumption that major development will be refused in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty other than in exceptional circumstances, are key matters that should not be overlooked.		The Soundness Self Assessment Checklist is set out by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) and is a tool for local planning authorities to complete.	None
PS D-WP 345		Policy 14 - Landscape and design quality				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 14 titled "Landscape and design quality to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 346		Policy 15 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 15 titled " Sustainable construction and operation of facilities to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The policy could, however, be improved through an additional paragraph to the effect that "alterations to existing facilities will be supported where they would enhance operational efficiency or are required to satisfy the requirements of other statutory regimes. The latter might, for instance, be dictated by changes in Environmental Permitting or Health and Safety and manifest itself in physical alterations.		Your comments are noted. It is considered that the policy and supporting text would benefit from a modification to clarify that this policy applies equally to new facilities and alterations/improvements to existing waste facilities.	MM12.3

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 347		Policy 16 - Natural resources				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 16 titled "Natural resources to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 215		Policy 17 - Flood risk				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Page 12 " we would query the reference to the River Parrett. We suggest amending the text to read, Rivers Wriggle and Yeo (headwater sub-catchments of the River Parrett), Chapter 6 " only a cursory mention of more recent flood events in Dorset is noted. We suggest more information is provided in respect of more recent events, notably the July 2012 event, and the storms during the winter of 2013/14. We suggest including these events in Table 5. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) will be able to provide details, as relevant for inclusion within the SFRA, for these flood events. We suggest updating sections entitled "Fluvial flooding and "Flooding from the sea as appropriate.		Your helpful comments are noted. The SFRA will be updated as recommended.	No modifications to the Plan but update to the SFRA proposed.
PS D-WP 348		Policy 17 - Flood risk					Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 17 titled "Flood Risk to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	Noted
PS D-WP 269		Policy 18 - Biodiversity and geological interest				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England support Policy 18 and the corresponding paragraphs setting out the considerations in further detail. There are no allocations which involve direct land take of protected sites which is welcome. However historical activities such as minerals extraction have led to subsequent waste uses coming forward in close proximity to protected sites. This gives rise to concerns about the impacts of additional levels of aerial pollutants such as ammonia and nitrogen compounds either from increased levels of transportation, from on-site waste management/processing or other processes such as Waste to Energy which generate increased aerial deposition. This is a concern around the Dorset Heaths SPA/Ramsar and Dorset Heathlands SAC which are low nutrient systems as well as within the Poole Harbour Catchment where there is a Nitrogen reduction in Poole Harbour SPD established by four Competent Local Planning Authorities. Proposed allocations will need to consider this matter with clarity and based upon evidence of likely effects. Natural England advises that there are a range of avoidance/mitigation options available and Policy 18		Your support is welcomed	Noted

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								provides a firm position on the need to avoid direct harm.			
PS D-WP 349		Policy 18 - Biodiversity and geological interest				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW acknowledges that the plan area is blessed with biodiversity assets. The plan rightly places high priority on safeguarding the integrity of habitats and flora and fauna therein. WHW considers Policy 18 titled "Biodiversity and geological interest to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. WHW notes paragraph 12.82 and raises a concern as to whether (f) Possible SACs , (g) Potential SPAs and / or the latter part of (i) areas which would meet the criteria needed to justify designation as an SPA are defined (both in terms of legislation and geography). Furthermore, it is currently unclear as to who defined them. Unless these terms are clearly defined and universally understood, then it would seem inappropriate to include them. Thus, I would respectfully suggest that these terms either be excluded or benefit from further explanation as a footnote.		It is proposed to provide clarification on this matter through a minor modification.	Additional Modification



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 262		Policy 19 - Historic environment				Historic England	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	Whilst Historic England welcome the principle of the policy, in its current form it is, unfortunately, inconsistent with the language and emphasis of national policy. We therefore recommend that to accord with national policy, Policy 19 is adjusted. We would be happy to help with this exercise and a revised Policy could be drafted as follows. Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where it is demonstrated that heritage assets and their settings will be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified, weighed against the public benefits of the proposal and whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset. Where harm can be fully justified, where relevant, the Council will require archaeological excavation and/or historic building recording as appropriate, followed by analysis and publication of the results.		The Waste Planning Authority has met with Historic England and is working together on a modification to the policy to address this comment.	MM TBC
PS D-WP 350		Policy 19 - Historic environment				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 19 titled "Historic environment to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 192		Policy 20 - Airfield Safeguarding Areas				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	Dorset County Council: Pre Submission Draft Waste Plan 2017 With reference to the consultation on the above plan, Bournemouth Airport (BOH) has the following comments to make with regard to Aerodrome Safeguarding as a statutory consultee. Bournemouth Airport recognises the importance of local waste provision and will support any applicant and the county in the management and mitigation of the risks posed by such developments. The sites listed in the plan as well as supporting documentation, at this moment in time, contain no mention of the risks posed by such developments so to be clear on what criteria need examining please see below primary criteria that would need to be assessed as part of any application for the development and extraction. Wildlife Strike Risk The storage of waste has the potential to create habitats that will encourage hazardous species of wildlife which will have a direct impact on safety at Bournemouth Airport. As a result of this we would expect to see a wildlife strike risk assessment and mitigation plan as part of any initial scoping document submitted to Dorset County Council. It should also be noted that there are risks that sometimes cannot be overcome and as a result an objection would be raised. ATC As part of any major project it is recognised that lighting will feature in the operational phases. All lighting should be examined to ensure that there is no impact on sightlines from ATC or aircraft operating from or in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport. Air Traffic Engineering Developments such as this commonly include the use of radio communications for site wide coordination. When radios are operating in close proximity to the airport the applicant should provide Bournemouth Airport with details as required to ensure no interference with critical equipment or communication frequencies. Obstacle Limitation Surfaces Within 15km of an airport, there are a series of protected surfaces that should be kept clear of any upstanding non-frangible obstacles to ensure the safe operation of aircraft. This not only includes permanent structures but also temporary structures and tall plant such as cranes and excavators. We would expect all equipment and structures of this type to be advised to Bournemouth Airport in advance so we can ensure that these surfaces remain clear of obstacles. The above outlines the four key criteria that should be examined		Further consideration will be given to the inclusion of additional criteria in Policy 20 and the supporting text.	<b>MM12.6</b> <b>MM12.7</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								as part of any aviation impact assessment and Bournemouth Airport will fully support early engagement on and developments as part of this plan to ensure that there is no abortive work and the safe operation of aircraft operating in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport is maintained. It would be appreciated if the above comments and criteria could be included within the plan so that applicants are aware as to the risks posed by such developments to Bournemouth Airport.			
PS D-WP 351		Policy 20 - Airfield Safeguarding Areas				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 20 titled "Airfield Safeguarding Areas to be pragmatic. Beyond this, WHW proffers no further comment.		Your support is welcomed	Noted
PS D-WP 352		Policy 21 - South East Dorset Green Belt				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 21 titled "South East Dorset Green Belt to be pragmatic, and considers it to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	Noted
PS D-WP 353		Policy 22 - Waste from new developments				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers the criteria within Policy 22 titled "Waste from new developments to be pragmatic, albeit WHW would respectfully suggest that financial contributions towards off-site waste management infrastructure should be encompassed within CIL, or		Your support is welcomed	Noted

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								otherwise be identified as a part of site specific obligations in policies allocating strategic scale development.			
PS D-WP 117		Policy 23 - Restoration, aftercare and afteruse				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	Policy 23 relates to the restoration of waste sites. This AONBs experience of policies which use the term "have regard to is that this leads to considerable confusion and misunderstanding with little real landscape or environmental benefit. This AONB recommends that in the policy "have regard to is replaced by "demonstrate how they comply with.		It is agreed that the suggested amendment would tighten the policy wording.	<b>MM12.8</b>
PS D-WP 307		Policy 23 - Restoration, aftercare and afteruse				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	POLICY 23 " Restoration, aftercare and afteruse. There is no such thing as a permanent industrial use, certainly not for a waste facility. This policy should be for all sites. Delete which do not constitute a permanent use of land We suggest you say Proposals for waste management development will only be permitted where the Waste Planning Authority is satisfied that ...		Policy 23 is intended to ensure appropriate restoration and aftercare measures for temporary waste facilities such as landfill and other developments that are restricted to the life of associated mineral permissions. Restoration and aftercare schemes are unlikely to be appropriate or necessary for permanent facilities.	None
PS D-WP 354		Policy 23 - Restoration, aftercare and afteruse				WH White Limited	Mr Brett Spiller	WHW considers Policy 23 titled "Restoration, aftercare and after use to be pragmatic, and considers it to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.		Your support is welcomed	None
PS D-WP 248	Paragraph	13.1	Yes	Don't Know	No	Railfuture, Wessex Branch	Mr Anthony Smale	Section 13 does not include a list of railheads to be safeguarded.	Section 13 We welcome the Councils commitment to safeguarding railheads at Wool, Hamworthy and Poole, as contained in the Minerals Plan. We recommend that a number of other sites around the County be added to the list of railheads for safeguarding, for example: Gillingham Shell Star siding; Maiden Newton ACE siding; Weymouth Jersey sidings	The purpose of safeguarding is to protect operational, permitted and allocated waste capacity. It is not considered necessary for the Waste Plan to safeguard these railheads.	None

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>and Quay; Dorchester South yard; Winfrith Siding. All these sites should be identified for safeguarding in Section 13 and Table 11. There needs to be a policy of encouraging waste contractors to develop new railheads at suitable locations, and of helping contractors to secure any grants that may pertain at the time of development. In addition to identifying railheads within the County, the Council should identify railheads in neighbouring counties up to, say, 50 miles of the County boundary. This would inform prospective waste contractors about facilities nearby. The Council should liaise with neighbouring authorities about the importance of these facilities and the need to safeguard them.</p> <p>Further Considerations The Waste Plan should include recognition of the importance of freight flows by rail where the source or destination of the flow is itself already conveniently rail connected. Income from rail freight could form a useful income stream for private railway ventures such as the Swanage Railway and (nearby in Somerset) the Yeovil Railway Centre.</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 251	Types of facilities safeguarded	Table 11	No	No	No	Mineral and Resource Planning Associates	Mr J Cowley	It should be noted that Henbury is not on the map or schedule of waste facilities to be safeguarded. This requires amendment.		Aggregate recycling facilities are safeguarded through the Minerals Strategy and the Mineral Sites Plan. The Waste Plan made the decision not to safeguard inert landfill sites as they are not seen as essential to the delivery of the strategy as inert recycling facilities and the recovery of inert waste through restoration will allow the management of inert waste, further up the waste hierarchy.	None
PS D-WP 210		Policy 24 - Safeguarding waste facilities	Yes	Yes		Suez R & R UK Ltd	Ms Annemarie Wilshaw	Policy 24 safeguards allocated sites and certain existing waste management sites against redevelopment for non-waste uses and against introduction of sensitive land uses within 250m which could constrain future waste use. Suez support this safeguarding approach, which reflects the approach in the NPPF that the impacts on the waste site should be acceptable and should not its efficient operation, nor prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy. However, the safeguarding of existing non-hazardous landfill sites should be until surrender of their Environmental Permit rather than until expiry of planning permission as the waste remains in the ground, actively degrading, settling and producing leachate and landfill gas well beyond the closure of the landfill site. Landfill gas and leachate are inevitable by-products of non-inert landfilling and are produced for many years after the waste has been deposited, as the waste gradually breaks down and decomposes. Leachate and landfill gas are actively managed, as required under the sites Environmental Permit, to ensure there is no danger to the public or the environment. When development is carried out close to the boundaries of a landfill site however, this might cause a change in the receptors and it is important that risks are appropriately assessed for the proposed development. For this reason it is considered that the safeguarding around landfill sites should continue beyond their operational life until such time as the Environment Agency accept surrender of the sites Environmental Permit. This is the point at which a landfill site no longer presents an environmental risk.	Policy 24 should include text to safeguard existing non-hazardous landfill sites until such time as their Environmental Permits are surrendered. Table 11 should list the criteria for non-hazardous landfill sites as "all existing landfill sites safeguarded until surrender of their Environmental Permits.	Your comments are noted. The remaining capacity at mothballed landfill sites may be important if Dorset is to work towards self-sufficiency. It is proposed to amend the Plan to ensure that remaining capacity is safeguarded throughout the Plan period. This approach can then be reviewed as the Plan is reviewed.	<b>See MM13.1</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 258		Policy 24 - Safeguarding waste facilities				Wyatt Homes	Mr Tim Hoskinson	Policy 24 " Safeguarding waste facilities and Appendix 4 " Safeguarding Map As noted in our comments on Policy 3, assurance is sought from the Waste Planning Authority that the proposed waste management facility south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford would be designed in a manner that is compatible with proposals for the wider north east Blandford area, including potential for a new school on adjoining land. It is important that the safeguarding of facilities does not result in the unnecessary sterilisation of land. The justification for the extent of the consultation area around safeguarded waste facilities is not apparent in the supporting text to Policy 3 or the evidence base. We consider the 250m consultation area as currently defined on the Dorset Explorer website represents the maximum extent necessary for such safeguarding. The Safeguarding Map at Appendix 4 of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan is unclear. The plan is drawn at a scale that shows the whole County, but this does not allow the extent of the Individual consultation areas to be clearly understood. The detailed mapping available on the Dorset Explorer website is useful in defining the extent of the consultation areas, however it does not form part of the development plan. The Proposals Map should be amended to show the safeguarding zones at an appropriate scale on a sufficiently detailed OS base plan to allow the consultation areas to be clearly defined.		The 250m consultation area around safeguarded sites is purely a mechanism for triggering consultation. Policy 24 enables the Waste Planning Authority to advise on matters which may need addressing to ensure that adjoining land uses are compatible. This includes mitigation measures that may be needed such as noise mitigation. Appendix 4 shows the safeguarded sites (and their consultation areas) at the time of publication. As the list of safeguarded waste facilities is intended to be reviewed regularly (according to the criteria set out in Chapter 13), it is considered more effective to use Dorset Explorer to show which sites are safeguarded, and their consultation areas, at a given point in time.	None
PS D-WP 183	Appendix 1 - Key Diagram		Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Sally Cooke	1. I can't see any reference in the key of the Key Diagram to the green/turquoise triangle at Piddlehinton. 2. I assume the text next to the red triangle in the key should read 'for bulky waste' not 'or bulky waste'. These changes would make the Key Diagram easier to understand.	check and if necessary fix the points raised in question 4 above	The Key Diagram will be updated to correctly reflect the proposals in the final Plan. It should be noted that the red triangle is correctly labelled.	<b>MM AP1.1</b>

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 13	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ms Katie Holland	Proposed site for waste management facility: Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross As a frequent walker on the heathland near to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, I would like to make the following comments about the proposal to position a waste management facility on this site: The site is in close proximity to the Ashley Heath/St Ives/ St Leonards estates and so there are a very considerable number of residents who would experience noxious fumes and odours and noise. Ringwood/Horton Road is already a busy road and traffic to and from the facility would cause congestion. There are various environmental concerns: The site drains into the sensitive Moors River, which is a SSSI. The site is next to SSSI land which is a habitat for many rare creatures such as Nightjars and Dartford Warblers. The land and its wildlife would be harmed by fumes and contamination of water supplies. Loss of hedgerows and tree belt. The proposed site (whilst adjacent on one side to the Woolsbridge Industrial estate) is essentially in the middle of rural/ heath land which has value as a scenic natural environment appreciated by local residents and visitors.	I therefore would urge you to reject this proposal.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report
PS D-WP 27	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ms Angela Gulliver	So this is another sneaky plan of yours to not inform nearby residents, I did see this attached to a lamp post in the estate, not to us residents! Since we have moved here 4 years ago the traffic is diabolical, myself being a dog walker, have been on several occasions narrowly been caught by my coat by very fast large lorries, not to mention rollalong transporters, that have as late NO wide load escort with them, never a police vehicle around ! Getting back to the subject of waste, what are you trying to do to an area with top price properties around, moors valley etc with additional traffic, noise pollution, smell, when there are plenty of open fields and land in an non populated area, not here ! I suppose you would say yes if you lived here NOT !		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 24	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes		Individual	Mr & Mrs John & Joy Nicholls	Access via C class Horton Road entirely inappropriate for movements of large waste vehicles leading to potential accidents (already several reported and more unreported). Damage to road repaired in the past only to be immediately damaged by large lorry and bus use. Materials falling off waste lorries sully verges etc. leading to expensive clean-up operations. Traffic movements adding to the already substantial traffic accessing Moors Valley Country Park leading to loss of tourism affecting local employment. Also the excessive journeys of waste lorries having to come from all over Dorset would add to environmental pollution and damage as well as increasing transportation costs (fuel, vehicle depreciation etc) to cash strapped local councils. Incursion of SSI sites. Location bordering on SSI could lead to significant damage to water course by leakage of cleaning fluid. Unprocessed waste material escaping into SSI and being ingested by wildlife. Heath - Any waste processing near residential sites can affect local health via smells, chemical escape, excessive traffic fumes and noise. If as common with many government schemes, the site morphs into incinerator or treatment plant the effects on local health could be catastrophic. This endorses the need to put waste treatment in non-residential areas.	My wife and I believe that the above arguments identify indisputable reasons for NOT siting any waste treatment plant at Woolsbridge Industrial Park. The rewording of the policy could thus be improved by emphasizing the need for remote siting in the centre of Dorset with good access and near a railway to constrain movement of large waste lorries on the roads.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 26	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs J L Lavers	<p><b>ADDITIONAL POTENTIAL EMPLOYMENT - OBJECTION</b> This Waste Facility would be almost fully automated - thus increased employment numbers from the local labour force would be very limited. Any additional employment numbers would result in commuting to work due to lack of affordable housing and available school places in this area. <b>FINANCIAL EFFECT - OBJECTION</b> This Waste Facility would seriously impact the valuation of existing properties in this area, resulting in de-valuation. The incoming waste deliveries and outgoing vehicles would increase costs of handling the waste, due to the proposed position on the extreme edge of the County of Dorset. Surely it is more cost effective to locate in a more 'central' location. It would also be better for the environment if this facility was placed next to a railway line, saving outgoing road transportation. <b>HORTON ROAD - OBJECTION</b> The Horton Rd is a Category 'C' road and totally unsuitable for even the current HGV use to/from Woolsbridge Industrial Site. The current estimated use by additional ingoing and outgoing HGVs to this Waste Facility (not considering yearly increases) will render the Horton Rd even more hazardous than it is now, and result in substantial repair/maintenance costs. The road is too narrow in places for HGVs and the number of wing mirrors or tyre marks in the grass verges or on the intermittent footpaths is clear evidence of the hazard to pedestrians. More people walk in Horton Rd to use the small local bus service as its route in the residential areas has been reduced by the bus company. I would not wish to cycle on the Horton Rd with current HGV numbers - let alone with the substantial increase proposed. Queing traffic at peak times or whilst inevitable repairs are being carried out (traffic light one way working) &amp; diesel engines running increase pollution. <b>ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTION</b> HGVs diesel engine noise and air pollution will considerably increase especially when stuck in traffic congestion on the unsuitable Horton Rd. This affects residents and most especially those that live alongside the Horton Rd. On frequent days traffic queues entering Moors Valley Country Park commence 2 miles from it at the Ashley Heath junction A31/A338. Washing of the waste materials will require chemical cleaners. As the surrounding area of the proposed facility is designated SSSI which includes the Moors</p>	<p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTION</b> If permission is granted to site the Waste Facility at Woolsbridge, the operating company will then apply for change of use for an Incinerator. This is inevitable as landfill and energy costs increase, and China has now ceased being the world's waste bin. This would dramatically widen the area of population affected (St Ives/St Leonards/Ashley Heath/Ringwood) due to prevailing SW winds taking the inevitable air contamination/pollution further afield. Decrease in air quality is known to dramatically affect health issues for both adults and children.</p>	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	See separate report

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								River and is subject to frequent flooding, there is high potential for serious environmental damage from even small spillages/leaks. The proposed siting of this Waste Facility does not benefit the health and well being of the local community, and would be detrimental to the tourism success of Moors Valley Country Park, which currently provides those benefits to all who visit.			
PS D-WP 37	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			Yes	Yes	Individual	MR STEPHEN WHITE	This would have a very negative impact on the health of the nearby community. Horton Road is only a class C road, 18 wide and is already suffering from high traffic usage and large lorries passing along often at high speed. This plan would increase the traffic problem along this length and lorries turn up mud and impact the edges of the road and vibrate to break the road surface. There would be a negative impact on the environment. The pollution from a waste facility could harm Moors Valley County Park which is an attractive and successful tourist attraction which provides employment and pleasure to the local people. Not only air borne pollution but as this is a very marshy area and floods " water borne pollution could be caused. Deeply concerned about the affect air borne pollution		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							will have on the children playing at nearby three legged cross school and St Ives Primary. Pollution caused Asthma is on the increase in UK. Unsafe access to the proposed site. The Horton Road runs straight through a residential area in Ashely Heath and many houses gave to use it for access. It will be harder than ever to find a space to fit into the traffic. There is no zebra crossing for walkers or cyclists to link the path between the Castleman Trail and Moors Valley up Forest Edge Drive. Ashely Heath roundabout if already heavily congested with huge queues. Further traffic volume will only increase this. In addition, the Ashley Heath/Horton Road is a site of many vehicle accidents. Further HGV will only increase the likelihood of these.			
PS D-WP 39	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes			Individual	Mr David Bacon	The following comments all apply to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate: Pollution will be airborne and waterborne (due to close proximity of river) near SSSI area. Horton Road and Ringwood Road are already overloaded and unsuitable for large lorry access to site. The new facility will require low skilled operatives as opposed to high skilled, desirable staff. Siting for waste transportation by road is undesirable. Better site the facility near a rail depot thereby taking lorries off the road. UKAEA, Winfrith is an idea site with rail links House values in the area of Woolsbridge for say 3 miles radius will be adversely affected Amenity areas like Moors Valley Country Park, Caravan sites at Ashley Heath all adversely affected by traffic and pollution Increased risk to all traffic on Horton Road, especially cyclists Given the treatment plant is to serve Dorset is it illogical to site it on the boundary of East Dorset.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 41	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	Yes	Individual	Ms Sylvia Olley	Horton Rd not deigned for large lorry vehicles Totally unsuitable in an area designed to encourage walking and cycling Density of traffic Moors Valley River at the risk of pollution Immensely popular Moors Valley County Park affected environmentally also with road congestion particularly during the summer season Over weight vehicles using shortcuts i.e. Woolsbridge Rd or Braeside road to avoid busy roads Surrounding value of properties would be affected Totally unsuitable in an area designed to encourage people of all ages to enjoy outside pursuits requiring a clean and uncontaminated environment without very large heavy vehicles causing dangerous road conditions in all respects.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 43	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Janet Davies	As a pedestrian I am already worried by heavy lorries with wide wing mirrors coming close to me when I am walking along Horton Road to the shops at Ashley Heath. As we are encouraged to walk more to save the environment it is dangerous for a pedestrian on Horton Road and will become more so in the future. Any proposal to increase the number of heavy vehicles to service a bulky waste facility at the Woolsbridge site is totally unacceptable.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 45	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Keith Sullivan	Horton Road This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and/or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and there is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy vehicles especially when stuck in traffic. Employment The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing. Environmental There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be detrimental to the residents of St Ives/ St Leonards/ Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the south-west would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. Financial The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.			
PS D-WP 47	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	No	Individual	Ms Christine Wright	There are many reasons to object to the proposal on the Woolsbridge Industrial site. My major objection is the Horton Road which is entirely unsuitable for the current load of large lorries let alone more! It is so unfit for the purpose! I walk to a local shop most days and take my life in my hands. The pathway is very narrow and large and oversized vehicles insist on speeding. It is quite frightening. Surely there must be restrictions on this 'C' class road? The damage these vehicles will do will be extensive! Other objections: Will considerably damage the reputation of Moors Valley Country Park,		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							one of the most important in the country. Pollution to: rivers, ground, noise, air, vibration Devaluation of property Concern of expansion of approved			
PS D-WP 34	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mrs Marion Bacon	I have just attended the residents meeting in the main hall of Braeside Road, St Leonards to discuss the possible use of the Woolsbridge Road Industrial Estate as a waste transfer site. I am most concerned about this site being used for the following reasons. This would have a very negative impact on the health of the nearby community Horton Road is only a class C road, 18 wide and is already suffering from high traffic usage and large lorries passing along often at high speed. This plan would increase the traffic problem along this length and lorries turn up mud and impact the edges of the road and vibrate to break the road surface. There would be a negative impact on the environment. The pollution from a waste facility could harm Moors Valley County Park which is an attractive and successful tourist attraction which provides employment and pleasure to the local people. Not only air borne pollution but as this is a very marshy area and floods " water borne pollution could be caused. Unsafe access to the proposed site. The Horton Road runs straight through a residential area in Ashely Heath and many houses gave to use it for access. It will be harder than ever to find a space to fit into the traffic. There is no zebra crossing for walkers or cyclists to link the path between the Castleman Trail and Moors Valley up Forest Edge Drive. There will be very little extra employment created by a waste plant. An attractive use such as soft play centre or trampoline centre which could complement Moors Valley County Park would give far greater employment opportunities for others.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 38	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three				Individual	Jason & Debbie Spiers	We strongly object		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Legged Cross									
PS D-WP 40	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	Yes	Individual	Mr Anthony Olley	The approach roads to the proposed site are unsuitable to support the extra movement of traffic. They have difficulty at the present time. There will be a great risk of polluting the Moors Valley River It would cause congestion if traffic entering Moors Valley County Park A very great risk of property prices being de-valued in the surrounding areas		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 42	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Alan Wright	There are so many reasons to oppose the proposal on the Woolsbridge site. Firstly we live just off the Horton Road and can hear the large lorries passing us. We live not far away and regularly walk from our house to a small shop (One Stop Shop). Walking from my house to this shop is very dangerous and lorries pass you very close to the kerb. Also cyclist coming out of Moors Valley Country Park. It is an accident waiting to happen.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 44	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr David Soan	<p>1. The road to the site (Horton Road) is a 'C class' road and is unsuitable for the proposed traffic loads. 2. Furthermore the traffic would pass Moors Valley Park (Dorset's largest tourist attraction) which already has 1,000,000 + visitors per year. 3. The site is on the edge of Dorset and would be more suited to a central Dorset location for centralised collection and redistribution of waste. Horton Road This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and/or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and there is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy vehicles especially when stuck in traffic. Employment The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing. Environmental There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be detrimental to the residents of St Ives/ St Leonards/ Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the south-west would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. Financial The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 46	Inset 1 - Wooldsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Angela Sullivan	<p>Horton Road This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and/or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and there is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy vehicles especially when stuck in traffic. Employment The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing. Environmental There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>detrimental to the residents of St Ives/ St Leonards/ Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the south-west would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. Financial The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.</p>				

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 48	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mrs Wille Warren	I would like to add my comments regarding the plans for General Waste transfer at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, this site is totally unsuitable for several reasons. 1. The Horton road is a C Road (very narrow and winding) and totally unsuitable for more heavy traffic, some lorries using it currently take up more room than the single lane, this regularly damages drain covers and requires a permanent repair work up and down this road. 2. We are all encouraged to 'go green' by either walking (this is very dangerous as wing mirrors from big lorries overhang the footpath so it is unsafe to walk whilst holding an umbrella) and cycling (cyclists need to go round the damaged drain covers and doing so means they are effectively in the middle of the road. There is no room for a car from both directions and a bike. 3. It is claimed this waste plan will increase employment for local people but it would only need very few people to work on the site as it would be mostly machinery doing the work. 4. The washing of all the recyclable products will require a lot of chemicals and water, which have to go somewhere and will end up in the unique Moors river. 5. The value of houses in the area would go down with lots of heavy traffic in the road, as it is, my house shakes when a heavy vehicle thunders past. 6. As the plan intends to collect waste from the whole of Dorset it doesn't make sense to place it right on the edge of Hampshire, surely putting it somewhere in the middle of the area it collects waste from would lessen the number of miles travelled by these trucks and therefore save petrol and travelling time. 7. I know it is stated that there no plans for an incinerator, but that is now , once on site and having permission for waste treatment it is a very short hop to an incinerator, with all the accompanying smells and pollution. Because of all the reasons above I strongly object to this plan.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 54	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr G M Olser	I wish to add my support to the parish council in objecting to the proposed waste site in Woolsbridge Road. I attended the meeting held on 13 th January. With over 200 people and it was unanimous after full discussion that it would be a disaster for this residential area to cope with more traffic on Horton Road. So many different objections were made over traffic, road and drains damaged already disastrous. As well as river pollution.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 73	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mr John Tomes	No consideration has been given to vehicular movements along Horton Road. Understand 15 large lorries would be evident. i.e. 30 total journeys in an already busy area. Narrow Road. Traffic to and from the industrial site, cars, vans, delivery lorries at peak times 7-9.30am and 4pm to 6.30pm. Horton Road not even classified as a "B road. Many times of the year heavy traffic for Moors Valley.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 157	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Yes		Individual	dr william richmond	Unsuitable access. Horton Road is already too congested and dangerous to accommodate any more HGVs and traffic associated with planned site Drivers will be tempted to use restricted access roads: Lions Lane and Woolsbridge road to avoid delays Loss of quality employment land Harm and damage to existing SSSIs Increased local air pollution direct from proposed site and increased traffic flow affecting a large residential area and Moors Valley County Park with its large number of local and national visitors Flood risk to the proposed site which will be situated in a "Risk Zone and with global warming this risk can only increase (if the rainfall this January 2018)		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 74	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mr Nick Tigwell	The Horton Road is a category C road and is totally unsuitable for HGV traffic. The Road is too narrow in places to allow two HGVs to pass each other safely. The increased traffic out of Old Barn Farm road onto the busy Horton Road will increase the likelihood of an accident at this junction. Cyclists and pedestrians will be at risk from increased HGV traffic. An HGVC cannot pass a cyclist leaving the recommended 1.5m Gap if traffic is approaching from the opposite direction. There is currently no pelican crossing enabling walkers and cyclists to access the popular Moors Valley County Park from the Castleman Trailway " Forest Edge Drive route. Extra traffic would make accessing the park by walkers and cyclists more dangerous. The site is on the Edge of Dorset. A waste transfer Station would be more suited to a central Dorset location preferable rail connected in order to reduce vehicle movements " a possibility might be the UKAEA site at Winfrith. Pollution from the site and vehicles accessing it could harm the Moors Valley (a SSSI) and the Moors Valley County Park.	For the seven reasons given above the Woolsbridge site is considered to be totally unsuitable for a waste transfer station, especially if the site develops to include an incinerator. This site should therefore be removed from the list of sites being considered.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 133	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr and Mrs D Buckle	<p>Before comment on the legality or soundness of this plan, we are of the view that the wording of Question 3 (above) on the paper Representation Form and the Electronic version here is very badly posed. On paper it invites a double negative but here on the 'electronic' form the "is/is not" invites mis-reading. We would question any attempt to infer valid information from public answers to this question. As written, dissention with the plan requires YES answers on the paper form and NO on the electronic version. This is at best careless in preparation, at worst, mischievous and contributes to "un-soundness" of the process. We consider this proposal to be not legally compliant because:- The submission states that Woolsbridge Industrial Estate has been allocated for bulky waste. This does not conform to the already adopted East Dorset Core Planning strategy policy VTSW6 for this site, as it does not bring sufficient quality employment to an otherwise urban industrial area. Your own assessment at Inset 1 Site information suggests "a small number of staff cars" for a site of 2 hectares. Even at 100m sq per employee, the worst case B8 warehousing (vide. Gov: Home &amp; Communities Agency Employment Density Guide), 2ha should accommodate 200 employees. This is inconsistent with the aims of both local and national policy as the land is intended for employment use. We consider this proposal to be unsound because:- It does not supply economic growth as required by the approved East Dorset Core Planning for this Estate (Policy VTSW6 - release of greenbelt land). The draft submission states "a few staff cars" therefore minimal employment. This is prime industrial land, planning approval given for light industrial mixed employment, research and development, not for a waste transit site. This land is needed to provide employment for new housing already under development i.e. 250 homes being built on A31 old St. Leonard's Hospital site and a further 1800 homes intended for Wimborne area. There is no evidence of a Transport Assessment for this site as required (at least) by the Highways Agency, therefore the plan is unsound. The Horton Road is an unclassified C road. At few (if any?) points does it exceed 18 feet wide and is already unsuitable and downright unsafe for the passage of HGVs. From regular experience as pedestrian and occasional</p>	The plan can be made neither legally compliant nor sound whilst including this site. This land was released from the Green Belt conditionally for higher employment use with or without the originally intended A31 link road still awaited...	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>cyclist along various sections it is only possible to walk in single file on the pavement for fear of being hit by driving mirrors of big lorries overhanging up to half the available footpath or being sucked into the carriageway by their drafts. Use of an umbrella even whilst waiting at bus stops is unthinkable. The pavement only exists on one side of the carriageway and switches from North side to South side requiring users (often elderly) to cross through what is already busy traffic. Cycling along the carriageway avoiding the damaged drain covers and potholes is suicidal. There is no room for cars to overtake unless the oncoming lane is completely clear, an HGV overtaking a cyclist is nigh impossible. Bicycle access to (for example) the popular Moors Valley Country park thus requires illegally cycling along a bumpy footpath dotted with trees, road signs, electricity poles and other pedestrians. The existing excessive HGV traffic flow causes air and noise pollution plus continual structural damage to the carriageway and vibration to adjacent properties. We are told (Inset 1: Site Information - Traffic Generation) that the "Bulky Waste Treatment" facility will have a throughput of 30,000tpa and would generate 4 -10 HGVs per day (one way). However, "throughput" moves 30,000 tons IN and OUT per year, meaning roughly 30,000/48 weeks/5 days or 125 tonnes per day, IN and OUT. A fully laden HGV 'Artic' can carry 24 tonnes, so 10 HGV fully laden trips per day becomes the minimum likely figure, but these vehicles will likely travel empty on their return trip, hence likely 20 or more HGV one way trips per day in reality at full capacity. We are also told (Inset 1: Site Information - Description of Potential Development) that separated parts of the "Bulky Waste" could be shredded and turned into "a valuable fuel known as Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) or Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF)". Given the accidental fire record for the local Blue Haze landfill site, has a full risk assessment been made of the potential fire hazard here? The plan fails to meet a major objective of its Spatial Strategy, namely sustainable movement of waste throughout Dorset, by selecting this site on the Eastern fringe of the county instead of more centrally. This site is adjacent to "sensitive receptors" including the Dorset Heaths SAC, SPA and RAMSAR site; SNCI and Flood Zone 3. Washing the recyclable products will produce chemical waste which may well end up foul drainage and then</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>into the unique Moors river. If this plan were to succeed, the industrial estate would become classified for waste processing and this would facilitate the inevitable next application for an unacceptable incinerator with its own associated pollution, potentially including dioxins and PCBs. Section 4 Objective 4 of the plan offers the fine words: "To safeguard and enhance local amenity, landscape and natural resources, environmental, cultural and economic assets, tourism and the health and wellbeing of the people." Given the importance of Moors Valley Country Park, an award winning tourism attraction with over 800,000 visitors per annum all using the main entrance on Horton Road, how does adding yet more HGV traffic achieve this objective? The proposed new access to the Estate is also on Horton Road, and thus simply transfers congestion from the Woolsbridge Estate to the Horton road. In addition, the Castleman railway is a permissive path well used by cyclists, walkers and horse riders, who also use it to access Moors Valley Park by crossing the Horton Road. The path is owned and managed by Dorset County Council and uses sections of the old railway line from Poole through to Ringwood, Hampshire and provides a tourist attraction for the area. This path is not high-lighted on the map of the Woolsbridge site because it is permissive rather than a right of way. However, it should be drawn to the attention of the Secretary of State due to its considerable leisure use.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 182	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Peter Cleeve	<p>These views relate specifically to Inset 1 - Woolsbridge. The inclusion of this option fails to give proper consideration to the following and must therefore be considered unsound:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site will require large numbers of HGVs and these will use the Horton Road as the only access. This road is totally unsuitable for this type of traffic as it is a class C highway, very narrow (18ft) in many places and already carries large volumes of traffic, a significant proportion of which is commercial. The road is already quite congested and there are many times when traffic queues at the Moors Valley Park entrance and at the junction with the A 31. Adding the expected number of extra HGVs will push this highway beyond its capacity, increasing the number and severity of accidents, maintenance costs and noise and air pollution caused by exhausts (especially by idling and stop/starting of vehicles) beyond acceptable levels.</li> <li>2. The impact on the Moors Valley Country Park has not been properly considered. This attraction, which has Regional if not National importance, is fed by the same road which feeds Woolsbridge and receives hundreds of thousands of visitors annually, many of whom are children arriving on foot or by cycle (they get in free). It is unacceptable to add heavy lorries to a congested location which has no cycle lane or effective footpath. Note that when this issue was raised at an earlier stage the response was that it had little adverse affect on the option, but this is clearly untrue.</li> <li>3. Woolsbridge is a class 1 employment site and a waste facility here does not conform to the Core Strategy policy VTSW6. Industrial developments should provide support and employment for the local community, this proposal does nothing to meet these objectives. It is inappropriate to include this site as an option when it does not meet basic policy aspirations or infrastructure requirements. In order to justify this option for inclusion in the Plan all the background work (including access, impact on community, flooding, SSSI and many other issues) should have been identified and quantified first so that the decision can be properly supported. It is unsound to include Woolsbridge as a proposed site if it is impractical.</li> </ol>	Remove Woolsbridge as a site suitable for waste processing from the Plan	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 94	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs G Brown	Horton road is a C road, it is flanked by SSI HEATHLAND, beautiful river, nice properties which will be overcome with smell when wind blows westerly (nearly always does). Cannot accept that this will employ many people but will create large lorries using OUR ROAD. I also believe that Bournemouth and Poole will separate from East Dorset (which will not exist in that name) in the future so it will mean we will be taking in waste from another district. There are NO buses in that area for workers so will mean more fumes from cars. Three legged cross is on the very edge of East Dorset almost into Hampshire so it is RIDICULOUS to send all Bulk Waste to this area, it should be central. Portsmouth started of as Bulk Waste and surprise, surprise it now has an incinerator, how do we no this is not in the pipe line for our future???. We in EAST DORSET must protect our LOCAL environment and not have outsiders trampling over us, and spoiling it for our future generation. The C Road (Horton rd) is not able to put up with any more traffic. The site is very near SSSI area, the Moors River The properties could be effected by noise and pollution on a prevailing westerly wind. When east Dorset is broken up will this site still take waste from Bournemouth and Poole. Why is this site (on the edge of East Dorset) been picked out rather than one central location? Why has a road from A31 to site not been looked at before getting this far	NO TO BULK WASTE	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 56	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Moira Selby	I do not consider the Waste Plan as being legally compliant and that it is unsound. The proposed Woolsbridge Waste Site would be served by very heavy vehicles both to and from the site via the Horton Road which is a dedicated C category road. Properties along this Horton Road and adjacent roads already experience an unacceptable level of noise, vibration and pollution. Crossing the Horton Road is extremely hazardous especially for the many older people living in the area. To the best of my knowledge one crossing on the Horton Road and people crossing the road take their lives in their hands. Holdups through accidents, roadworks, heavy traffic on the A31 and drivers distracted through sat nav are all to frequent. It follows that if the site is chosen it will use vast quantities of water for cleaning waste. Inevitably an however well designed the plant will leak dirty and toxic water into the environment placing the fragile eco		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							structure if the Moors River and area in great danger. If the decision were to be that the Woolsbridge Plan goes ahead and the A31 and Horton Road are gridlocked then it follows that lorries using the site will use the entirely unsuitable Woolsbridge and Braeside Road for access or egress to the site. This will happen, even if assurances are given that it will not. It follows any suitable site proposed will need to have adequate and safe road access that does not blight the lives of people living in the vicinity, whole properties will sustain damage, cause health issues and devalue their properties.			
PS D-WP 87	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Christine Bates	The proposed plan does not meet the requirement for "High Quality Employment land because the plant would be mainly mechanised, and therefore it does not comply with the Local Plan. The Unit will be built on land that already floods. SSSI land including the Moors River run very close to the site. There is high potential for environmental damage. As of the date of the Parish Public Meeting, i.e. 13th January 2018, there was no report available regarding the potential impact on the SSSI. Given that the proposed Unit will take waste from all over Dorset, why is a site on the very edge of East Dorset deemed suitable? when clearly a more central location in the county would have far less environmental impact in terms of transportation pollution, particulates etc. Additionally, siting the Unit in an area which already suffers badly with congestion will further increase those pollution levels. The Police notification of "no accident problem in the last 7 years is not accurate and is misleading. My house on Ringwood Road is situated opposite the Three Legged Cross Public House & Restaurant and is the closest residential property to the junction with the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. We have lived here for 7 years. There have been a number of accidents outside my house including one vehicle that left the road and took down the fence at the front of our plot, damaging the pole carrying the overhead power cables and left us without electricity for a day. There have also been at least 4 occasions when HGVs have come off the road and fallen into the ditch which runs on one side of Ringwood Road through Three Legged Cross. The road is then closed/closed in one direction while the lorries are recovered causing traffic mayhem! This ably demonstrates the problems with the width of the road.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>My house is situated more than 100ft back from Ringwood Road and yet it still suffers from vibration when HGVs thunder by. Many lorries are travelling through in the early hours of the morning and reach speeds of over 50mph. The surface of the road is potted and uneven, being constantly damaged by the weight and speed of the HGVs travelling over it. This then increases the level of vibration felt by homes that border the road " hence vicious circle. Once a proposal such as this is approved, then this is invariably the thin edge of the wedge and further approvals will be sought for expansion and likely an incinerator. Levels of waste produced are only going to increase and therefore traffic levels accordingly. Potentially Hampshire's waste could be brought into the area. When the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was given its initial approval, this was on the basis that a service road would be built linking it to the A31. This never happened and residents living along the Horton/Ringwood Road have been blighted by heavy traffic ever since. This proposal threatens the health and well-being of our area and the people in it, and it should be sited well away from residential homes.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 81	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	Individual	Dr NC Dicken-Fuller	I have chosen to write a letter, rather than complete the form, as a protest against the form, the design of which I feel, is deliberately obtuse in order to reduce the number of objections you will receive. I have a number of concerns with reference to the proposed waste transfer unit at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The consultation period was arranged to include Christmas, effectively reducing the time local people had to object. The representation form was poorly designed, making it difficult for lay people (especially the elderly people who live in this area and are likely to be most effected by the proposal) to understand "presumably in the hope of intimidating them from objecting. Publicity about the proposed waste transfer site has been very limited. Many elderly people do not rely on the internet for their information, yet there has been no letterbox drop. I am appalled, even now, at how many people are totally unaware of what is proposed. If this site is allowed to go ahead and is designated as a waste site, then it will always be a waste site. Although the incinerator has been refused at the moment, this does not mean that at some stage in the future, once the site has been designated, further applications for an incinerator will not be made. I am very concerned that waste transfer would very quickly morph into waste processing. One is informed that this waste transfer unit will create jobs. It will create very few, but will harm local businesses. The Three Legged Cross Pun is known for the joy of eating outside. No one will want to sit outside and eat so close to a waste plant. The Caravan park offering a rural holiday home will not be supported by visitors which will be assailed with nasty smells and the often still unevaluated dangers of particulates which will be produced at the unit. The Moors Valley County Park, the award winning jewel in Dorsets crown, will no longer attract the same number of visitors if it was so close to a waste transfer unit. The Moors River is both ecologically Valuable and sensitive. This would be put at risk by even more pollution that it has to contend with already. Where is the logic in siting a waste transfer plant so that it abuts SSSI land? I fail to understand why it should be sited on the extreme east of Dorset, forcing heavy lorries to travel all the way across Dorset to reach the proposed site. Access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate has to be via Horton Road. This is a travesty. Why not site it		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>next to a dual carriageway, an A road or, better still, where there is access by rail? I am very concerned about the impact of additional heavy lorries adding to the already over-used Horton Road, which is still quite narrow in places. An 18ft width is not sufficient for lorries or any kind, let alone the excessively large heavy lorries demanded by a waste transfer unit. Horton Road is a C road. When we moved here it was a quiet, unspoilt, rural road. Since then the traffic has built as a result of the Moors Valley County Park, The Sunday Car Book Sales, which were supposed to be an occasional event, but now happen on a regular basis, the advent of the industrial estates. The increase in traffic now makes it very difficult and often dangerous to turn out at the edge of Forest Edge Drive onto Horton Road, often forcing one to wait up to twenty minutes to achieve this manoeuvre. It also makes crossing the road very dangerous. I use a mobility scooter, which means I can't dash in and out of the cars as pedestrians are often forced to do. Twice already this year I have had to give up my planned dog walk in Ringwood Forest and return home because I have run out of time waiting to cross over the road safely. The number of heavy lorries which use this road will be greatly increased as they will have to travel both in and out of the proposed waste transfer plant. Additional heavy lorries will increase pollution, produce life-threatening particularly. Heavy lorries, for which this road was never intended, already tear up the road surface on a regular basis. The large hole, which was patched successfully shortly before Christmas, just north of the One Stop shop, has already returned and will soon be sufficient to cause damage to any unwary car. Heavy lorries damage the manhole covers and cause nearby home to vibrate. The vehicles necessary for a waste transfer site will be exceedingly large and heavy. If the proposed waste transfer site at Woolsbridge were to go ahead, it would destroy the nature of Ashley Heath and Three Legged Cross, as well as the many other villages along the rural route to it. It would ruin the Moors Valley County Park, damage local businesses, have a detrimental impact on house prices and pollute the Moors River. In my view, this proposal is neither legally compliant nor sound. The planners should think again about where this waste transfer plant is to be sited and look at a site in Mid Dorset with either rail or major road access.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 160	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	No	Individual	Mr David Burman	The proposed waste transfer/treatment facility should not be sites on Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The only access road to the estate is Horton Road/Ringwood Road, a local minor road which is already overused by a large volume of traffic including heavy commercial vehicles. Walking along the narrow pathways for pedestrians, particularly disabled and people pushing prams, is precarious and wing mirrors on large commercial vehicles are a particular danger. The effect on Moors Valley County Park needs to be carefully considered. Siting of the proposed facility on the edge of the Dorset area and distant from the major residential area it is intended to initially serve is unnecessary and undesirable. Previous opportunities to provide an alternative access to the estate from major roads needs to be reconsidered before ant further facilities of this nature are considered.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 55	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Margaret Lenton	I am writing to strongly object to the intention of siting a waste site at Woolsbridge Industrial Park. Potential environmental impacts on the site enforce the need to place the Waste Plant elsewhere, possible more central in Dorset. This is mainly a residential area, as well as a very popular tourism, draw at Moors Valley Park, which recently won a Tourism Award. Horton Road is already unfit for the purpose with a lot of traffic, as well as huge lorries causing long hold-ups. At times we cannot join Horton Road for a considerable time. Please do not defile our lovely area.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 57	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr Derek Selby	I do not consider the document to be legally compliant and believe it to be unsound. The Horton Road is already unfit or purpose and is not capable of absorbing any additional traffic of a heavy nature. The Horton Road is a dedicated t̄c road and when built was intended to serve the villages of St Ives, Ashley Heath, Three legged cross and other small villages leading to Horton. At the outset the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was designated to provide high quality employment. A waste disposal site would provide minimal employment and certainly not high quality.	It is a face that the Horton Road is unfit for purpose as it existing and any solution to overcome this must provide adequate and safe road access that meets the criteria required for heavy duty vehicles. Access by building a new road from the roundabout on the A31 (at present no exit roads) could provide suitable access. However, this would not overcome the sensitive environmental issues concerning the proposed site. We have an award	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									winning county park nearby and sites of special scientific interest including the Moors River. The road infrastructure throughout Dorset is in the main woefully inadequate even before many more thousands of properties are built for this reason it would make sense to seek a site that has rail access.		
PS D-WP 59	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				No	Individual	Mrs Linda Emery	Horton Road is a c classed road not it for purpose of approx. 10,000 extra per year HGVs to travel through. Therefore road not fit as a county road only. Heavy Pollution and noise will be exuberated by extra HGVs travelling to and from Woolsbridge Industrial Site. Vibration from HGVs travelling to and from site detrimental to housies along Horton Road. Frightening to local residents who need to walk along Horton Road as road too narrow and only partially pavement in some areas. Environmental issues for rives close to sire, also Moors Valley and care homes in vicinity.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 60	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs RH & SJ Akehurst	write with reference to the planning application referenced and would request that the following points be taken into consideration. 1. Allocated employment land 1.1. This scheme offers little in the way of employment, certainly not skilled employment designed to engage the local student apprentice or graduate opportunity. Nor does this assist with our productivity or export potential following Brexit. An extension to the current trading estate could reasonably be expected to provide for these opportunities. 1.2. This lack of employment opportunity does not comply with the local plan for the estate. 2. Increase in traffic 2.1. This location is admitted to produce greater waste miles which will be: 2.1.1. Bad for environmental pollution, 2.1.2. Bad for the road system, 2.1.3. Increased vehicle journey costs for the council tax payer. 2.2. This would be on top of an expected increase in traffic through the extension of the estate, unless it is proposed to take up the whole of the extension which would be even worse for local employment opportunity. 2.3. The increased traffic would see large HGVs having to contend with high traffic volumes, including many other HGVs and wide loads, on the Ringwood / Horton road. 2.4. Ringwood / Horton road is a 'C' class road which is unsuited to the proposal for 2000 HGVs pa (Waste Transfer Station) and between 880 and 2,200 HGVs (Bulky Waste Treatment) in a working year. A combined total of between 2,880 and 4,200 HGV one way journeys pa. These numbers on the assumption that the quoted ~one way journey equals out and return. If it does not then the number of vehicle movements are doubled due to the outbound return journeys for the deliveries and the inbound journeys for the collections, a potential 8,800 HGV journeys pa. 2.5. The Police notification of ~no accident problem in the last 7 years on the Ringwood / Horton Road cannot be a reliable indicator of future events given the nature and volume of the projected increase in traffic. 2.6. There already exists a current traffic management problem with HGVs ignoring the current weight restriction on the Woolsbridge road. There is no evidence of enforcement action being taken. It is a concern that such a dramatic increase in the HGV traffic flow would encourage other, waste associated or non-waste associated traffic, to similarly flout the regulation to the		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>detriment of the local populace. 3. Treatment 3.1. It is understood that this Transfer Station will be washing the waste, typically food residue from recycled food containers. 3.2. Whilst reference is made to the river Moors SSSI, no preliminary research appears to have been undertaken to assess the potential impact on one of the most sensitive rivers in the country. Should the waste wash not be discharged into the river then the assumption must be that it will be removed by road for disposal elsewhere. That would create a further rise in the traffic volume. Such a basic omission, even if compliant with your working policies, renders this proposal unsound. 4. Effect on local property values 4.1. This proposal, if adopted, would blight the local property values. The land having been designated as use for waste could be expanded or changed to an even less acceptable waste usage in the future. This would have the potential to affect land / property values, to the detriment, over a wide area. Given the above it is considered that this proposal is unsound and does not make effective use of the planned extension to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. Accordingly, I would like to lodge my formal objection to this proposal.</p>				

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 62	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Don't Know	Yes	No	Individual	Mr Neil Harris	<p>The Plan is unsound in respect of the location Inset 1 Woolsbridge Road Industrial Estate as it does not fully address these concerns: The road link to the trunk roads is not suitable for the volume of traffic or size of HGVs likely to be using the site. Horton Road is classified as a C category road and is already overstretched with the current level of traffic using it. It passes through a residential area which would suffer increased noise vibration and pollution from HGVs and is detrimental to health and wellbeing. The Castleman Trail (Footpath and Cycle way) crosses this road providing access to the very popular visitor attraction Moors Valley County Park Cyclists and pedestrians use this road and HGVs are a real threat to their Health and Safety. Access to the proposed site would be via new traffic control on the existing entrance into the Industrial Estate or by a proposed new access road to the east of the Industrial Estate. Neither of these would provide any relief to Horton Road. The width of the Horton Road is reduced in places, being a little more than a country road, I have seen approaching HGVs straddling the centre of the road and travelling at speed. The infrastructure of the road is not good, some verges are being damaged by HGVs as they move over to pass each other. The Plan refers to HGVs bridging loads to the site 1 way and HGVs leaving with bulked up waste 1 way but as it is not likely that the same vehicles are bringing the waste and removing the processed waste, that equates to double the vehicle movements that will be required to maintain and service the waste handling plant. The land on which the proposed site is situated has been designated to provide additional high level employment, the proposed use will not provide significant levels of local employment. The site is adjacent to land which is designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest, Flood Plain and near to the Moors River which is of local significance. As the proposed use will involve cleaning of waste for transfer there is significant risk to the fragile local environment. The Plan does not reduce the use of transportation of waste by road.</p>	<p>As I understand it National Policy for the movement of waste is to reduce the use of transport by road. Whilst it is acceptable that roads may be the only way to bring in waste from remote areas, should the transfer plant not be sited more geographically central and a rail link be used for moving the bulked up waste out? I believe that there may be suitable land with a rail link at the former nuclear research site at Winfrith. The draft plan makes reference to cleaning up the site but should in not be considered for waste processing as well?</p>	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 65	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Sally Marshall	<p>I am writing to view my objections to this proposal Woolsbridge Industrial Park The area is sited on the edge of the County and I believe would be more beneficial if it was located more centrally. Less mileage and pollution from the additional HGVs The area is close to a SSI and the Moors River which is a significant beautiful part of the area and needs to be protected from increased pollution which the additional HGVs will bring. The area is also close to many camping and caravan sites. The area is also close to Moors Valley Country Club which is a great tourist attraction with Go Ape, a mountain cycle track very popular park and already causes a lot of tourist traffic and cyclists.</p> <p>The Horton Road and Woolsbridge Road are not suitable for the HGVs and I believe it was never intended for heavy traffic. The roads are often gridlocked with traffic servicing Woolsbridge Industrial Park currently, the car boot sale on Sunday and Moors Valley at certain times of the year. The Horton road has been under repair for most of 2017, it is not coping with the traffic currently so any additional heavy traffic will have a further impact. It also used is a rat run when there is a problem on the A31. There is only a single narrow pavement along most of the road which is not suitable for pedestrians and cyclists to share, Cyclist do use this as the road doesnt have a cycle path and is not safe. The Woolsbridge Road has a weight restriction and is not suitable for HGVs. The Woolsbridge Ind Park is already cramped with vehicles parked down both sides of the road, sometimes lorries are unable to get through. This will not change with the new entrance, as staff are parking along the road by the company they work for as there is not enough off road parking.</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 69	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	Individual	Mr Gary Clarke	The access to the proposed site will require large lorries driving along Horton Road. This narrow road is already a problem for the exiting traffic without adding many more large vehicles requiring daily usage. I also consider the proposed site is too close to the houses in St Leonards, St Ives and Ashley Heath as different types of pollutants and smells could travel by wind to affect the population of these areas.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 75	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Dr & Mrs J & S Berrington	We are writing to formally lodge our objection to the proposed waste transfer and treatment site at Three legged Cross, the reasons for which are detailed below: We are concerned that if approval for a waste treatment centre is given there will be the ability to expand and change this under the initial approval. At the moment the proposal is for a recycling treatment centre whereby enormous lorries will deliver mixed recyclables that will be washed and repacked inhouse and then sent out again on even bigger lorries. In future this may expand to include other types of waste bringing further environmental, health and traffic problems with it. Should the incinerator be built studies previous studies suggest that particulate matter released into the air may be associated with reduced life expectancy due to the toxicological effects of the micro-particles that escape capture in the filter bags used. These bags have also been know to burst releasing vast quantities of pollutants into the air. Our understanding is that the Industrial Estate was initially given planning approval to improve the local economy by providing jobs for local residents. The bulk waste facility will only offer a small number of jobs, as the tasks performed are mostly machine driven. The main form of employment available will be that of the lorry driver based all over the Dorset area. There will be little economic gain (if any) by building the facility at Woolsbridge. Horton Road is a category C road already struggling with the number of vehicles using it on a daily basis and is quite narrow in places. Large lorries full of rubbish will be hurtling along it to and fro several times a day adding to that load. During the summer months there are frequently queues of over a mile up the Horton Road as visitors wait to get into Moors Valley or the Ashley Heath Car Boot site. Occasional accidents on the Ashley Heath roundabout mean that even more cars are diverted down the Horton Road. When the road network is straining or		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>there are time constraints there will be the temptation for lorry drivers to take shortcuts along Oaks Drive, Braeside Road and Woolsbridge Road, none of which are suitable for vehicles of that size and regularly have cars parked on the road at all times. There will naturally be an increase in the fumes pumped out by the lorries and the vibrations on the road and to the local homes as the lorries thunder by. Our son catches his school bus on the Horton Road and the footpath at the bus stop where he and his fellow students wait is so narrow that when buses and lorries drive past the children are forced to squeeze themselves up against the fence of the property behind them. They are frequently soaked when it rains as puddles gather at the edge of the road and the narrowness of the road means that the traffic going by is unable to avoid driving through them. Moors Valley Country Park is a very popular site for tourists and locals alike and has activities to suit any age group. It has a wealth of local fauna and flora and is particularly popular with families particularly in the warmer months. It regularly has to turn visitors away when full. It has won a wealth of tourism awards and apart from the obligatory car parking costs it is possible to spend a whole day visiting without spending any additional money meaning that it is an affordable day out too. MV encourages healthy living by offering golf, cycling, walking, running and many other courses aimed at those wanting to improve and maintain their health and well-being. It is an enormous asset to the local community, valuable local source of employment and we dont want to see it damaged in any way. Surrounding land owned locally is subject to SSSI designation and is at times liable to flooding. There is the question of where the detergents used in the washing process will end up or indeed that of any other contaminants used. The local Moors River is home to a number of native bird, fish and insect species and runs very near to the site proposed for the treatment facility. Pollutants released into the air and or water is likely to have a devastating impact on the local waterway and wildlife. The Three Legged Cross Pub is a much-loved local establishment and the gardens are frequently busy with people enjoying a meal or drink. We also have the John Browns Garden Centre, Season Restaurant at Moors Valley and a number of caravan parks in the area. It is very likely that the traffic,</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p data-bbox="1231 535 1825 640">pollutants and odours from a waste treatment centre will have a detrimental impact on these local businesses and in the longer term cost our economy dearly.</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 77	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mrs Hilary Walker	Roads Horton Road is only a C class road and is not designated for Heavy traffic Its width is insufficient for some existing traffic e.g. Static Homes on trailers which force oncoming motorist off the road and onto the pavement which may well damage their steering geometry "Rat run by HGVs going to Shaftesbury " damage to the road surface and to the drains which then subside. Dangerous for cyclists thrown into the path of following vehicles. Damage suspension of cars. More HGVs = more problems. Current vehicle movements on Horton Road include those to Moors Valley County Park; approximately 800,000 visitors a year, a minimum of 200,000 vehicles creating 400,000 vehicle movements pa. If local vehicle movements are added in this is a vast number for a C class road. Pedestrians have to negotiate narrow footpaths fearful of the wide vehicles passing only inches away. The footpath from the Ashley Heath roundabout is only as far as St Ives Park. Pedestrians then have to dodge traffic to continue on the footpath on the other side of the road as far as the pedestrian crossing near the One Stop. Ashley Heath roundabout is already congested as can be seen by the long queues on Horton Road as far back as the junction with Woolsbridge Road & Lions Lane. More vehicle movements from this waste plant will exacerbate the situation. It is already difficult to get on to the roundabout because of the volume of traffic coming around it from the A338. HGVs gave an even more difficult time because they are slow moving and more accidents are likely to occur. Environment The proposed location is at the far eastern side of the country near to the border with Hampshire. Recycling lorries will have to travel further to reach the waste treatment site which is counter-productive to the aim of recycling waste and saving the world. A site needs to be more centrally placed in the district or county to obtain a maximum effectiveness and reduce the distances lorries need to travel. Stating vehicle movements as one-way is misleading as any vehicle going into the site also has to leave the site. The application says "A waste transfer station could generate in the region of 2,000 one-way movements per year plus a small number of staff cars. I consider that this figure of 2,000 seriously underestimates the true position. We are told that there are 15 recycling		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							lorries, so of they enter the site each day this produces a yearly figure of 3,900 one-way movements or 7,800 two way movements. Allowing for 5 staff, each driving to work this yearly figure of 1,200 one-way movements or 2,400 two-way movements pa. So, recycling lorries and staff produce total of 10,200 movements and then we need to add in the bulky lorries mentioned below. The application says "the bulk Waste treatment would generate 4-10 HGVs per day one-way. I assume this refers to the larger lorries removing the cleaned and sorted waste. If say 7 HGVs are used this gives an annual two-way movements total of 3,640. Add this to the figure in c above gives us a grand total of 13,840. How Much pollution will all this traffic produce? have Wessex Water confirmed that the sewage system is capable of coping with the large amounts of waste water\effluent that will be produced? How will they ensure that no water escapes the plant given that it is adjacent to watercourses and SSSI land If this application is approved, it may well lead to future applications to expand the site creating yet more traffic and environmental problems. How long before Hampshire CC ask us to process their recyclable waste as a trade-off for allowing Dorset residents to continue to use their Somerley tip?			
PS D-WP 79	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	Yes	Individual	Mr John Worledge		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 58	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				No	Individual	Mr Leslie Emery	As Horton Road is classed as a "C road it is not fit for purpose to cope with a huge increase of HGV traffic Increase pollution from HGVs emissions in Horton Road Increase in noise and vibration to houses on Horton Road Concerns regarding environmental issues for Moors River, Moors Valley Country Park and near homes and residents.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 63	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate,					Individual	Ms Joan Cundill	The Representation form will not allow me to write my comments on it, so please accept this email as my response to the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan and Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft. This consultation is unsuitable for a public	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Three Legged Cross						<p>consultation. The number of pages involved and the technical terms used will deter the vast majority of residents from making a sensible judgement, or view, of the proposals. There needs to be an 'easy-read' version, and an executive summary outlining the main proposals, with pros and cons of each site, in appropriate language for non-technical residents. Abbreviations and 'council-speak' should be avoided. I am not sure whether the proposal for an EfW incinerator has been removed from the Woolsbridge Industrial site in the final revision dated December 2017. I do not believe this is a suitable site for an incinerator or any other waste facility for the following reasons; Ashley Heath is a large residential development and is just 1 mile to the East. The prevailing westerly winds here will carry any unpleasant odours to the estate, especially from a 100 metre high chimney. The site is very close to Moors Valley Country Park which is an award-winning and highly successful visitor attraction. A 100m tower would not be in keeping with this facility which helps to relieve the visitor pressure on the New Forest National Park. It also provides a wonderful day out for countless families and is a great boost for green tourism in this area. My main concern is with the access to the site via the Horton Road . This is already a busy road with many lorry movements every day. It is the access road for Moors Valley Country Park, Ashley Heath, and a cut through for lorries and cars to the A350/354 to the north west. The road is narrow and very undulating in places, which makes it very difficult for cyclists, and it also makes it a hazardous road for cars, especially at night with headlights shining directly into oncoming vehicles. There is no continuous pavement alongside the Horton Road for pedestrians, from the A31 to the site. The stretches of pavement that do exist are narrow and the existing lorry traffic is very intimidating. The proposed new road through Oakfield farm is even closer to the access for Moors Valley Country Park. Another 4-5,000 lorry movements a year using the Horton Road would need major improvements and widening of the road with great costs.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 64	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	Individual	Mrs Pauline Hitchins	1. Horton Road is not suitable for more heavy traffic. This is a Cat. C road. 2. Query the environment can cope with the waste detergent from cleaning the recycled material. 3. Impact on health of people in the area, particularly children and the elderly. Pollution from water as well as air. 4. Will affect value of properties. 5. Find an alternative site near railway to keep heavy traffic off country roads.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 68	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mr Frank Peach	I believe your document is unsound as you have not fully considered the items listed below: Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is on the very eastern border of North East Dorset and as such vehicles will have to travel long distances to reach the planned site. This is neither sensible, cost effective or environmental friendly, obviously the whole plan has been poorly thought out. The plant should be sited near to railway stations or major A roads, and towards the centre of the geographical area of East Dorset. There are more suitable sites ie Winfrith or close to Wool. Development Plan - The present Development Plan for the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should not have been approved for enlargement of the site without consideration having been given to access to the A31. The Highways Commission should have been consulted and instructed to build a new road from the A31 to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, as was originally envisaged. (hence the roundabout on the A31 currently leading nowhere) Congestion on all roads - The roads in the area are unsuitable for heavy traffic. Already there are grid locks during busy period on all roads leading to and from Horton Road. This development would exacerbate the situation. The Highways Agency has already highlighted these problems and there concerns seem to have been ignored. When the roads become worn and need repairs where will the traffic go? Nowhere! The Roads and Transport Plans should be seriously looked at as Horton Road is not suitable for the volume of traffic and type of vehicles envisaged or at present using the Feeder Road. This is a country lane - category 'C'! Additional traffic generated by the proposed Woodland Burial Site does not seem to have been factored into the proposal. Currently the kerb drains along the first half mile of Horton road are being repaired/replaced on an almost 18 month cycle due to the weight of the vehicles and the narrowness of the road resulting in		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>the vehicle wheels travelling in the gutter. At certain times on an almost daily basis there is at least a mile of stationary traffic waiting to get on the A31. From the Site assessment an additional 10,250 heavy/vehicle movements per year assuming an 8 hour working day 6 days per week = one vehicle every 15 minutes (ie 10,260 movements per year = 33 movements per day) This does not include employees and personal vehicles. Other items I wish to be considered: Damage to Tourist Attractions and Residential House Values - Moors Valley attracts thousands of visitors as do the various caravan and camping sites in the area. The local hotels attract visitors as do other beauty spots in the vicinity. The siting of this plant with the heavy traffic envisaged will deter visitors. If there are problems with pollution, driving and congestion housed values will be affected. Pollution of environment Pollution and damage to Moors River and other streams from the detergents used during the washing of items. The Moors River was erroneously omitted from the Development Plan. The area is in a flood plain and already there are problems with overflows from roads etc causing damage to residential properties and land. Damage to the SSSI areas, and population in area from particulates and fumes from vehicles. There are Schools and Retirement Homes in the area. The noise, vibration and pollution from the vehicles will cause distress and danger which will deter families from moving to the area. Has an Environmental Assessment been undertaken? Damage to infrastructures - Damage to residential properties from vibration caused by volume of heavy traffic. Finally the mere fact that this consultation period fell over the Christmas and New Year holiday meant that the consultation period was too short. In addition the Representation Form to be completed was inappropriate for laymen to decipher and the language and spaces required for responses should be clearer and larger. I trust the above will be considered before a firm decision is made.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 70	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mary Peach	<p>I am outlining below why I think the above Pre-Submission Draft is neither legally compliant or sound in my view. High Quality Employment Site - Christchurch and East Dorset Council stated that the Waste Plan ignores the adopted Core Strategy with regard to meeting the employment land needs and are contrary to the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. I agree with this statement.</p> <p>Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was designated for high quality employment when original approval was given. This plant will not meet this requirement as most of the work will be automated. With the additional houses planned for Dorset employment is a crucial factor and units employing more personnel should be considered before this plant. This plant will not lead to economic growth in the area, as most of the processing will be automated. Congestion on all roads and Damage to infrastructures - The above council (Christchurch and East Dorset) and the Highways Agency also commented on the concerns raised regarding the increased traffic which will impact on the area. Again I am concerned regarding these issues. The roads in the area are unsuitable for heavy traffic. Already there are grid locks during busy period on all roads leading to and from Horton Road. This development would acerbate the situation. Damage to roads from heavy traffic and damage to residential properties from vibration caused by volume of heavy traffic will be inevitable. The Roads and Transport Plans should be seriously looked at as Horton Road is not suitable for the volume of traffic and type of vehicles envisaged or at present using the Feeder Road. This is a country lane - category 'C'! This volume of traffic will have a detrimental effect on the area. When the roads become worn and need repairs where will the traffic go? Nowhere! Pollution of environment and Damage to Tourist Attractions and Residential House Values - The area of the Plan has many SSSI sites and will be an environmental concern if this Plan goes ahead. There will be pollution and damage to Moors River and other streams from detergents used during the washing of items. The Moors River has been erroneously omitted from the Development Plan. Also the area is in a flood plain and already there are problems with overflows from roads etc causing damage to residential properties and land. As well as damage to SSSI areas,</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>the population in area from particulates and fumes, from vehicles will be at risk: there are Schools and Retirement Homes in the area. It is well known that fumes from heavy vehicles cause many health problems and pollution. Plus the noise, vibration and pollution from the vehicles will cause distress and danger and will deter families from moving to the area. Thus also putting tourist attractions in the area at risk. Moors Valley attracts thousands of visitors as do the various caravan and camping sites in the area. The local hotels attract visitors as do other beauty spots in the vicinity. The siting of this plant with the heavy traffic envisaged will deter visitors. If there are problems with pollution, driving and congestion house values will also be affected. Has an Environmental Assessment been undertaken? THIS IS NOT A GOOD PLAN - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is on the very eastern border of North East Dorset and as such vehicles will have to travel long distances to reach the planned site. This is neither sensible, cost effective or environmental friendly, obviously the whole plan has been poorly thought out. The plant should be sited near to railway stations or major A roads, and towards the centre of the geographical area of East Dorset. There are more suitable sites ie Winfrith or close to Wool. I do hope that the Woolsbridge site will not be chosen.</p>			
PS D-WP 72	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mrs Susan Perkins	<p>Site should be in the centre of county, not on the edge. Pollution and cost of travelling could outweigh any environmental benefit from recycling. Road links unsatisfactory as Horton Road is a C road and not suitable for the traffic already using it, let alone the extra traffic planned, arriving and leaving the site. No thought has gone into the environmental damage that may be caused to the Moors River by the cleaning of the recycling materials and any overspill or flooding. I would assume that most of the work carried out at the site would be automated so cant see that many local people would be employed.</p>	<p>1. Entrance road to site needs to come directly off the A31 not down Horton Road or Woolsbridge Road. There is an unused roundabout off the A31 that could be used possibly. If no other site is suitable. 2. Survey needs to be carried out on the proposed site with regard to the impact on the SSSI landscape and in particular the Moors River, before decision is made - not afterwards</p>	<p>See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.</p>	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 76	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Adam Hill	I would like to strongly object to the proposal to site a waste transfer / treatment plant at the Woolsbridge industrial estate on the grounds that the Horton Road is totally unsuitable for all the extra heavy lorries. The current amount of lorries is excessive. They spew out pollution and our house vibrates as HGVs go by. The road is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other without hitting the road drains, this causes a thumping noise followed by a rattle of loose framework on the trailers. Most of the pavements are only wide enough for two people and they are right next to the carriageway, so lorries traveling at 40 to 50 MPH are only inches away from a pedestrians, children, dogs and pushchairs. Children cross this road to get to school or play on the green or in Ringwood forest and the speed and frequency of traffic makes this dangerous. It is not uncommon to see cars overtaken because they are only doing 40 MPH, just after the speed camera is a favourite place. Far from having more vehicles the Horton Road needs less and it could do with a 30 MPH speed limit. It is a residential road the fact that many houses back on to it actually makes the noise and pollution worse, our back garden is far from the tranquil haven you might expect a garden to be with pollution and noise invading it. There are plenty of A roads in Dorset with a 30 MPH speed limit. Why is a residential minor road considered suitable for heavy lorries? There are plenty of residential roads with vehicle weight limits. Why don't the residents of Horton Road have this benefit? Horton road is currently used as a short cut for lorries from Shaftesbury, Blandford and Wimborne our council should be striving to protect us from this misuse of a minor residential road not trying to inflict more lorries upon us.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 78	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mr Peter Walker	Roads Horton Road is only a C class road and is not designated for Heavy traffic Its width is insufficient for some existing traffic e.g. Static Homes on trailers which force oncoming motorist off the road and onto the pavement which may well damage their steering geometry It is already used as a "Rat run by HGVs going to Shaftesbury " these cause damage to the road surface and to the drains which then subside. This is dangerous for cyclists who can be thrown into the path of following vehicles. Current vehicle movements along Horton Road include those to Moors Valley County Park; which has approximately 800,000 visitors a year, a minimum of 200,000 vehicles creating 400,000 vehicle movements per annum. If local vehicle movements are added in this is a vast number for a C class road. Pedestrians have to negotiate narrow footpaths fearful of the wide vehicles passing only inches away. The footpath from the Ashley Heath roundabout is on the south side of the road as far as St Ives Park. Pedestrians then have to dodge traffic to continue on the footpath on the other side of the road as far as the pedestrian crossing near the One Stop where the footpath reverts to the south again. The Ashley Heath roundabout is already congested as can be evidenced by the long queues the build up on Horton Road as far back as the recreation ground. Further vehicle movements from this proposed waste plant will exacerbate the situation. It is already difficult to get on to the roundabout because of the volume of traffic coming around it from the A338. HGVs gave an even more diffident time because they are slow moving and are more accidents are likely to occur. Environment The proposed location is at the far eastern side of the county almost adjacent to Hampshire. This means recycling lorries have to travel further to reach the waste treatment site which is counter-productive to the aim of recycling waste and saving the world. A site needs to be more centrally placed in the county to obtain a maximum effectiveness and reduce the distances lorries need to travel. Stating vehicle movements as one-way is misleading as any vehicle going into the site also has to leave the site. The application says "A waste transfer station could generate in the region of 2,000 one-way movements per year plus a small number of staff cars. I consider that this figure of 2,000 seriously	No changes are possible to make the Plan sound as the site chosen is in the wrong loaction.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>underestimates the true position. We are told that there are 15 recycling lorries, so of they enter the site each day this produces a yearly figure of 3,900 one-way movements or 7,800 two way movements pa. If we assume that there are 5 staff, each driving to work by car this produces a yearly figure of 1,200 one-way movements (5x5 days per week x say 48 weeks pa) or 2,400 two-way movements pa. This gives a total of 10,200 movements even before factoring in the bulk lorries mentioned below. The application says "the bulk Waste treatment would generate 4-10 HGVs per day one-way. I assume this refers to the larger lorries removing the cleaned and sorted waste. If we use a mid figure of 7 HGVs this produces an annual two-way movements total of 3,640 (7 x 5 days per week x52 pa). This when added to the figure in c above gives us a grand movements total of 13,840. We can now see the true scale of the operation. How much pollution will all this traffic produce? No doubt in order to clean the refuse large quantities of water will be needed. Have Wessex Water confirmed that the sewage system is capable of coping with the large amounts of waste water\effluent that will be produced? What arrangements will be in place to ensure that no water escapes the plant given that it is adjacent to watercourses and SSSI land If this application is approved, it may well lead to future applications to expand the site creating yet more traffic and environmental problems. The residents of Verwood, Three Legged Cross, St Ives, St Leonards, Ashely Heath and West Moors use the Somerley refuse tip opperated by Hampshire CC. How long before Hampshire CC ask us to process their recyclable waste as a trade-off for allowing Dorset residents to continue to use their Somerley tip?</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 80	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs P & J Bain	Our objections are primarily the access to this site. There is only one way in and one way out " Horton Road/Ringwood Road. This road over the years has seen a great change in the volume and type of traffic. Given the frontage to the road, Ringwood Forest, various properties and a SSSI. This road is always going to be a narrow " only 18 ft in places, single lane road. Surely any planning r usage for Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be restricted not one that will need the use of HGVs, why knowingly add to an already known traffic problem. The state of the road would give a patch work quilt a run for its money. As for local employment. Tis would be minimal an there is no connecting public transport between the "one stop shop and the roundabout at 3x junction with the Verwood road this would limit the choice of how to get there. No amount of "entrance widening or traffic light system is going to alleviate the volume of traffic. We are cyclists (not the lycra ones) and go to John Browns garden centre, this can be very hair raising at times " you can almost feel the wing mirrors brush past. Coming back along the pavement " I know this is wrong but with only a ditch on the other side, I would never ever go home on the road, I would rather walk.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 82	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs Patrick Hester	<p>The site is within a commercial estate established to provide a high level of employment for local people. The proposed use for waste transfer will require few staff according to the information given to us. The site is adjacent to a river which itself carries considerable risk of being polluted and yet, this does not appear to have been considered during the preliminary stages. The site access road is itself accessed from the Horton Road (the road to Ringwood and the A31 at the Ashley Heath roundabout) which is a class "C" road and totally unsuitable for the current level of traffic using it as can be seen by the deterioration in the existing surface. We were told that some 15 lorry movements a day would be used to bring waste to the site for sorting. That is an additional 30 lorry movements a day along this narrow road which in places to the east is no more than a country lane. Added to this will be the lorry traffic taking sorted waste outwards to its final/export destination. There is a considerable danger that the site use could be maximised by other Authorities leading to considerably more heavy commercial road traffic. Pavements are narrow and the road width often causes lorries passing in both directions to have to travel very close to the pavement, to the danger of pedestrians. In addition, to the Ringwood side is the Moors Valley Country Park where, at peak times, particularly in Summer, has considerable family car movements often causing tail backs in both directions. We understand that there is a weight limit imposed on this road or local roads likely to be used as short cuts and cannot understand how it is possible to consider a waste transfer site with heavy lorry traffic when such a weight limit and poor road exists. There is a noise issue for us associated with this road. We live about 50 metres off it, behind dwellings that front onto it. Opposite them is the edge of the forest and traffic movements create noise which is reflected back by the trees over these fronting properties and our property. This is intrusive but we have come to accept it. Adding additional noise will have a further detrimental affect on us and consequently the value of our property which in any case will almost certainly be affected by the designation of this site as a waste transfer station. We are advised that washing facilities will be required to treat some waste. This will inevitably produce a fluid, polluted by the washing chemicals used and by the</p>	Short of removing this site from the list, there is little that we can see that would make the document sound as in our opinion, to be effective, all the above matters need to be considered and addressed, as none appear to have been considered so far.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>material cleaned from the waste. This will need to be treated on site before being disposed of, or taken off site by tanker. Either situation will lead to additional lorry traffic to carry the residue off site. Discharge of effluent, even if treated, could have an adverse effect on the local environment which is of a very high importance in National terms.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 91	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs Robert Bews	<p>With reference to the proposed waste recycling plant to be situated on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Ashley Heath/Three Legged Cross area. We are extremely concerned and must register our objections to this proposal for a number of reasons as listed below: The Horton Road/Ringwood Road which is the main access to the site, is a C class road and is overused at this time with the amount of traffic and heavy goods vehicles on it. It would be totally dangerous to increase its use with more heavy goods vehicles. The pavements are dangerous in that the wing mirrors from HGVs overlap these and therefore pedestrians are at great risk of being hit by these. There is a great risk of pollution from the plant especially the Moors River and the numerous SSSI areas local to the Industrial Estate. Further risk of pollution to the Moors Valley Country Park which is a major local and tourist attraction visited by many hundreds of thousands of people per year. Many roads in the area are restricted by weight limits. The demographics of the area are such that there are many elderly people whose health and safety would be greatly affected by any increase in traffic or pollution. The carbon footprint would be huge as lorries would have to travel across the county to the furthest point east of the county to deposit the recycling from West and North Dorset Weymouth and Portland and Purbeck. Would it not be more sensible to find a centrally located site with access to rail.</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 93	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Peter Hawkins	<p>I am writing to you so as to express my concerns at both the further development of the existing Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and the proposals to consider its use for General Waste Transfer, Bulk Waste Transfer and Waste Treatment. Rather than repeat all the many objections to these proposals I enclose a copy of the petition which stated very clearly some of the reasons why the proposals are wrong. To expand on the items raised I would add the following comments and questions: 1 " Why wasn't the A31 link road built and, more to the point, why isn't it being built now? This was assured as being part of the original plan. Over the last ten years the levels of traffic on the Horton Road have now reached extremely high and unacceptable numbers. Made worse by the disruption caused by lorries and juggernauts. This on a road that is, little more than, a lane. The intention to introduce large numbers of Waste transfer vehicles would have serious traffic and environmental effects not only on the Horton Road but local areas such as West Moors and Three Legged Cross. If the road is built the Waste Station could be located as far as possible to the extremity of the Southern side so that Waste and heavy traffic would be kept away from all surrounding roads except for the A31. This would also keep the inevitable vermin problem as far from the nearby inhabitants as possible. It is quite wrong to look purely to your own interests whilst ignoring all the surrounding citizens who are also, of course, rate payers. This would also remove the need for traffic lights and a new junction being built on the Horton Road. Access from Horton Road to the Estate could also be removed although this would depend on the levels of traffic from Three Legged Cross and Verwood. Lorries could then be instructed to use the A31 where, of course, the island has already been built. With regard to Waste Treatment I understand this, quite rightly, is not being considered. 2 " The question of an additional flooding risk is a very serious matter. Although this has been acknowledged the remedy is not acceptable. A so called Flood Compensation Scheme is, as confirmed by Gareth Kitching, East Dorset DC Planning Manager, a maintenance scheme to ensure that any raising in land levels on site is compensated by a lowering of levels elsewhere on site to ensure the volume of the floodplain is maintained- as per Environment Agency</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>requirements. This has nothing to do with financial compensation. Our house backs onto the Moors River flood plain. House insurers have raised insurance premiums in the past but this has not been experienced in recent times. However, should any such problems arise in the future, increased flood risk caused by this latest site development, could render the property uninsurable and therefore unsaleable. If this should transpire then I would have no alternative but to seek full recompense from the Local Authority. 3</p> <p>“ Before I raise the final questions I would wish to make the following points. Apparently up until 2010 requests to extend the Industrial Estate were refused on the ground of it being Green Belt. Then suddenly from then on this was no longer an issue. In correspondence with Gareth Kitching, he advised any increases in business rates, deriving from the expansion of the industrial sites are used to provide local services to the local community. So much for Green Belt when Local Authority income is needed! According to the Local Authoritys files the number of houses directly notified of the redevelopment proposals was shown on their records to be just 162. Yet within a five mile radius of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate there are many thousands of residents still unaware of your intentions. Clearly to avert the backlash, of what may prove to be considerable outcry, the Authority would be wise to show they have tried to remove as much of its effects as possible. I would suggest that building the link to the A31 may go some way towards this. 4</p> <p>“ The first question is one that you have posed me. Should I ask to speak at the public examination? At the original public hearing for the proposed extension of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, the local councillor, Ray Bryan, made the representations on my behalf as I had to take my terminally ill son for his annual visit to see his consultant in Bristol. Apparently, apart from a question as to my concern about flooding, my submissions had no effects whatsoever as was the case with a neighbour. It was apparent that the eventual outcome had always been a foregone conclusion. If this forthcoming public examination is also just a formality then what is the point in my attendance? The second question concerns as to who is the ultimate authority? Your notes advise that the final publication plan is submitted to the Secretary of State. However, I previously wrote to Michael Gove on</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>this overall matter just after he had been appointed Secretary of State to the Department of the Environment. The matter was passed to a Department for Communities and Local Government Planning Manager who advised that decisions to grant planning permissions rest with the Local Authority. I was further advised that such matters can apparently be challenged in law as I was informed I may wish to consider seeking legal advice to assess what course was open to me. This brings me back to the question, is there any point of my or any other member of the Publics attendance? I await your advice. Appended: Copy of Petition Text</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 95	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Dr Mike Cundill	I accept that waste handling and processing facilities are needed but this location is on the fringe of the area it is serving which must make it inefficient, accessed by an overloaded and dangerous minor road, alongside a busy country park close to housing areas. It is hard to believe that a better choice could not be found. The site will generate heavy goods traffic but the figures given are neither complete, nor consistent. They appear to be under-estimates. There are two facilities being proposed: a waste transfer station and a bulky waste treatment facility. The bulky waste treatment facility will have a throughput of 30,000 tonnes per annum and would generate 4 - 10 HGV trips per day (one way) . A throughput of 30,000 tonnes per year means 120 tonnes in and 120 tonnes out each working day. 10 one-way trips, as claimed, would mean 5 trips in and 5 trips out, at an average payload of 24 tonnes. This is not practical and in reality, it will probably require 20 to 30 one-way HGV trips per day. The throughput of the waste transfer station was not given but if HGV flows have been estimated on the same basis, they could well be underestimated also. The Horton Road is narrow, busy and subject to congestion delays at peak periods. As it passes through Ashley Heath, the pedestrian pavements are narrow, dangerous and incomplete. Dips in the road reduce visibility. There are no facilities for cyclists. It should not handle the traffic it already carries. Adding more traffic, especially significant flows of large goods vehicles, should be ruled out. The environmental impacts of the proposed plant - noise, smell, pollution - are not quantified but it will probably be very noisy and smelly. Prevailing westerly winds could easily carry smells and noise to the nearby country park and housing areas which start less than one mile away.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 97	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Vivien Hirst	I do not consider the location of Woolsbridge Industrial site (inset 1) to be a sound and viable option. The site access is only of an unclassified minor road (Horton Road) along which large and heavy collection and delivery vehicles will need to travel a mile or more. This road is already heavily used by cars and commercial vehicles and would increase unnecessary use would increase the risk of accidents, wear and tear, traffic hold ups and traffic issues at the roundabout to the 338 road to Bournemouth.	To make the plan sound the option of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be removed from the plan.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 131	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr John Roberts			See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 107	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs Peter & Judy White	We wish to object to this proposed development on the following grounds The increased traffic on the Horton Road is totally unacceptable.This road is too narrow in places for large vehicles.There is already high volumes of lorries/ vans etc using it and it is very unpleasant to walk on the pavement from diesel fumes and spray when wet. More would make matters intolerable. 2.The increased traffic on the Woolsbridge Road ,a residential area,will clearly increase with traffic coming from the West along A31 and short cutting through to the Horton Road.Not acceptable. 3 There surely must be a better site in a less built up area or if not why cant you build an access directly from the A31.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 109	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Jim Eggleton	What risk assessments have been carried for Horton road and its impact on the residents living on or off this route. At peak times traffic can be at a standstill. What then for emergency vehicles. The road is not wide enough for vehicles to pull over to the left without mounting the pavement. Health hazards from exhausts and the danger of heavy lorries on pedestrians. Damage to the drains on Horton Road have been damaged making loud noised when hit by HGVs	Widen Horton Road so it can safely accept large lorries Increase the kerb height Drain maintenance, reinforce at gutter level Reduce hold ups of traffic trying to get onto the A31 roundabout It help to have the speed cameras (x2) operational to control traffic speed at other times	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 121	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Cllr Barry Goringe	Land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate contained within the core strategy allocation VTSW6 is proposed for a waste transfer facility and treatment of bulky waste. This proposal is contrary to the adopted core strategy which allocates the site under policy VTSW6 for employment uses including B1, B2 and B8 use classes. The site is also of strategic significant in the East Dorset Housing Market area for industrial development. There is also concern regarding the deliverability of the proposed allocation, as a transport assessment has not been undertaken to identify the impact of the proposed waste uses. Finally, planning consent has already been granted in outline for		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							employment uses consistent with the core strategy allocation, linked to an approved master plan which makes no allowance for waste uses. Waste uses should not automatically be directed to employment sites where there is a conflict with the local policy and economic development strategy. Therefore the proposed allocation is not considered deliverable and I strongly object to this proposal.			
PS D-WP 129	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs Matthew Ayrtton	Horton Rd not wide enough to cope with heavy and large vehicles. Is not classed as a 'B' Rd Will impact on wildlife Will impact on residents living on Horton Rd with the extra heavy goods vehicle traffic. Larger vehicles using Horton Rd at present already cause the houses to shake and vibrate. Will impact house prices Will increase pollution levels harming residents, wildlife and fauna.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 125	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs June Jones	I am writing in connection with the Waste Plan Document which covers a Waste Incineration Unit to be installed at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. My reasons for writing are:- The Access to the site, via Horton Road, is ridiculous. The road is already busy with many vehicles travelling to the Industrial Estate, the Country Park and Verwood. To add further vehicles, without widening the road, make this decision stupid. Cyclists use the Horton Road, as do walkers. The local bus has already been taken away from the area. People love there, and the people have to get out and about. There is also a question of pollution - which could damage walkers, cyclists and car users health. Large and sometimes smelly vehicles are not acceptable. The question of the operation of the unit must be considered. I can see more and more cars coming to the Industrial Estate. People will have to travel there by car because, once again, the use of public buses has already been cut. There area is also considered to be on a flood plain - what would happen if there was a major spillage. Not only would it be impossible to get rid of this, there would inevitably be a danger to the local public. The Moors Valley Country Park which promotes Health and Well Being Benefits to all, could see the building of a Waste Unit as		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							detrimental to tourism. It seems to me that allowing a Waste Unit to be sited so close to the edge of Dorset is ridiculous. The roads are not suitable, the Estate is already big and the heavy lorries are increasing. Why not have a unit in the centre of Dorset. This would make sense and allow people of Ashley Heath, St Ives, St Leonards, Three Legged Cross, and Verwood to live and enjoy the countryside.			
PS D-WP 132	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mrs Janice Roberts	Access from A31 to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate via Horton Road is already unsuitable for existing heavy goods vehicles passing through a residential area of Ashley Heath. Pavements for pedestrians to reach local shops, Castleman Trailway and Moors Valley Country Park are narrow with no scope for widening. Increased vehicle emissions would be detrimental to health for local residents. Tourist, environmental and economic assets would be affected due to proximity to:- hugely popular and successful Moors Valley Country Park, access off Horton Road several caravan sites accessed from Horton Road important conservation areas including Moors River flood zones with possible contamination problems loss of skilled employment possibilities on that site Waste management facilities should be located as close as practicable to origin of waste to mitigate mileage it has to be transported.	Direct access to the site from the A31 would be necessary. Comprehensive research and work would be needed to safeguard nearby important conservation sites in an area already prone to flood risk.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.
PS D-WP 88	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	No	Individual	Keith & Elizabeth Gawler	As a local resident living adjacent to the Horton Road and using this and then the adjoining roads (to West Moors, Verwood and Ringwood) on average some 4 times each day, I wish to protest about the proposal to site the waste recycling plan at Woolsbridge. I see no evidence of a sustainability appraisal of the economic, environmental, and social effects of a plan having been undertaken from the outset of the preparation process to allow decisions to be made that accord with		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>sustainable development otherwise surely it would not have got as far as this pre-submission draft stage of the process. I therefore assume this happens at the next stage of the process after consultation. Put briefly I think it will not be legally compliant on the following points: Economic " I do not see the plan bringing significant employment to the area as the plant of necessity will be largely mechanised. In any event there are sufficient other employers and low employment in the immediate area to not justify putting the site here. Environmental " there are numerous arguments against siting on environmental grounds. Horton Road is a C road which already carries too much traffic and the feeder roads are equally unsuitable. Further HGV traffic feeding into and away from the Estate will further overload this dangerously narrow road. Though I have no view of the whole of the Horton Road I am aware of 3 nasty accidents near my end of the road (just off Woolsbridge Road) in recent months " one an overturned car, one a crash involving a Tesco van and most recently an overturned lorry just off the Ashley Heath roundabout. I regularly drive through Horton and Wigbeth and this road is already dangerous with too many large vehicles using it as a cut-through from and to Blandford, Shaftesbury and beyond. There are already too wide loads using the Horton Road carry park homes with no wide load escort and these allow no room for cars let alone lorries to pass easily in the opposite direction. Lions Hill and the Moors River are important and unique SSSI areas and there can be no risk of pollution or disturbance to these important sites. The Horton Road already backs up at busy times and recent utility road works along the whole stretch (which have just started up again right by the estate) demonstrates the negative impact that traffic lights have so introducing a new entry to the estate controlled by traffic lights is not a way forward. Though I only have to walk about 7 minutes to the entrance to Moors Valley Park, every time I do this I am overwhelmed by the noise as well as the risk of accidents. My wife and I have only once walked to the Three Legged Cross Pub as we consider it too environmentally unfriendly and unsafe to do so. Neither do I believe the plan can be legally sound, based on the following key points: Consistent with National Policy - It is not a sustainable development as there are no economic or environmental/infrastructure</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								positives from such a development Justified “ I can see no benefits on siting the development here and there must be other locations more suitable, eg not adjacent to SSSI sites, more central in Dorset, close to better transport or rail infrastructure Positively prepared “ will not meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure needs. There is no wider benefit to be gained by siting the development here, and it can only degrade the quality of the road infrastructure further.			
PS D-WP 96	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	Mr David Hirst	I do not consider the location of Woolsbridge Industrial site (inset 1) to be a sound and viable option. The site access is only off an unclassified minor road (Horton Road) along which the large and heavy collection and delivery vehicles will need to travel for a mile or more. This road is already heavily used by cars and commercial vehicles and further unnecessary use would increase the risk of accidents, wear and tear on the road and traffic hold-ups.	To make the plan sound the option of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be removed from the plan.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 106	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ms Hinxman & Mr Gibbs	<p>We oppose the granting of any type of permission for and type of waste site to be granted on the Woolsbridge Industrial Park, off the Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross. The new phase is supposed to be of a high end employment opportunities which this certainly is not. A waste facility would be more appropriate positioned more centrally in Dorset to cut long movements of traffic and therefore pollution.</p> <p><b>SENSITIVE AREA</b> The site is among large sensitive areas of Green Belt which sites many SSIs and Dorset heathland. The area proposed was in fact green belt and lifted from this recently without our knowledge and we live right across the road. It is also close to many nationally designated sites of nature conservation such as the Moors Rivers Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Holt and West Moors (SSSI), Lions Hill (SSSI). Also a number of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) are situated including the farm next door.</p> <p><b>FLOODING</b> The area is also at risk of flooding. Our fields and drive flood but they are not included within flood risk boundaries. The site proposed drains into the Moors River (SSSI). Any chemical spillage will pollute this sensitive area. We notice that the flooding survey only ever mentions the current and proposed development, nothing about the effect that it will have on the neighbouring property and land around as once covered in tarmac and concrete it is obvious flooding by run-off will increase and therefore any accidental spillages.</p> <p><b>POLLUTION</b> We live in a valley hence "Moors Valley so any drifting of noxious, poisonous gases and particulates would stay here and will drop on us. If you walk to the end of our property you can see quite clearly that we are in a valley and we are only at 27m above sea level. No wind is going to help disperse any nasty particulates. And when it rains it is likely to be acidic covering us and our properties in muck. The smell from a waste plant using chemical cleaners and large vehicles would hang in the area particularly us as we are only across the road. We already have some strange smells here on occasions. The noise pollution will be intolerable because of large rumbling lorries in and out all day all of them going past our property. We already have rattles from the windows and ornaments with the traffic we have now. Our rafters also squeak and groan, we are very worried that a further increase of traffic will affect the very</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>foundations of the house. Rush hour(s) already starts about 06:00 and goes on for several hours, we just dont get a break from it. And starts again about 16:00. Even on a weekend there are visitors to Moors Valley and in addition the Ashley Heath Car Boot and the car trailers for Ringwood Cheetahs on Sundays 9 months of the year. When the roads are wet the noise from the current traffic, of which a third is industrial, increases. If there are waste vehicles too it would be horrendous. Nearly all HGVs use diesel engines that emit dangerous particulates and fumes polluting our air. This has detrimental affect on our health and particularly on mine as I suffer from chest infections. The risk of any detergent being leaked into the area, in particular the areas of the Moors River and its protected banks, would be an environmental nightmare waiting to happen. The past behaviour of the developers that own the phase 1 of the industrial park is horrific. As the ponds have been polluted over many years and they have been warned about it and yet they still did not clean them up for many years. Why would we believe that any of the next phase would be any better. ACCESS The road to the site is a c class road and is not suitable. This road is already at breaking point that it actually takes the same mph at rush hour that it does in London. The vehicles would be too heavy and too big causing a lot of damage on the road and a have a major impact on our health. The road would need constant mending as it does now. It has many potholes, sinking drains and crazing areas. There are in fact many accidents along this road of which not all get reported therefore not included in any council/highways figures. It would be a case of ~chicken if a waste vehicle faced a Rollalong ~exceptional convoi. We already have to drive on the pavement to let Rollalongthrough. This is not safe. The Hinton Road and Ringwood Road are not ~fit for purpose. CONSEQUENCES If any permission is granted it would be granted so loosely that anything could be built there under ~waste which could mean an incinerator chimney, and because of the sensitive areas could be as high as 100m. This height is enormous, only 23m short of the spire at Salisbury Cathedral and even higher than most structures in London. Respect for the local character of the area would not be shown by agreeing to any waste facility in this area. Value of our property would be severely</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>affected by any kind of waste development. For the comments made above we strongly oppose any waste facility on the Woolsbridge Industrial Park.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 108	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr Richard Weavers	<p>I appreciate that the world is producing too much waste and that it has to be placed somewhere. Equally no one wants that place to be adjacent or close by to them. Perhaps a law prohibiting the use of packaging would be the best solution. However the proposal for the woolsbridge industrial estate is poorly conceived. I have attempted to complete the questionnaire but am unable to answer whether it is legally compliant or not. I have assumed from the various meetings I have had, that it is not. although I do not consider myself to be a legal expert. I do not consider that the planning as envisaged is sufficiently specific and would in my opinion, if granted, give rise to further expansion of the site, without the need for further redress to the public at large. I understand that a roundabout was constructed on a major road in order to provide access when the original industrial estate was envisaged, however it was not completed, for what ever reason. I would ask then if it was part of the planning, was the planning amended or was the road conveniently forgotten. If ignored I would ask is the occupation of the industrial site legal. Moving on to the problem in hand the proposal to use the Horton road, which I understand is a category C road, would only exacerbate the already dangerous and totally unacceptable situation. It is not possible for lorries to pass safely often requiring the use of the pavement or the verge. We have lorries using the road which have loads wider than the transport, overhanging as much as 900mm each side, which should you be walking or riding along the road when these lorries approach could result in a fatal accident unless evasive action is taken by said walker or cyclist. This is totally unacceptable now and would be made considerable worse when further large lorries are required to use the road. The road is too narrow for the number of vehicles that use the road at present, which clearly is a "rat run" for vehicles wishing to bypass the main roads. The country wishes us to be healthier and locally we have a magnificent attraction designed for the purpose, however it would be sad if in trying to reach this attraction an accident occurs due to the use of the carriage way by unacceptable vehicles. The present speed limit is often ignored by the lorries. Environmentally the introduction of more diesel vehicles would affect the air quality and the toxins from the treatment plant would exaggerate the situation. No</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>industrial process is completely safe nor fully controlled, there will be spillage from the plant both in terms of waterborne effluent and general debris arising from the lorries if not completely sealed. I assume that waste can be airborne when doors are opened to allow access into the plant. I recently attended a meeting where there was in excess of 150 people present and there was not one attendee that was in favor of the proposal. Information given at that meeting related to recent accidents and listed only three in the last seven years. I have witnessed four accidents in the last year, one being a lorry carrying glass which took evasive action when a large lorry approached from the other direct and resulted in that lorry loosing its load, depositing the glass across the pavement and shredding a garden fence for a distance of six meters. Anyone walking that footpath at the time or being close to the other side ie working in the garden, would have suffered considerable injuries. Second a lorry crashed into the garden wall, thirdly another vehicle crashed into a garden fence and lastly a lorry overturned causing disruption to the access way onto the A31, probably due to excess speed at the turn. I do not know if these accidents were reported or if the information from the highways was up to date, but if such information is being used to make a decision it is a sad situation. In my opinion the existing Horton road should be classified at 30 miles per hour and have a weight, height and width restriction applied, with suitable narrowing points and sleeping policeman to safe guard other road users and the walking cycling public. I consider that this waste facility should be sighted adjacent to a major A road with suitable access and egress for the safe passage of vehicles. All other similar facilities of which I am aware are sighted to provide safe passage and a minimum disruption to the surrounding areas. I sincerely hope that this site will not be selected.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 110	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Joyce Gaskell	The Waste Plan identifies land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a bulky waste treatment facility serving the whole of Dorset. The only road serving the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is the C2 Horton Road/Ringwood Road. This road is not part of the Dorset HGV/Freight Route Network. It is over 2 miles along the C2 to the A31 to the east of Woolsbridge. This is the closest point on the Primary Road Network. It is a mile along the C2 to the B3072 to the west of Woolsbridge. The B3072 is not identified for through traffic Woolsbridge will have an adverse impact as a consequence of the additional traffic generated. This will compromise large HGVs bringing in bulky waste onwards to multiple sites after treatment or sorting/bulking up. The initial estimate is 210 HGV movements per week. In its current state, the C2 is unsuitable for large HGVs. The Waste Plan Policy 12 states that a Transport Assessment is needed to determine whether the waste development at Woolsbridge is permitted, This should have been produced alongside the draft document. Differing the production of a Transport Assessment to the Planning stage brings into question the viability of the allocation of Woolsbridge in the Plan.	If the Transport Assessment indicates that the traffic impacts are too great to mitigate, the allocation of Woolsbridge will have to be deleted and another site for bulky waste sought. If the criteria of Policy 12 can be met the developer will need to make provision for highway and transport network improvements to mitigate or compensate for significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of the highway. Because Woolsbridge does not have direct access or suitable links to the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network transport improvements will also be needed to overcome significant, adverse impacts on the local road network. These should minimise the use of any roads which are not part of the Primary Road Network by stipulation mandatory HGV access routes. A Travel Plan is also needed to facilitate the implementation of sustainable transport mode for the movements of goods or people.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 120	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Margaret Goringe	Land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate contained within the core strategy allocation VTSW6 is proposed for a waste transfer facility and treatment of bulky waste. This proposal is contrary to the adopted core strategy which allocates the site under policy VTSW6 for employment uses including B1, B2 and B8 use classes. The site is also of strategic significant in the East Dorset Housing Market area for industrial development. There is also concern regarding the deliverability of the proposed allocation, as a transport assessment has not been undertaken to identify the impact of the proposed waste uses. Finally, planning consent has already been granted in outline for employment uses consistent with the core strategy allocation, linked to an approved master plan which makes no allowance for waste uses. Waste uses should not automatically be directed to employment sites where there is a conflict with the local policy and economic development strategy. Therefore the proposed allocation is not considered deliverable and I strongly object to this proposal.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 122	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr Robert Purry	Horton Road is too small, narrow, minor to take additional heavy vehicle traffic. Effect on Moors Valley River not taken into account Minimal additional employment New road should be built to A31 roundabout Should be sited where the waste is produced not on the edge of the county " as per usual	Put it where the waste is produced	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 128	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr David Knott	Woolsbridge Recycling Centre The access road to the Woolsbridge Industrial Park is the Horton Road/Ringwood Road. This road is classified as a minor/local road. It is already used by a large volume of traffic, much of it heavy commercial vehicles. The proposed waste recycling facility will add an increasing volume of heavy commercial vehicles to this. The road is narrow (under 5.5 metres) and has a restricted width footpath. I fail to see how the following points are consistent with that set out in Objective 4 of the Draft Waste Plan To safeguard and enhance local amenity, landscape and natural resources, environmental, cultural and economic assets, tourism and the health and wellbeing of the people. - Walking along this road is often dangerous with some commercial vehicles encroaching onto the footpath as they pass other similar vehicles. A greater volume of HGVs will lead to further instances of this with resultant risks to pedestrians. - Cyclists use the road but cannot be passed with the overtaking vehicle using the opposite side of the road. Additional traffic flows will increase the danger to cyclists. - The road is used by visitors to the well used Moors Valley Country Park. As a result of the heavy volume of traffic already using this road, the entrance to the Moors Valley park is often blocked and a backup of a kilometre or more is not unusual. Additional traffic will only make this a more frequent occurrence. The proposed facility is sighted at the edge of the Dorset region and some distance from the major residential areas that are the likely producers of waste to be recycled. In order to limit the added pollution impact of the facility, it should be located nearer to the source of the recycling materials as noted in Objective 2 of the Vision of this Draft Waste Plan Waste management facilities should be located in appropriate locations, as close as practicable to the origin of waste in order to reduce the total mileage waste is transported .	The site of any new waste management facility should be located closer to the areas that are producing the bulk of the waste materials to be processed. There should be appropriate access roads suitable for carrying heavy goods vehicles in required volumes and where this traffic will not be a danger to other road users or pedestrians.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 124	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mrs Sally Hockley	The road to the site is a C road. The Horton road is narrow and not suitable for the type of lorries that will be needed to take the recycling waste in and out of the proposed site plan. The amount of these large heavy vehicles using the Horton Road which is a C class road, will cause a lot more accidents due to the width of the road, more pollution to the environment and the road will break up and become dangerous for general	The Waste Plan would be better allocated where there are better road access and more central in Dorset, and not on the edge of Dorset. Surely it would make sense to centralise it to make it	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								traffic to use. The lorries will cause a lot of congestion to Moors Vally and cause visitors and in the summer Tourists from using this beautiful venue. The road will also become very dangerous for cyclists and walkers and children who also use the Horton road as the paths are not very wide and the large lorries will be driving near the kerbs. There are SSI sites along the proposed plans and the rivers could also become polluted through this waste Plan. The Horton road is totally unsuitable for these lorries and the amount of lorries going to be used, also the extra Polution they will cause using this road near residence, road surface.	easier to access through out Dorset.		
PS D-WP 126	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Tina Stone	1. Infrastructure to site not suitable 2. Horton Road is a C Road only 18 foot wide in places 3. Traffic and Air contamination from such a site would affect a) Anyone living along road b) Nursing Homes c) People visiting local area for pleasure Moors Valley Park Three Legged Cross Eatery Browns Garden Centre 4. Noise pollution 5. Water pollution (Flood plain) Impact on Environment is far greater than any impact on the Employment factor - Economic Growth Site could be exploited in the future to include incineration which would be even more devastating. The site is too small for future expansion so a long term solution should be sort.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 130	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	K Buxton	Environment The site is close by to Moors Valley Country Park where 800,000 visitors annually, mainly families, currently enjoy a peaceful and healthy outdoor space. As a very popular tourist amenity this could be put in jeopardy. Moors Valley Country Park is a site of Special Scientific Interest. It is one of the top sites in the UK for rare dragonflies. The additional traffic noise and the pollution from any waste storage/treatment facility would surely reduce this delicate population, if not destroy it altogether. Other sites of Special Scientific Interest adjacent to the Moors river, although mentioned in the plan, have not been given any consideration in the proposals. Washing of the waste materials will require chemical cleaners. As the surrounding area of the proposed facility is designated SSSI which includes the Moors River and is subject to frequent flooding, there is high potential for serious environmental damage from even small spillages/leaks. The proposed site is also immediately adjacent to the MOD Fuel Storage Facility in Three Legged Cross/West Moors which, given the propensity of waste materials to instantaneously combust, provides not only a severe fire risk to this facility, but also another health risk and danger to life should the fuels ignite. There are already many known health issues associated with waste transfer/treatment and/or treatment of bulky waste station (in particular, smoke, ash, smells and air pollutants with associated carcinogenics from incinerators). It is established that many sites already designated for waste transfer/treatment and/or treatment of bulky waste station do not require further permission to subsequently adopt an incinerator. If permission is granted to site the Waste Facility at Woolsbridge, the operating company may then apply for change of use for an Incinerator. This is inevitable as landfill and energy costs increase, and China has now ceased being the world's waste bin. This would dramatically widen the area of population affected (St Ives/St Leonards/Ashley Heath/Ringwood) due to prevailing SW winds taking the inevitable air contamination/pollution further afield. Decrease in air quality is known to dramatically affect health issues for both adults and children. I am now really worried for my health should this proposal be granted on land so close to residential housing. Transport The Waste Plan identifies land at	Employment The site proposed is designated as "Employment Land". This Waste Facility would be almost fully automated - thus increased employment numbers from the local labour force would be very limited. Any additional employment numbers would result in commuting to work due to lack of affordable housing and available school places in this area. Transport If the Transport Assessment indicates that the traffic impacts are too great to mitigate, the allocation of Woolsbridge will have to be deleted and another site for bulky waste sought. If the criteria of Policy 12 can be met the developer will need to make provision for highway and transport network improvements to mitigate or compensate for significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of the highway. Because Woolsbridge does not have direct access or suitable links to the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network transport improvements will also be needed to overcome significant, adverse impacts on the local road network. These should minimise the use of any roads which are not part	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a bulky waste treatment facility serving the whole of Dorset. The only road serving the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is the C2 Horton Road/Ringwood Road. This road is not part of the Dorset HGV/Freight Route Network. It is over 2 miles along the C2 to the A31 to the east of Woolsbridge. This is the closest point on the Primary Road Network. It is a mile along the C2 to the B3072 to the west of Woolsbridge. The B3072 is not identified for through traffic and will have an adverse impact as a consequence of the additional traffic generated. This will compromise large HGVs bringing in bulky waste onwards to multiple sites after treatment or sorting/bulking up. In its current state, the C2 is unsuitable for large HGVs. The Waste Plan Policy 12 states that a Transport Assessment is needed to determine whether the waste development at the Woolsbridge site is permitted, This should have been produced alongside the draft document. As it was not produced, it brings into question the viability of the allocation of the Woolsbridge site in the Plan. Ringwood/Horton Road is already heavily used by vehicles and lorries. This C2 class road (in some places only 18 feet wide) has limited or extremely narrow pavements, in some places impassable due to encroaching vegetation. Waste disposal sites of the type proposed would inevitably bring large numbers of additional heavy vehicles on a 24/7 basis, again bringing additional dangers to an already overused road. This road is used by school buses and at peak times there are many children waiting on the pavement for their buses. It is simply too narrow for them to be subjected to even more heavy vehicles on this narrow road and is an accident waiting to happen. I do not believe that the use of a C2 class road for these purposes complies with local planning consent on highways (as mentioned above). Woolsbridge Road is becoming increasingly busy and is already used as a cut through from the A31 roundabout for many vehicles using Horton/Ringwood Road and the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. This is a residential road with many elderly residents. It has a weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes and a 30mph speed limit which is frequently ignored by the many heavy lorries already taking this route through to the industrial estate instead of using the Ashley Heath roundabout to access Ringwood/Horton Road. If this proposal goes ahead</p>	<p>of the Primary Road Network by stipulation mandatory HGV access routes. A Travel Plan is also needed to facilitate the implementation of sustainable transport mode for the movements of goods or people</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>this 30mph residential road will become quite congested and even more dangerous. The majority of comments made to date have highlighted the inadequacy of Ringwood/Horton Road for the additional traffic movements. However, there would also be additional unwelcome pressure on the very busy A31/Ashley Heath roundabout and the A31/Woolsbridge Road roundabout. These two junctions are exceptionally busy at peak times and the persistent issues with backlogs would only add to the misery and stress for commuters and demand additional patience and care when attempting to pull out onto the busy A31. HGVs diesel engine noise and air pollution will considerably increase especially when stuck in traffic congestion on the unsuitable Horton Rd. This affects residents and most especially those that live alongside the Horton Rd. On frequent days traffic queues entering Moors Valley Country Park commence 2 miles from it at the Ashley Heath junction A31/A338. Location The incoming waste deliveries and outgoing vehicles would increase costs of handling the waste, due to the proposed position on the extreme edge of the County of Dorset and its location on a C2 class road some 2 miles from a primary route (A31). Surely it is more cost effective to locate in a more 'central' location. It would also be better for the environment if this facility was placed next to a railway line, saving outgoing road transportation. Given the Woolsbridge site sits on the eastern border of the county, one can only conclude that it is designed to facilitate the intake of additional waste from the bordering counties of Hampshire and Wiltshire. Therefore, any projected calculations for annual waste quantity and vehicle movements in relation to this site are totally inadequate and should be ignored. Any proposed site should be located more centrally within the county to minimise the transportation of waste. Detriment to local businesses/residents The proposed siting of this Waste Facility does not benefit the health and well being of the local community, and would be detrimental to the tourism success of Moors Valley Country Park, which currently provides benefits to all who visit. There are many campsites in the area that would be affected by reduced visitor numbers, and many other businesses in the area (B&amp;Bs, John Brown's Garden Centre, Three Legged Cross Pub and established businesses in the</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Woolsbridge Industrial Estate could experience downturns in trade. The impact of a facility such as this would have a negative reaction on house values in the area. Who would want to live close by to such a site? This Waste Facility would seriously impact the valuation of existing properties in this area, resulting in de-valuation.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 153	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Kate Bardsley	I object strongly to this proposal on the following grounds: Road Access - Horton Road is narrow and winding, without room for heavy vehicles to pass each other and presenting a very real danger to cyclists and pedestrians. It goes through residential area to the East and to the West it is only 18' wide in places, very much a minor country road, totally unsuitable for heavy lorries. Large vehicles damage drains and verges, adding to the dangers on a road already subject to significant congestion. Impact on Community - Why is no mention made of the nearby St Leonards and St Ives communities? This quiet and leafy area will inevitably be used by lorries seeking to avoid traffic congestion (or to save the odd mile), with narrow residential roads becoming rat runs. House prices will fall as the character of the area is changed, and quality of life affected. We have a superb and highly rated community facility at Moors Valley Country Park - access to the Park would be directly affected by the size and number of lorry transports, presenting hazards to local residents who regularly access the Park by bike or on foot, resulting more people travelling there by car. Visitor numbers overall are likely to be affected as access to the Country Park is affected by traffic and heavy waste vehicles. Environmental - The proposed site is in a flood plain, beside the environmentally significant Moors River and SSSI areas. I am astonished that any detailed surveys would be done after close of consultation rather than before. Sustainability is not a foregone conclusion! Location - Transporting waste to a site at the far edge of the area it needs to serve makes no sense. To save on lorry miles, such a site must be located within easy reach of the whole area. Employment - While the proposal appears to support existing plans to support employment in the area, relatively few staff would be employed at the proposed site. The information provided is misleading. Future Developments - It is clear that once a site has been approved for waste management activities, it becomes a prime candidate for additional waste processing in future. Thus any consultation on use of the Woolsbridge site for the current stated waste management should also take into account the suitability and impact of possible future processing facilities and activities.	See comments above.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 143	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Jennifer Sansom	<p>No evidence of any risk impact assessment undertaken with regard to: 1) Potential hazards 2) Who is at risk? 3) Preventative measures 4) Responsibilities - Pollution/environmental issues on Horton Road Ashley Heath end. - Health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists using Horton Road. - Levels of damage to road surface and drains in Horton Road - Wessex Water capability of dealing with effluents. Environmental Sustainability. The current vehicle movements along the class C Horton Road include those going to Moors Valley Country Park, which has approximately 800,000 visitors a year - this is without local vehicle movements. The Ashley Heath roundabout is already congested as can be evidenced by the long queues which can build up on Horton Road as far back as the recreation ground. This congestion of vehicles is causing harmful exhaust emissions being released into the environment. Damage to road surface and drains It is already used as a 'rat run' by HGVs going to Shaftesbury. These cause damage to the road surface and to the drains which then subside. This is dangerous for cyclists who can be thrown in the path of following vehicles. More HGVs will only worsen the situation. Danger to cyclists and pedestrians Its width is insufficient for some existing traffic e.g. Static Homes on trailers which force oncoming motorists off the road and onto the pavement, thus endangering the lives of cyclists and pedestrians. Pedestrians have to negotiate narrow footpaths fearful of the wide vehicles passing only inches away. The footpath from the Ashley Heath roundabout is on the south side of the road as far as St Ives Park. Pedestrians then have to dodge traffic to continue on the footpath on the other side of the road as far as the pedestrian crossing near the One Stop where the footpath reverts to the south side again. Emergency services Due to congestion of traffic ambulances and police vehicles have very restricted access along the Horton Road.</p>	<p>Risk Impact Assessments Needed: - Further investigation into environmental effect of slow moving HGVs polluting the atmosphere-exhaust emissions - Safety impact assessment for pedestrians and cyclists - Alternative site because Horton Road is a 'C' class road, only 18 feet wide. - Impact assessment for Wessex Water capability to deal with effluent.</p>	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 147	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Don't Know		Individual	Paul Stalker	Plan is not (fully) supported by a detailed evidence base. We are writing to STRONGLY OBJECT to a possible waste installation on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for the following reasons: 1. Horton Road is a 'C' Class road and in places is only 18' wide - it cannot cope with much more traffic let alone the HGVs which will be involved in transporting the waste to the site. There are weight limits on these roads. Our house shudders every time a lorry passes at speed as it is! 2. The area is surrounded by Green Belt, Triple SI Sites and areas of natural interest such as Moors Valley. Has any impact on the environment been carried out? If not this must surely be cause for concern. Pollution will impact severely upon these areas. 3. Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was planned to help with quality employment which a waste plant will NOT be. This is therefore contrary to the core strategy.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 149	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Margaret Briggs	<p>This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3,500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7,000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and/or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and this is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy vehicles especially when stuck in traffic. EMPLOYMENT The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing.</p> <p>ENVIRONMENTAL There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of the Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include an integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be detrimental to the residents of</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							St Ives/St Leonards/Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the south-west would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. FINANCIAL The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.			
PS D-WP 156	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	Individual	Mrs Ann Thorpe			See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 158	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr D Deller	Air pollution " the degree of contamination from the incinerator would surely affect the air pollution level in a normal residential area Horton Road is relatively narrow is already takes a high volume of heavy lorries. Large container lorries (some carrying large mobile homes) take up more than half the width of the road, this is effect means in the case of vehicles travelling in opposite directions one of these would be required to mount a four-foot-wide pavement, which is not a safe situation for pedestrians. i.e. waste disposal lorries/ mobile home lorries		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 270	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross, this site is adjacent to designated specially protected sites. Natural England concur with the views set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment. In addition there are concerns about suitable buffering of the site, access for other local people to the Estate as well as surface water quality and management.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 140	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	S J Akehurst	On 13 th January I attended a public meeting at Braeside Village Hall with regards to the proposed siting of a waste treatment plant on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Horton/Ringwood Road. I write to put forward objections on the basis of: It is claimed that a development of this type would be beneficial for employment. Surely it would take very few people to operate such a plant, but the building itself would take up the equivalent of several industrial units thereby reducing the opportunity of further employment. Areas surrounding the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate are designated SSSI sites. Water used to wash recycled rubbish will obviously be contaminated which would be detrimental to the environment. The Horton/Ringwood road is classified as a C road. The large number of heavy lorries needed to transfer waste to and from the treatment plant would only add to the increased usage of the road which has already been problematic over the last few years. It is inevitable that the present level of traffic will increase due to the expansion of the industrial estates, visitors to Moors Valley Country Park and the caravan park. Additional use due to a waste treatment plant would put an intolerable burden on an already congested road. I believe that siting a waste transfer/treatment plant on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would be detrimental to the environment, local		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								residents and all road users and would urge the County Council to reconsider the placing of this plant.			
PS D-WP 142	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs Barry Juniper	The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was not designated for this type of usage and this proposal would open the floodgates for expansion and other unsuitable usage. The site is adjacent to an important stream and SSSI area. The Horton Road is wholly unsuitable for the increased traffic such a development would necessitate. It has no A or B road status and is unfit for heavy lorries. It is extremely narrow in places " some 18 feet I believe " which means a danger to traffic encountering such large lorries, the road is already potholer and the footpath very narrow. The junction into the estate off the Horton Road is on a ben and would coarse additional problems to traffic with slow moving lorries.	There have to be more suitable sites able to handle the increase in traffic nearer to A roads designed for large lorries.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 144	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Roger Tinson	<p>I would like to make comment on the proposed location for the East Dorset Waste Plan. Whilst appreciating that this is still at an early stage, it is highly important to us residents that we make known, to the powers that be, our concerns about this proposal. I have tried to complete the "official form" which does not make it easy for a resident to voice their concerns on this proposal. As a result I have resorted to a letter that enables me to get my points across. I believe that more consideration is required in order to gain a balanced view. Road access, via a "C" class road (Horton Road) is a serious local issue. I have only lived in the area for 5 months and have seen 3 accidents on the Horton Road stretch between "One Stop" and Ashley Park Drive. More recently the movement of mobile homes along this road is dangerous and this month (January) has already seen instances of such homes over hanging the transportation vehicles and bringing traffic to a temporary stop. Increasing the number of larger vehicles on this road will only lead to further accidents and unnecessary delays. The road is not suitable for such traffic. Vehicles into and out of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate already experience difficulty and at peak times access onto and down the Horton Road towards Ringwood are a major issue. The Tourist season brings even more traffic and to include waste vehicles into the Industrial Estate is a step too far for safety reasons. Environmental Considerations The suggested alternative to build a new road from the A31 is also unacceptable, even if the substantial financial requirements were to be made available. This would only exacerbate the impact on the wildlife and environment which is already a major concern. The proposed site will destroy local wildlife and cause untold damage to the ecology of the area as I am sure the Environmentalists will also say. By adding a new road this will only enhance the impact. I am fully aware that the county requires further waste locations but the proposed located is ill conceived and in the wrong place at the wrong time.</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 146	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Don't Know	No	Individual	Dawn & Paul Stalker	Para 1.15 Plan re Woolsbridge is not (fully) supported by a detailed evidence base. We are writing to STRONGLY OBJECT to a possible waste installation on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for the following reasons: 1. Horton Road is a 'C' Class road and in places is only 18' wide - it cannot cope with much more traffic let alone the HGVs which will be involved in transporting the waste to the site. There are weight limits on these roads. Our house shudders every time a lorry passes at speed as it is! 2. The area is surrounded by Green Belt, Triple SI Sites and areas of natural interest such as Moors Valley. Has any impact on the environment been carried out? If not this must surely be cause for concern. Pollution will impact severely upon these areas. 3. Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was planned to help with quality employment which a waste plant will NOT be. This is therefore contrary to the core strategy.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 148	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Richard Harrison	The Horton Road is narrow ,currently carrying heavy traffic and will be heavily affected by increased traffic .There are many pedestrians crossing on the Castleman trail as well heavy build ups turning into Moors Valley Park. Access from A31 directly into the park should be constructed.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 150	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ruth & Mark Farthing	We live in West Moors and we are very concerned about the increase in traffic that this plant will create. Station Road up to Three Legged Cross has already become a 'rat run'. We think that there are alternative sites with easier access without impacting our lovely villages.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 159	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	Yes	No	Individual	Mrs B Richmond Piot	Increased air pollution due to HGV traffic on Horton Road Pollution of river nearby Horton Road traffic will become even more congested and this will affect tourists going to Moors Valley County Park Harm to existing SSSI Dangerous as Horton Road is narrow “ Risk of accidents Increased HGV traffic will affect a large residential area including Lions Lane and Woolsbridge Road Loss of quality employment land and contrary to Core Strategy The lives of local residents will be affected by noise, pollution and increased HGV traffic		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 217	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	<p>Site Specific comments The table below gives our detailed comments on each of the proposed waste sites. This includes information about surveys, assessments and other requirements that would need to be undertaken at the planning application/ pre-application stage. These are very important to assess the potential impact of these sites, and to ensure appropriate mitigation or other measures are put in place to protect the environment. FZ1 Moors River near site (approx 80m) Adjacent Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI. No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Site is in FZ1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Outputs of our new Moors River hydraulic modelling should be available sometime in 2018. If required we can share the results of this project when available to see if the new modelling results in any encroachment of fluvial Flood Zones within the site boundary as currently proposed. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site " Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site Fisheries and Biodiversity The site lies adjacent to the Dorset Heaths SAC/ Dorset Heathlands SPA and RAMSAR, and Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI to the west and the Moors river SSSI to the east. The site should be assessed for its ecological value and ability to support protected species such as sand lizards. Any hedgerows surrounding the site should be retained where possible. Where this is not possible, appropriate mitigation and compensation measures should be put in place. Hedgerows are important habitats for wildlife including birds and bats and some have the potential to support the protected dormouse. The site should also be assessed for any non-native species such as Japanese knotweed. With any waste transfer operations, the spread of soil contaminated with knotweed is high risk. Groundwater and Contaminated Land The location of nearby industrial sites suggests</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								that site investigation may be required. This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection relating to groundwater issues subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Groundwater levels appear to be very close to the ground surface and is currently drained using trenches towards the Moors River (an SSSI). Impermeable hardstanding and sealed surface water collection systems would be required. Waste management Proposed site likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 169	Inset 1 - Wooldsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	As previous comments have outlined, Highways Englands main concern was regarding the use of the site as a Household Recycling Centre. Whilst the use of the site as a Household Recycling Centre has been discounted, Highways England still has concerns about this allocation due to its proximity to the A31, although Highways England recognise that the trip estimates for the site are not at a level where a significant impact on the SRN is expected (2,000 movements per year, and 4-10 HGV movements per day for the waste transfer stations and bulky waste treatment facility respectively)		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								and therefore we do not require the identification of mitigation to support the sites inclusion in the plan. Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion, and any forthcoming application would need to provide information on trip distribution and timing.			
PS D-WP 319	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	Yes	No	East Dorset Environment Partnership	Mrs Hilary Chittenden	The proposals are unsound as they are not justified, effective or consistent with National Policy. There is no evidence that this site is deliverable: i) Although the Environment Agency recommended that a detailed FRA and a surface water management plan should be undertaken at the site allocation stage, there is no evidence that either has been done. Thus deliverability is uncertain. ii) On p 118 Schedule of Comments ( <a href="https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/219774/Draft-Waste-Plan-2016-Report-on-all-comments/pdf/Report_on_all_comments_to_the_2016_Draft_Waste_Plan.pdf">https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/219774/Draft-Waste-Plan-2016-Report-on-all-comments/pdf/Report_on_all_comments_to_the_2016_Draft_Waste_Plan.pdf</a> ) Intelligent Land, ID 2016WP447, (acting for the owners Ankers and Rawlings) report that the site would be expensive to develop due to costs related, in particular to drainage and bio-diversity . It is clear that the proposals would not comply with Standard Rules Permitting (2015) so the allocation would require a Bespoke Permit to ensure no harm to the adjacent designated heathland (Dorset Heaths SAC/ Dorset Heathlands SPA and RAMSAR, and Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI), the Moors River SSSI and SU00/053 Woolsbridge Farm Carr Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI). The high standards that would be required for prevention and mitigation measures will undoubtedly be costly. If, as the agents indicate, development of the site for waste were to be unviable then it would not be deliverable. iii) The proposals do not comply with the adopted Core Strategy for Christchurch and East Dorset: Policy KS5 which identified 80ha employment land was required for B1, B2 and B8 uses; Policy VTSW6 which identified the entire 13.1ha of this allocation for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Because of significant undersupply of employment land across the whole of SE Dorset conurbation, the site is intended to help meet a strategic employment need. iv) By failing	Delete Woolsbridge Industrial Estate from the Waste Plan	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>to address the requirement for local economic growth, the proposals do not comply with NPPF. v) By failing to address the requirement for local economic growth the proposals do not comply with Objective 4 of the Draft Plan. vi) EDEP supports East Dorset District Councils response. The Access Considerations identified in Inset 1 are inadequate. With regard to the Transport Impact we advise that any transport assessment should also consider potential impact on local residential roads, the junctions at Three Legged Cross, and (to comply with Policy 3d of the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan) additional HGV movements across Holt Heath NNR.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 185	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council	Mrs Ann Jacobs	Reference question 3 - Parish Council Response: The wording of this question is ambiguous so to be clear“ We do not consider the document is positively prepared, sound, justified, effective or consistent with National Policy. Question 4 - Details why not legally compliant or unsound The adopted Core Strategy policy VTSW6 allocates the expansion of the Woolsbridge Ind estate for new high quality employment. This type of use will provide very minimal employment in ratio to the land space taken up. The functions of this type of facility are heavily mechanised and automated. The use is not sustainable due to the poor access roads leading to the site and the potential for harm to the SSSIs which surround the site, pollution due to heavy traffic and the impact on the urban area through which the traffic serving the site will pass. The proposal for the use of this site is unsound as it does not make any note to remedy the impact on the infrastructure, ie,. Poor access to site this is a C road and narrow. It will harm the existing local businesses which rely on tourism due to the impact of the additional HGV traffic. There is no provision to alleviate the impact of this proposal on the community immediately adjacent which will effectively be cut in two by the increase in activity of this road by this use. The Plan is not supported by appropriate impact statements in respect of the environmental impact and traffic impacts of the proposal. The proposal to use this site cannot be justified, this location is at the periphery of the area of production of the waste to be collected. The site needs to be more central to the area of collection to reduce harm to the environment and adding on costs to the treatment of the waste collected. It needs to be accessed from the Strategic Road Network and not from a minor C road through residential housing. Whilst improvements to the entrance to the actual estate are approved there appears to be little thought if any as to the impact of the additional traffic on the wider area.	Que 5 The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be removed as a potential site from this plan. The location of this site at the edge of the area of service is inappropriate. The site should be relocated to a more central point with good Strategic Road Network links or with rail links. This would be more cost effective will have a lower pollution impact and add value to the waste collected. The plan in its current form utilising this site at the edge of the area of collection is not justifiable as it surely negates some of the benefits of recycling, as well as harming the quality of life of the adjacent communities either side of the proposal due to pollution, noise and the impact of the volume of additional heavy goods traffic.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 286	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	Development of waste facilities at this site has the potential to have significant impacts on European sites and species, as well as the immediately adjacent Woolsbridge Carr SNCI, a fragile habitat of wet woodland and unimproved neutral grassland BAP priority habitats supporting a number of Dorset notable plant species, which would be highly vulnerable to any run-off from waste activities. The ditch which runs down from the existing industrial estate, alongside the proposed site drains directly into the SNCI so there will need to be strict measures in place to ensure that there is no possibility of pollution into the fragile wet woodland habitat if waste materials are being treated. As well as a substantial buffer area, this would probably require a totally enclosed building with appropriate technology to ensure that there is no rain/run-off contact with waste or other pollutants. We are pleased to see that mitigation of impacts on the SNCI, including an appropriate buffer is included in the Development Considerations, but we nevertheless remained concerned as to whether the proposed site is viable since appropriate mitigation against all impacts, including those to protect the European sites, might make it undeliverable.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 308	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Inset 1, Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross, ( WP02 in the Update, and WP ED03 in original draft): We asked you to exclude the Southern site from your consideration as its environmental sensitivity makes it unsuitable for waste operations. Buffer zones : As you intend to continue with the Southern site, you must include a large separation area (buffer zone) at the Western side to separate from the SPA/SAC and on the Eastern side to separate from the SNCI. This is not shown on your map. The Eastern buffer is mentioned in ~development considerations; the even more essential Western one is not. Development considerations : should include preparation of a comprehensive landscape and management plan .		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 164	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three				Individual	Ms Hilary Williams	The plant will not fulfil the requirements of the site regarding high quality employment. The size of the lorries which will be using a C class road which already overused and is totally unsuitable for further use of this nature. The danger to the public which is already present from the current use and which will affect both pedestrians and cyclists. The site is		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Legged Cross						geographically unsuitable as it is on the edge of the county, necessitating extra mileage and therefore pollution. The area is used by the public for recreation purposes (Moors Valley Country Park) and is also close to a SSSI which also could be affected. All in all, I feel that the Council should consider other sites which will not be as problematic as this one.			
PS D-WP 166	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr michael Williams	The suggested proposals for a Waste Treatment plant to be sited in the Woolsbridge Industrial Area do not take sufficiently into account the following :- The impact of yet more heavy traffic on the Horton Road which is already used to over capacity. This is a classified "C" road hardly wide enough to allow two large vehicles to pass and on occasions necessitates having to mount the pavements to allow vehicles to proceed. To allow even more traffic would be a danger to pedestrians, cars and, importantly cyclists who already tend illegally use the pavements. The Woolsbridge Estate is designated for : "quality" employment which the operation of a waste treatment plant hardly meets this regulation. I have considerable concerns over the damage to the environment this proposal inevitably would bring.. The fact that the facility would serve most of the County despite being sited on the very edge would entail even greater exhaust emissions as vehicles would be travelling greater distances than would be the case if it were sited in a more central location. All in all the proposals need more thought and revision.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 184	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Allen Waters	Not enough consideration given to the impact on areas of SSI. Local consultation inadequate with respect to areas surrounding the site.	Further consultations/discussions with local community and businesses.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 208	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Richard Marshall	The site designated is for employment and this will give minimum employment to the space taken.	The access is not suitable along a C Road and goes through suburban housing. Although an additional entrance will be provided to the Industrial Estate no thought has been given to surrounding road infrastructure which currently is at certain times gridlocked. The Waste Plant should be sited more central to avoid any unnecessary mileage and air pollution. The area is close to a SSI area, a Country Park, West Moors Plantation and caravan and camping sites.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 212	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Dr Sarah Berridge	I am writing to record my objections to plans to allow the development of a waste management site on the Woolsbridge Industrial estate. I am objecting on the grounds listed below. The Horton Road is classified as a C road. It is totally unsuitable for the increase in volume and size of vehicles that this waste management centre would bring. The road is already too small for its current usage as demonstrated by the number of cars parked on the road side along it. I understand a C road should not have vehicles over 7.5 tonnes on it and this is obviously not currently adhered to. The Heathland surrounding and in close proximity to the proposed site already has a triple SSI on it. Therefore an eco assessment including assessment of the impact on the Moors River should be central to any plans and future decision as to the site of the waste management plant. I can not find any evidence of this having been done as yet. There has already been a documented increase in pollution into the Moors River presumably from the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. With the expansion of the estate and a Waste management plant this will increase. I understand the expansion of the Woolsbridge Industrial estate was granted as it would benefit employment in the area. However the Waste Management plant will be of very limited benefit to local employment opportunities. I have		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								concerns about the health and wellbeing of all the residents and wildlife in the area as there is a densely populated area close to the site and a great deal of wildlife in the surrounding heathland and river. The impact this will have on Moors Valley Country Park. I am shocked and surprised that such a successful and popular tourist attraction could be put at risk by this proposal. Will people really choose to visit Moors Valley if a waste management site is potentially polluting its air and water? I think not. The placement of a waste management plant on this site will inevitably bring down the value of all properties adjacent to the site in Ashley Heath and Three Legged Cross.			
PS D-WP 232	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	No	Individual	John & Ann Pitt	We were not appraised of the development and therefore my neighbours and myself had no opportunity to appeal. I was able to appeal today as I heard a volunteer colleague discussing it.	We would need to see the effect on the Horton Road which is a nightmare already with Dorset's number 1 visitor site of Moors Valley. The traffic for Ashley Heath Boot sales and the hold ups onto A31. Ringwood congestion is well known - at times as long as 1 hour for the last few miles to Ringwood.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 234	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mr Roger Newman	Unsound with respect to Woolsbridge Ind Est because of national policy and council policy on health and safety, pollution and noise. With reference to paragraph 4, I submit the following comments:- The Horton Road which is the access road to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is a 'C' class road not designed for the HGV's of today. When HGV's pass each other in opposite directions there is only just clearance and if pedestrians are walking on the pavement they have to walk in single file as the wing mirrors overhang the pavement. Woolsbridge Road which is also a feeder road to Horton Road, has cycle lanes in both directions, a pavement each side, a 30mph restriction and a weight limit. It is also 7m 5cm wide where the Horton Road is only 6m 4 cm wide, has one non-continuous pavement, no cycle lanes, a 40mph limit and no weight limit. It is unsafe for cyclists on the Horton Road as traffic cannot pass unless there is no traffic coming in the opposite direction. There are no lay-bys for the buses to pull in off the Horton Road, no protection for passengers alighting from a bus or waiting at the bus stops. Access on to the Horton Road from feeder roads and properties is difficult and potentially dangerous because of high volume and speed of traffic. Regular increased volume of HGV traffic at 40mph would make this situation far worse. Nearby the industrial estate is West Moors Country Park which is visited by many families with small children and there are also three caravan sites. Increases in pollution near these sites would be against national and council policy.	I suggest the removal of the Woolsbridge Ind Est from the Waste Proposal Plan. However if this plan goes ahead it should only be accessed by all HGVs from the Azalea rounabout on the A31 to the south of the estate.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 236	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs David & Margaret Slater	The objections fall into two overlapping categories, Environmental and Transport. Environment The area immediately surrounding the site is a designated SSSI and is a flood plain for the Moors River. Washing recycled waste will cause continuous low level pollution, any spillage having the potential for major environmental harm. With many heavy diesel lorries using the site, there will certainly be constant particulate pollution in the atmosphere. I would suggest that the proximity of the Moors Valley County Park should, in itself, have caused planners to have rejected the proposed location. An incinerator on this site would seriously affect the downwind area, this including both the Moors Valley Park and the large residential area of St Leonards, Ashley Heath and St Ives. Transport Currently the Horton Road often struggles with the amount of traffic it carries. This is mixed traffic, mainly private, but an increased number of large trucks mixed in. The presence of a re-cycling site would cause a vast increase in the number of heavies (30 per day) using what is, after all, a C class road. The environmental and safety impacts are obvious. The whole area hosts a lot of activity, walking, cycling, jogging encouraged by the presence of the Moors Valley County Park. With the number of elderly and retired people in the area, sufficient consideration has obviously not been given to safety along Horton Road (not to mention the number of heavies travelling along the A31 from the West from the West using Woolsbridge Road as a short cut). In short, a totally half baked, half thought out proposal.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 181	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr David White	Reasons for lack of compliancy and soundness are given in detail below Although this form does not seek a response with regard to objections, I most strongly object to the allocation of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a site for a waste facility and ask that it be withdrawn as an allocated site from the Waste Plan. My reasons for this objection are given in detail below Preamble I am a resident of Ashley Heath and land-owner at a site adjacent to the SSSI adjoining Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. I feel myself only competent to comment, in general, on issues relating to these areas. Thus the following comments apply ONLY to the Woolsbridge waste facility site, unless otherwise specified. I regard the Waste Plan as a comprehensive, justified, positively prepared and generally sound document. I cannot opine on compliancy other than for my own area of residence. I most certainly cannot opine on legality. Unfortunately the nature of the Response Form compels a respondent to rate the Plan as "unsound or "non-compliant even if only a proportion of the Plan is regarded negatively. This will explain why my comments are largely critical with respect to one site when I suspect that such criticisms may not be applicable to some other sites. I will comment on the Response Form later because I believe that its wording may cause some respondents to give unintended answers or may confuse some members of the public such that they feel unable to complete the form. I have attempted to frame my comments so as to explain my reasons for answering the questions on the form as I have. My comments are also intended to explain why I most strongly object to the siting of a waste facility at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. I have a major concern that reporting of impact assessments regarding Individual allocated sites is limited " at least in the case of the Woolsbridge site which I have studied closely. I am led to believe that some, perhaps most, impact assessments will be carried out after one (or more) of the thirteen allocated sites is selected and full planning applications are being prepared. If this is so, it will explain why only a limited amount of data has been provided in papers supporting the Plan. I contend that comprehensive and detailed impact assessments are necessary before a final site can be selected. This is particularly so with a site like Woolsbridge where so	I consider that the attached provides sufficient information to enable changes compliant and sound. The attached explains the reasons why such changes might make the Waste Plan legally compliant and sound. Specifically, I consider that removal of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as an allocated site will address most of the issues I raise. The nature and scope of the above comments make it impossible to refer to Individual sections of the plan for which specific changes in wording might be suggested. Clearly, these comments call for Woolsbridge, as an allocated site, be removed. Also, it is suggested that a modification in structure of the Waste Plan might make assessment of the plan easier for lay people whose major concern is the impact of any Waste site on them and their community. Therefore it would be helpful if the Site Assessment papers such as "Inset 1 for Woolsbridge be incorporated in the body of the plan and written so as to combine, at least in summary form, all the information relevant to an Individual site. For clarity, this means having a section	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>many risks of serious impact are evident at the outset, even to the layman. The Waste Plan and supporting papers run to many hundreds of pages. This documentation requires a large amount of reading and analysis if meaningful and helpful responses are to be provided by the public. Therefore I might be forgiven if some of the points made here are already answered or mitigated by the Plans content. In sections 1 and 2, ~Generally means the general compliance or soundness of the Waste Plan. 1. Legally compliant 1.1 Generally ~dont know but this has to be answered as ~no. Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the answer is ~no. The Plan is not compliant. 1.1.1 Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan has not been prepared fully in accordance with the Local development scheme. 1.1.2. Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan has not been prepared fully in co-operation with other local authorities / counties. 1.1.3. Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan has not been fully subject to sustainability appraisal. 1.1.4. Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan has not had regard to national policy. Note. The responnent is not qualified to opine on legality of compliance. 2. Sound 2.1. Generally ~yes but this has to be answered as ~no because some aspects are regarded as unsound. In my case, this applies to Woolsbridge. 2.1.1. Positively prepared ¢ Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan does not appear to achieve what I imagine it sought to do. ¢ The Plan does not meet objectively assessed development for Woolsbridge. ¢ Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan has not fully assessed infrastructure needs. ¢ Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan has not taken account of meeting the requirements of neighbouring authorities (in this case, at least Hampshire). ¢ Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: the plan is not meeting the requirement for sustainable development. 2.1.2 Justified. ¢ Clearly, overall the Plan is justified. It is absolutely essential. Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: comprehensive proportional evidence has not been provided and I consider that alternative sites close to Woolsbridge should have been considered, regardless of county borders. For instance, these could possibly include the existing Somerley Household Recycling Centre site and the Quarry site on the A338 Bournemouth spur road. ¢ I am told that the landfill site behind the Somerley HRC</p>	<p>for each allocated site with cross references to the main body of the report that are belived to be essential reading for the general public.</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>has been or is to be closed. Does this not have potential for a waste handling and treatment centre designed with capacity to cope with both Dorset and Hampshire's needs? Whether the site is a practical proposition or not, I consider that the possibility should have been discussed by the Waste Plan. ☺ To quote an article from Bournemouth Echo: Now the Spur Road works are all but over, what exactly will happen to the quarry that the rebuild team have been using as their recycling base? Hanson contractors are using the site as a recycling centre, and as part of the build, slip roads to and from the quarry have been constructed. But siteholders Lafarge Tarmac say their plans for a quarry are currently "mothballed" and the site will be fenced and gated off when the rebuild is over. The slip roads will still be accessible however. At the end of 2013 Avon Common was one of 10 sand and gravel sites with planning permission in Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset, according to the Mineral Planning Authority. But since the economic downturn all plans to produce gravel and sand at Avon Common have been shelved with no date yet set when operations will resume and questions have been asked why the ingress/egress slip roads have been developed at all. Andy Cadell, estates manager for Tarmac told the Daily Echo the firm plans to start again "at some point in the future. Whilst we were granted planning permission for a sand and gravel quarry at Avon Common in 2008, the site has been mothballed ever since due to economic conditions he said. 2.1.3 Effective. Cross-boundary strategic priorities do not appear to have been met eg cross-working with Hampshire and waste-facility contractors in adjacent counties as discussed above. 2.1.4. Consistent with national policy. Specifically as applied to Woolsbridge: not consistent. 2.1.5. Other. County-wide, the efforts at presenting and explaining the plan have been excellent and comprehensive " as described in the "Consultancy Statement. However, circumstantial evidence points to a situation where a significant proportion of residents of the areas possibly affected by the allocated Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Waste facility (namely: Ashley Heath, Three Legged Cross, Westmoors, Verwood). I contend that a significant number of residents: a) were not aware of the outline planning consent to extend the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate by approx. 8 hectares " which has, in turn, enabled</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>allocation, by the Waste Plan, of the South site for waste operations. (I accept that the existing outline planning consent for the Woolsbridge Estate extension does not include a waste-related use). b) were not aware of the Waste Plan c) were consequently not aware that Woolsbridge had been allocated as a possible waste site. d) were confused as to what was being proposed (once they were aware of the Waste Plan). There was/is particular confusion as to whether an incinerator was or was not proposed (I accept that the need for incineration of residual waste was linked to the originally-planned inclusion of a Household Recycling Centre (HRC). I accept that the HRC proposal has now been withdrawn from the Waste Plan. However, the plan does not definitively rule out the possibility of the future addition of an incinerator plant and associated stack. Further, Inset 1 for Woolsbridge, page 9, still includes what would be the requirements for any such stack. A concern expressed by everyone I have spoken to in the area is that an incinerator could be added later without the need for further planning consent or added later with a planning consent that could not be challenged by the public. The situation regarding the need for Environment Agency permits and associated reliance on further planning consents does not appear to have been discussed in the Waste Plan. It hardly needs saying that placing an incinerator with, presumably a 100-metre high stack, adjacent to a SSSI and the Green Belt is highly contentious. It would most certainly have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt and be impossible to mask with any possible landscaping scheme. The health risks and smells that might be imposed on the work force employed in all parts of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, on nearby recreational sites, including Moors Valley Country Park, on holiday homes / caravan parks and, of course, on residents within an indeterminate radius of the site is a matter of conjecture. Nevertheless, siting an incineration plant in such an area would be inappropriate, not to say reckless, regardless of expert opinion. This is especially so since it has been demonstrated that it is possible for the filter system within the stack of an incineration plant to be ruptured, causing widespread and serious temporary pollution. But I stray into a highly technical and much debated subject which is the domain of experts, regulators and researchers. The</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>bottom line here is that “ should the siting of a waste facility at Woolsbridge go ahead despite substantial public objection “ the Waste Plan must provide a legally-binding prohibition on the addition of an incinerator at Woolsbridge. 3. Reasons for responses Note. for brevity, only key reasons for challenging soundness and compliance of the Waste Plan of the Woolsbridge site allocation are listed. These do not necessarily constitute an exhaustive list and should be only taken as illustrative of why, specifically as applied to Woolsbridge, the Waste Plan is both unsound and non-compliant. Similarly, for practical reasons, no attempt has been made to map non-compliance with specific policies referenced by the Plan. 3.1. Local and national development. A principle and supportable argument for expanding Woolsbridge Industrial estate with the East and South sites was to encourage further employment opportunities and economic development in the area. For this reason, the sites were removed from the Green Belt. The outline consent covers mixed use consistent with adding premises suitable for generating employment. This mixed use also includes amenities intended for the estates business workforce as well as the local community. Amenities include, for instance, a gym, retail, cafe, crÃ©che etc. The allocation of the 5 hectare Southern site as a waste facility (with two buildings occupying one hectare each) by the Waste Plan overrides the objectives described above by significantly reducing the potential for employment (in terms of numbers of people). Although the number of staff needed to run a waste facility, as briefly described, is not discussed in the Plan, it is reasonable to assume that employment opportunities on this site will be reduced by orders of magnitude in comparison with the opportunities presented by the original development outline planning application. This effect is amplified by the fact that the East site was intended to provide 3.35Ha of development land and the South site 4.58Ha. Thus use of the South site for waste operations would remove 58% of the originally intended employment land. The above issue is well illustrated by a paragraph in the Consultation Statement for the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan, November 2017. Page 22 WPO2. The district council have indicated that this site [Woolsbridge] is needed to address employment land requirements for South East Dorset area and the</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>proposals for waste facilities will prejudice the councils ability to deliver projected requirements for employment land. 3.2. Sustainability / environmental issues. The logic of allocating a waste site close to a SSSI, and adjacent to a flood zone, while at the same time, apparently, reducing employment opportunities is unclear. This situation is compounded by transport issues that will be discussed below. It is not unreasonable to expect that a plant handling and treating recyclables will involve washing of those recyclables and will probably involve installation of water / contaminated-water storage tanks external to buildings. It is not unreasonable to assume that leaks and accidental spillages will occur. The proximity of the flood zone and the Moors river to the proposed plant make it impossible to rule out the possibility of contamination of the SSSI and river. Clearly the design of the plant and its site perimeters will be subject to considerable scrutiny at detailed planning application stage. Notwithstanding, it is difficult for a layman to understand how effective containment measures could be implemented at times of flood, given that the site requires constant access by HGVs. The respondent accepts that this is conjecture but is surprised that this has not been discussed at this point in determining site allocation. Also, while it is understood that calculations regarding flood levels have been carried out, the information regarding the scope of this analysis has not been reported. Clearly, calculations and projections are required in many cases to design or specify mitigations for the possibility of environmental damage. In this context it is alarming to see the following statement in an East Dorset Council schedule of planning applications in a section relating to the Woolsbridge development (as originally defined): Please note that DCC accept no responsibility or liability for any detailed calculations submitted in support of these proposals . The question has to be asked ~who will be responsible for the validity and proof of calculations where this may be critical, for instance, in determining mitigations needed as a result of impact assessments?. The issues of smell, rodent infection and noise from the waste facility do not seem to have been addressed by the Waste Plan. This is surprising, given that the closely located Eastern site would presumably still include planned amenities such as restaurant, gym and crÃ¢che " as well as commercial and light industrial</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>developments. Other environmental aspects regarding national requirements are best commented on by experts. However, the amount of information provided on this topic by the Waste Plan and supporting papers is limited, at least in respect of the Woolsbridge site (thinking of the specific issues discussed in this response). Also, the Woolsbridge site does not appear to be covered in the Sustainability Appraisal Report. To emphasise a point made earlier, it is clear that Dorset District Council and local authorities would insist that detailed studies and impact assessments would be made at time of preparing a full planning application for whichever of the 13 allocated sites is selected. It is also clear that any selected site would be subject to a full planning consent. However, it seems to the respondent that it is reasonable that such a selection should be made as a result of such detailed analysis and not vice-versa.</p> <p>3.3. Fuel depot West Moors The Southern site brings Woolsbridge in closer proximity to the adjacent MOD fuel depot. Given the safety precautions already in place at the depot, the respondent assumes that fire risk is minuscule. However the impact of a fire, should it occur, would have catastrophic implications ranging over a very large radius. It is therefore suggested that the risk implications of siting a waste-plant next to one of the largest fuel depots in Europe needs at least some consideration in the Waste Plan, however small is the risk.</p> <p>3.4. Transportation issues. Issues reviewed by the Waste plan in respect of transportation seem limited, at least in respect of Woolsbridge. Of concern are the various impacts of increased HGV traffic flows on roads serving the Woolsbridge site. I will confine my comments to the Horton / Ringwood road " one of a number that are impacted by the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and will be further impacted by the addition of the Southern and Eastern sites. The Horton Road is narrow, has narrow pavements, has a damaged road surface and its structure was not designed, I am told, for the level of traffic now using the road. A relatively large number of residences are located along the road. Towards the Western end of the road, it is straight but undulating giving rise to hidden oncoming traffic. The road is a feeder to the Moors Valley Country Park which is a national amenity and which attracts, I understand, circa 800,000 visitors per annum. The park is, of course, used by large</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>numbers of walkers and cyclists many of whom do not use cars to enter the park. A number of caravan sites adjoin the road. Events such as car-boot sales, t-banger racing and some local shows further impact traffic on an intermittent basis. No traffic census data is provided in supporting papers to the plan, at least for Woolsbridge. The plan provides only outline information on vehicle movements associated with the waste facility and no comparative data on projected increases in vehicle movements associated with the original development plan (that did not encompass a waste facility). Note: the Schedule of Planning Applications did detail projections for all traffic types for the originally envisaged Woolsbridge development. These figures do not appear to have been picked up by the Waste Plans Inset 1 for Woolsbridge. The respondent believes that more detailed information should have been provided by a paper supporting the Waste Plan, including a break-out of data by type of vehicle (for instance: HGV, light commercial, car, bicycle) and that a new DoT census should have been called for to provide accurate data on current traffic flows split by vehicle types, including wide loads and military fuel tankers. Because of the perhaps unusual variance in flows due to the above, census data would need to include projections taking this into account. The provision of comprehensive analysis is particularly vital because of the existing impact of traffic on this area. This impact is amplified by the nature of the road described above. The impacts are serious and numerous: i). Major noise and vibration (to adjacent structures) as a result of HGVs using the road. ii). Traffic jams at peak times and times of events and public holidays. This could have serious local economic impact if access to Moors Valley becomes unacceptably impeded. iii). Danger to pedestrians and cyclists. This danger, in part, stems from the minimal clearance (on this very narrow road) between pedestrians walking on some sections of the pavements and passing HGVs. This clearance can be fractions of a metre. This is compounded by the major forward air displacement caused by vehicles that can be as large as six-axle 42 tonners. The 40mph limit is high given these factors and circumstantial evidence suggests higher speeds, even by HGVs, occur. iv). Danger to road users. It is surprising that there are not more accidents than there are, given the minimal</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>clearance between HGVs travelling in opposite directions or the negative clearance between cars and the not-infrequent wide loads being transported “ this means vehicles travelling in the oposite direction to the wide load have to mount the pavement to provide sufficient clearance. It is said that many road traffic collisions on the road go unreported which may explain why there is not a greater differential of accident data with other local roads. v). The nature of the road means many residents are faced with poor sight lines that make it difficult and dangerous to exit their driveways. This problem extends to some roads joining the Horton and Ringwood Road. The junction with Woolsbridge road is a case in point because it is used as a short-cut from the A31. As a result, Woolsbridge Road has a higher traffic flow than might be expected. This traffic includes commercial vehicles and emergency vehicles, as well as cars (and the occasional horses!). vi). The road is only partially lit. vii). The Road has a number of bus stops. A significant number of children use buses to get to and from school. viii). It is reasonable to assume that the high traffic flow, with or without the extension of Woolsbridge), has a serious health impact in terms of the diesel particulates, NOX etc generated by vehicles and inflicted on residents, pedestrians, cyclists and visitors to Moors Valley Country Park. Without measurement, this is conjecture. Such measurement, together with projection for the effect of future traffic increases, should form part of the Waste-Plans impact assessments. ix). Finally, cyclists use the road or would like to use the road. The exceptionally poor surface and recessed (sunken) drain covers force cyclists further away from the kerb thus increasing the risk of injuries. That injury statistics have not been cited probably means that the majority of cyclists who would like to use the road do not because of the risk either of injury or inhalation of vehicle emissions. The Waste Plan considers only the mitigation of traffic issues through modification of the existing access to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate or the construction of a new access road from Horton Road (which has some environmental issues not discussed here). Other than road resurfacing, lowered speed limit and limit enforcement, other mitigations appear to be impossible, either practically or economically. These include: i) The previously rejected West Moors bypass</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>from Woolsbridge to the already purpose-built roundabout. ii) Reconstruction of the Horton Road. ii) Widening of the road (which would be pointless unless the entire road could be widened) As a final point, the Waste Plan does not address or comply with the Dorset Lorry Plan. 4. Conclusion The virtually or totally insoluble transport issues taken together with the risks inherent with sustainability, environment and employment opportunity add up to making Woolsbridge an illogical choice as an allocated site in the Waste Plan (in the view of the Respondent). The above comments underpin the opinion of the respondent that the Waste Plan is non-compliant and unsound in respect of Woolsbridge. Response form This form does the excellently and comprehensively prepared Waste Plan a serious disservice and could easily impact the accuracy of statistical analysis of responses. Questions 1 and 2 only allow for a binary answer (~yes/no) and not, additionally, ~dont know. They do not allow the respondent to separate their rating so as to apply to the whole Plan or a specific part of the Plan such as the location of interest. Question 3 uses a double negative which introduces the risk of respondents giving other than the intended reply. As for 1 and 2, the questions only allow for a binary response. Ideally it should offer a rating system (such as 1 to 10) for each of the four topics. ~Compliance is almost impossible for the layman to assess. When ~legality is introduced, many respondents are likely to feel it is impossible for them to complete the form.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 363	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Edward Leniston	<p>I lost the will to live attempting to complete the above document with my objections as this form is designed to make it as difficult as possible for people who are not familiar with this process. I have therefore found it necessary to write a letter with my objections which are as follows. Roads Horton Road is only a C class road and is not designed for heavy traffic Its width is insufficient for some existing traffic e.g. Static Homes on trailers which force oncoming motorists off the road and onto the pavement which may well damage their steering geometry. It is already used as a rat run by HGVs going to Shaftesbury. These cause damage to the road surface and to the drains which then subside. This is dangerous for cyclists who can be thrown into the path of following vehicles. The suspension of cars can also be damaged. More HGVs will only worsen the situation. The current vehicle movements along Horton Road include those going to Moors Valley Country Park, which has approximately 800,000 visitors a year, say a minimum of 200,000 vehicles creating 400,000 vehicle movements per annum. If local vehicle movements are added in this is a vast number for a C class road. Pedestrians have to negotiate narrow footpaths fearful of the wide vehicles passing only inches away. The footpath from the Ashley Heath roundabout is on the south side of the road as far as St Ives Park. Pedestrians then have to dodge traffic to continue on the footpath on the other side of the road as far as the pedestrian crossing near the One Stop where the footpath reverts to the south side again. The Ashley Heath roundabout is already congested as can be evidenced by the long queues which can build up on Horton Road as far back as the recreation ground. Further vehicle movements from this proposed waste plant will exacerbate the situation. It is already difficult to get on to the roundabout because of the volume of traffic around it from the A338. HGVs have an even more difficult time because they are slow moving and are more accidents are likely to occur. Local Employment The proposed waste facility will be automated as much as possible and I fail to see any significant employment opportunities for local people. Environment There is no mention of potential impact to the local environment with regard to potential pollution of the local area which includes Moors river and Moors Valley Country Park</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								and Forest both of which are designated SSSIs. These areas regularly flood in the winter			
PS D-WP 193	Inset 1 -	Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	6.5km north of BOH. As long as any approved development proceeded with only the proposed use being an indoor facility, then no issues for BOH but a monitoring schedule would be beneficial.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 245	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Douglas Ramsay	Policy 3 Paragraph C There would be no unacceptable cumulative impact from the development, in combination with existing waste management operations (Unsubstantiated). Paragraph D (Unsubstantiated) Transport: Roads feeding site. Horton Road/Ringwood Road is clearly not a suitable road to handle additional traffic of this nature (i.e quantity and payload) Road surface is not of a substantial enough standard to withstand demands including weights, vibration, access with respect to other traffic, pedestrian safety. Current and future traffic flow data non- existent or difficult to find. Thus a proper objective comment is not possible. Other local amenities shall be impacted negatively (i.e Moors Valley) Pollution concerns not addressed in a designated area with respect to dust or toxicity exposure. Health and Safety: No risk assessment appears to exist with regards to site in general ot with respect to the MOD fuel depot adjacent to the site. Environmental: No risk assessment appears to exist associated with ground water contamination. Concerns ober the possible inclusion of an incinerator. Concerns are in regards of pollution to air, water and noise especially wth nearby SSSI site and the very popular Moors Valley County Park Conclusion The lack of substantive and objective impact analysis at this stage is wholly unacceptable for such construction and thus this site is an "Unsound Plan	The only change proposed here is the total withdrawal of this Plan. This site is wholly unacceptable in so many ways. Not least of which are air and water contamination/pollution rusks and traffic/pedestrian hazards and practicalities.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 259	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr Andrew Cumming	I write to object to the use of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for the siting of a waste transfer station or indeed any waste related activity. A. Objections of Unsuitability There are a number of very good reasons why the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is unsuitable for use in waste transfer or indeed any waste handling including incineration or the like. I understand that the planning permission for the use of the land at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for industrial use has only been granted on the strict provision that any activity only provides high quality employment. A waste facility would not be in accordance with that requirement. The use of a waste facility at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would of necessity involve an increase of use of the local roads for access. The vehicles used for waste transfer are very heavy and very bulky. I understand that the principal direction of access would be along the Horton Road from its junction with the A31 at the Ashley Heath Junction (a distance of about 2 ½ miles. This is a category C road that was never intended for heavy vehicles. Furthermore the Horton Road is already overused for both heavy and light traffic and is breaking up under that over-use. Any increase whatever the numbers (which I understand to be substantial) will therefore make far worse an already intolerable situation. Actions should be sought for reducing heavy vehicle use of the Horton Road, not increasing them. If the alternative of access from the north were to be used this would necessitate access through West Moors Village which would severely impact the residents. Over and above the extreme problems with the proposed increase in heavy traffic, I do not consider that adequate thought has been given or advised of the environmental consequences of the waste facility. The area is apart for the Industrial Estate almost entirely residential. There are likely to be grave pollution risks to the Moors Valley Stream and the area. The use of Horton Road will also affect the enjoyment by locals and others of the award winning Moors Valley Country Park and the Castleman Trailway crossing Horton Road. The siting of a waste facility will be injurious to the health and well-being of the local community. Other sites I understand that part of an area adjacent to Ferndown Industrial Estate and also Blunts Farm had been considered for waste facilities for this area; however I understand that a	Remedy " Changes Necessary Remove from the plan the inclusion of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as an allocated site for waste.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>decision was made against this use on the quality employment basis that also applies to the Woolsbridge site. I would point out that although generally transport needs considerable up grading in this area, sites on and near the Ferndown Industrial Estate have one large advantage over Woolsbridge for the use of waste in that the A31 is immediately adjacent and that access can therefore be more easily obtained to sites in that vicinity. The same is not true of Access to the Woolsbridge site by the Horton Road. There is a long distance of about 2 ½ miles from the junction with the A31 to the site. Much of this road is sub-standard only being in places about 5.5 m wide as opposed to the more normal 7.3 m usually considered being suitable. Definitions I understand from attending a meeting In St Ives that those preparing the plan may consider that the current planning permission for Industrial Use in the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is deemed to include the use for Waste Facilities. I would question the validity of this assumption. It appears that those preparing the report are trying to introduce something that was never intended when the planning permission for expansion of the site for quality employment . A waste facility here would also blight the site for use by other organisations, who may be deterred from investing interest in a site adjacent to a waste facility. It is therefore apparent to me that this is an underhand attempt to slip the Waste Facility use onto a site where it was not intended to be provided and not considered when planning permission was granted. Such subterfuge is in my view unethical. Those responsible for this should be reprimanded for this unethical behaviour. B. Inadequacies of the Plan and Consultation General I would also take issue with the way the plan has been presented to the public. I find the documentation provided to be lacking in transparency and clarity I understand that there are needs for the local democratic organisations to consider and make suitable plans for waste. However whilst such plans need to consider the many and complicated factors that bear on this situation, I consider that the officers and or consultants involved in the preparation of the documents presented to the people have not acted with due care and attention to the needs of the public to understand the implications for them. In particular it appears that the adoption of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a waste transfer</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>site has been arbitrarily inserted without adequate reference to its implications and impact. Whilst the document goes through a number of waste management issues (as it should) when it comes to the selection of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a site for waste activity there appears to be a lack of reference to the appropriate consideration. I would therefore ask; have these considerations not been made or if they have they not been properly referenced (or signposted within the documentation). I consider that either those responsible for the preparation of the documentation have either not properly considered the implications and impact or if they have, they have such considerations appear to have been buried with in the report or other documentation in a way that is opaque or misleading for the public. The documentation should have clear referencing to the matters that affect the public and highlight the changes in allocation of site for waste and clear reference to the relevant parts of the documentation dealing with the implications and impacts. This does not appear to have been done and I consider that this indicates a failure of the duty of care incumbent on those preparing the documentation. This is in itself adequate reason for rejecting the plan on the basis of inadequate delivery. Representation Form In Part B the form asks for the Policy No., Paragraph and Site Allocation. There is no explanation of these terms. It appears that the policy no. is the number above the blue background text in the Pre- Submission Draft Waste Plan 2017 (1) and the paragraph numbers are those at the head of each piece of text (as per the document accessed from the website). However that is not stated as such (probably an error of familiarity by those preparing the documentation). Therefore there is a dislocation in the connectivity of the Draft Waste Plan documentation and the Representation Form likely to be obstructive to proper comment. C. Summary I object to the inclusion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for waste facilities. I consider that the plan is unsound on this aspect due to the following: The waste facility would not be high quality employment, which the site is reserved for. The roads that would be used for access and egress of the waste are entirely unsuitable. It would be injurious to the health and well-being of the local community. I also consider that the plan is unsound and/or illegal due to the poor presentation and lack of adequate referencing and</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								consideration of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a waste facility. The effect of the way the plan has been prepared appears to merely serve the selfinterest those preparing the document by avoiding adequate public access and this acts against local democracy needs.			
PS D-WP 187	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	No	Individual	Ms Jane Baker	I wish to strongly object to Dorset CC waste plans for the Woolsbridge site, and have highlighted the following points to support my objections:- unsuitable access.Horton Road is already too congested and increasingly unsafe to accomodate any more HGVs.plus illegal shortcuts via Lions Lane and Woolsbridge Road. loss of quality employment land harm and damage to SSSI's which are already in jeopardy locally and nationally. increased local air pollution direct from the proposed site and HGVs transit affecting a large residential area and Moors Valley Country Park which has a large number of local and national visitors year round.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 240	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Eddie Perkins	The current Horton Road (C Class) is not suitable to be a feeder road to site. At times it is completely overloaded with vehicles now, going to and from work, Moors Valley or car boot making it difficult to cross, or turn out of. Any additional lorry/tractors would make it unsafe. The cost to upgrade the whole length of Horton Road makes this site uneconomic. You cannot just plan to upgrade access to site. Also vehicles travelling to and from site will take a short cut from the roundabout on A31 to Woolsbridge Road and take a difficult turning on to the Horton Road at Ashley Heath. I understand the trailer used for removing bulk waste from these plants tend to be the largest allowed on our roads, again making existing the road infrastructure poor and unsafe. Will the site be used to recycle waste from other councils? ie Wilts, Hants, thus giving more vehicle movements. Site is close to SSSI, on a flood plain and Moors River. Would the plant require additional storm drains and tankage for a filtration process unit to ensure any water used for cleaning is perfectly safe to enter the water course. Will the noise levels of plant machinery be considered, ie bond conveyors, screw conveyors, washing pumps, bulk compacting rams etc.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 244	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs S E Marshall	The proposal goes against the Core Strategy. The location was green belt and changed for employment land. However, this would give minimal employment to size of land taken. The access route via a C road is not appropriate and not been thought through.	The Waste Plant should be located more centrally to the area served and not on the outskirts, ideally near a railway. The additional unnecessary mileage and air pollution caused and additional cost contradicts the need for recycling. The site is close to a SSSI area, Moors Valley County Park, West Moors Plantation and tourists camping sites. The location of Woolsbridge Industrial Park is not suitable although a second entrance will be provided no thought has gone into the access roads. In 2017 the Horton	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									Road was regularly under repair causing chaos and gridlocks. This is without the extra traffic from the expansion of the Industrial Estate.		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 250	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mr John Codd	<p>Unfortunately, questions 4 and 5 have been worded in such a way that they do not allow me to respond correctly to the Plan as I would wish to. Even Q3 is ambiguously worded as a negative and this could be misleading to someone who does not read it carefully, resulting in a wrong answer being given in the four YES/NO boxes. I accept that the document has been positively prepared and the overall Waste Plan is justified. However, with respect to the proposal for the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate site only, I do not believe that the Waste Plan is sound or compliant, because I found much of the data and assessments it contains and which may be relied on to justify the proposed Waste Transfer facility, seem to me to be either incomplete, subjective, outdated or potentially misleading when considering this particular site. There needs to be a very thorough, independent scientific assessment of all issues the Responders to the Waste Plan identify. At an extraordinary Parish Council meeting held on Saturday 13th January 2018 a capacity audience of local residents met with Parish Councillors to discuss the proposals for the Waste Transfer facility on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. By an overwhelming majority the residents voted against the Waste Plan's proposal for the site and I would sincerely hope and expect their decision be respected and taken into account in any final planning decision. With respect to the environment, I support the concerns already expressed in EDEP's Response (EDEP15), including the potentially adverse impact on Moors Valley Country Park. There are clearly potential and historical flood, SSI and contamination risks associated with the Moors River which cannot be ignored. Areas in other parts of the country have suffered severe and unexpected flooding on similar industrial sites mainly due to unusually high rainfall coupled with prior accumulation of river debris and the failure to remove it. If the predictions for global warming and future environmental funding is cut even further than the type of unexpected flooding event which affected the High Street and Industrial Estate on Yafforth Road, Northallerton in 2012 will inevitably become more frequent and similar flooding here could easily result in serious contamination of the Moors River with toxic run-off from the proposed Woolsbridge waste site. Re: National and County Council Policy:</p>	The proposed use of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for any form of large scale Waste (Transfer) management should be removed in its entirety from this Plan and all future Waste Management Plans.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>NPPF policy Para 7 requires "sustainable development in terms of the overall economic, social and environmental needs of the area and its residents." I do not believe the use of Woolsbridge for waste management will comply with this. Paragraph 68 confirms "developments should aim to achieve places which promote safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and, safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas." I do not believe the use of Woolsbridge for waste management will comply with this. EDCC Policy DES2 states " Developments will not be permitted which will either impose or suffer unacceptable impacts on or from existing or likely future development or land uses in terms of noise, smell, safety, health, lighting, disturbance, traffic or other pollution". I do not believe the use of Woolsbridge for waste management will comply with this. As a local resident of some 40+ years standing and having lived along Horton Road since 1981, I am convinced that if approval is granted for a Waste Transfer facility at Woolsbridge the significant increase in HGV traffic along Horton Road and the surrounding area will inevitably have a severe and unacceptable impact on the quality of family life locally for generations to come. For the reasons I have stated above I do not believe that the document is consistent with National or County Council Policy, nor is it effective or justified when considering the proposal for a Waste Transfer facility on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. ISSUES RELATING TO LACK OF SOUNDNESS:- The Proposed Woolsbridge Industrial Site: The identified site area is 5.08ha and the Plan states up to 2ha is required if both facilities are built. It is of particular concern to read on Page 11 of the document 'Inset 1 - Woolsbridge I. E. Site Assessment' that: "An outline planning application has been granted for the development of the site. The application refers specifically to waste transfer but would not exclude other forms of waste management - subject to further application." It is therefore reasonable to assume that if this initial waste development were to go ahead there will be a substantial risk of additional waste processing development on the remaining 3.08ha, possibly in the</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>form of an Incinerator, with all the legal implications and potentially serious health issues such a facility would bring. (Reference: "The Heath Effects of Waste Incinerators", 4th Report of the British Society for Ecological Medicine, Second Edition, June 2008. Moderators: Dr Jeremy Thompson and Dr Honor Anthony). Horton &amp; Woolsbridge Roads: Horton Road (from Ashley Heath roundabout) &amp; Woolsbridge Road are both main C2 access roads to the Industrial Estate. They run between areas of substantial mixed properties with many homes along Horton Road having relatively poor sight lines. Woolsbridge Road has two wide footpaths, two cycle lanes, a 30mph speed limit and a weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes with good residential sight line. Horton Road is significantly narrower than Woolsbridge Road and it is poorly lit. It has no cycle lanes, no HGV weight restriction and an excessive 40mph speed limit (unfortunately nobody in authority seems to be listening!). It also has only one relatively narrow disjointed footpath along its length which alternates from one side of the road to the other. Near to the Ashley Heath roundabout the road has several dips with no solid white lines and congestion is bad, especially during the rush hour and at weekends. It is not unusual to queue for 10-15 min waiting here to join the A31 or A338 slip roads. Horton Road is only just wide enough for 2 HGV's to pass with care, but when Rollalong or other wide and heavy vehicles use it the opposite direction traffic invariably has to stop and mount the kerb. Bus stops along this road are situated very close the kerb and so provide little or no protection to passengers from passing traffic. Due to all of these factors and the occasional speeding motorist, residents, pedestrians, cyclists &amp; schoolchildren face a substantial risk of harm simply walking or accessing this road; especially whenever any HGV goes by. Traffic Figures and Statistics: Since 2009 there has been an almost exponential rise in traffic along Horton Road. A thorough &amp; independent impact assessment on the future effects this Plan will have on local traffic in the area needs to be carried out, because as I have already said some of the data being relied on in the Plan is potentially misleading. For example, the likely increase in traffic due to the two Transfer facilities quoted in document 'Inset 1 - Woolsbridge etc' states they are both only one way. Why? Because taking them into account properly as two-way traffic journeys</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>(i.e. In &amp; Out) means that the Waste facility alone will potentially generate a similar amount of HGV traffic each year when compared to the total traffic movement along Horton Road in 2009. The official accident statistics for Horton Road do not appear to give a true reflection, with many minor incidents going unreported. This month along (01/18) there have been at least 3 to my knowledge between the Ashley Heath roundabout and Woolsbridge Road. Two serious with one involving a delivery van being pushed into a resident's entrance wall and another occurred on 08 January when a Bulk Waste lorry(sic) over-turned by the roundabout and blocked the slip road. The potential increase in traffic on two already congested minor roads and these recent accidents should be a serious cause for concern to everyone. When compared to the Highways Agency's statistical data for 2009 along Horton Road they demonstrate a potentially significant and severe increase in the predicted number of HGV movements and a worrying trend in the accident rate. Use of Existing Waste Sites must take priority: Making maximum use of existing waste sites within Dorset and cooperating fully with neighbouring Counties must surely be the most cost effective, practical and least intrusive way to plan for future waste management. It makes no sense whatsoever to permit any sort of Waste (Transfer) facility at Woolsbridge when there is an existing large waste site already being used on the B3081 only 2nms away and there is plenty of space there for suitable expansion, if required. Unlike Woolsbridge this Blue Haze site is situated in a relatively open forested area and the B3081 road from the A31 is far and away more suitable in terms of traffic flow and access, being much wider and well away from any significant housing. Common sense alone must surely say to anybody looking at the Waste Transfer Plan and comparing the B3081 with Horton and Woolsbridge Roads which site is the most practical, economical, environmental and safest one to use. A</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 242	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Rodney Smith	It is difficult to contemplate logic for siting a proposed waste transfer/bulking up or waste treatment facility at the Woolsbridge Industrial Park. The site is located to the Southeast of Dorset and this would require substantial transport by road throughout the county and again transport when the process is completed. The planning permission granted for the extension of the Woolsbridge Industrial Park was for light industrial use. Waste transfer and waste treatment should not be covered by light industrial consent. The intention of the planning consent for 'employment land'. A waste transfer/bulking would provide little employment since most of the process would be completed mechanically. The surrounding area is precious heathland and the movement of and treatment of waste, including hard plastic, could well disrupt the delicate balance of the heathland and the bird and animal life which live on the heathland. The River Moor is protected and again any run off from the site and all the water used to clean the waste could well impact the river and the land surrounding the proposed site. Adjacent to the proposed site is the country park, now well established as a major country park and tourist attraction in Dorset. The park was winning many awards for the facilities and environmental projects it provides for Dorset and for West Hampshire. The proposed site can only be approached by, to the west from West Moors, from the North Verwood and from the east from Ringwood, on country roads. These roads were not build for, and are not maintained well enough, to be used by the very heavy trucks that presently use them let alone any additional traffic which will be substantially higher than the daily 15 journeys each day. Horton Road, which appears not to be shown as an 'A' or 'B' road is extremely narrow, particularly at the junction with the A31 at Ashley Heath roundabout. At most places there is only a narrow path on one side of the road and in some places there is no pavement. Many of the local householders are reluctant to use the pavement, where they exist, because of the close proximity of the heavy trucks as they drive down Horton Road. We have not allowed our grandchildren to walk to the local One Stop Shop since we are concerned that a vehicle will mount the narrow pavement. Cyclists, who use Horton Road, do so by using the pavement, where it exists, to avoid		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>the obvious danger of the volume and size of vehicles which use the road. It is not safe for them to cycle on this road. Such is the width of the road, that large trucks have to overlap the road centre line, and quite often wing mirrors are broken or damaged. The weight of these trucks has caused the road around drain covers to subside leaving potholes in the road. The heavy trucks which use the Horton Road often cause our home to vibrate. During the school holiday period quite often Horton Road is blocked by the number of vehicles trying to get to the country park. These vehicles occasionally try to park on Horton Road, which has no parking restrictions, and this causes traffic jam problems. In the 9 years we have lived on the Horton Road we have seen a large increase in the amount of traffic, particularly heavy trucks including some military vehicles, which use the road. Any agreement to allow a waste transfer/ bulking or waste treatment facility would have a detrimental impact all the properties on the Horton Road and all properties in the vicinity of the waste facility. It is difficult to understand why the Council would wish to place a waste facility in a rural location where there is extremely poor access for the many heavy trucks they will be needed to service the waste facility. Surely this would be better sited in a location where there is excellent road links and where the facility will cause no damage to the local environment. Perhaps consideration should be given to finding a site adjacent to the railway facilities, whereby the waste could be delivered by rail and sent to its final destination by rail, thus reducing the need for heavy trucks and the pollution that goes with them. There must be such sites in urban locations.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 252	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes		No	Individual	Mr & Mrs N Willson	We object to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate site for the following reasons: The classification of the Horton Road makes it unsuitable for the type or volume of traffic proposed. The Horton/Ringwood Road is important to the local community as its the main road which links us with employment, hospitals and the amenities of nearby towns. The road suffers from flooding and pooling of water, which in turn, re - opens much of the Councils attempts to patch and repair the potholes. It is extremely narrow in places, lacks a lane for cyclists or any consistent run of pavement for pedestrians. Accidents, deliveries and current usage already place heavy demand, and at times, makes it very hazardous. We have seen an increase in the use of traffic management systems which are needed to make the road safe for maintenance work. There is little scope to divert traffic away from the Horton Road, so any blockage causes real problems. Many homes and driveways rely on being able to safely access this road. The local shop, bus stops and Moors Valley Country Park are all valuable amenities and being able to access them is important to residents and visitors. Traffic already going to the Industrial Estate, garden centre, car boot sale, Park, to name a few, keep this road busy at usual times and in peak holiday times we already see that the volume of traffic cannot be managed, leading to cars spilling out into the residential roads to seek a route out of the area. To create further congestion on this road would cause real problems and further delays. The proposed alternative entrance to the Industrial Estate still results in the traffic directly impacting the same Horton/Ringwood Road and therefore fails to address the issue of overload. Vehicles to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would have to travel across Dorset to the Hampshire border so time of vehicles on the road would be greater along with traffic pollution. It seems unlikely that employment opportunities on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would arise due to what you would expect would be a largely automated function. Amenity and quality of life would be impacted by an increase in noise and vibration, airborne emissions, dust, litter and debris all impacting on a residential area. We object to the Woolsbridge Site as we dont think the road is suitable and therefore the site would be unsustainable over the period of the plan.	We dont feel its possible to consider the Woolsbridge Industrial Site as a 'sound' option	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 260	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Peter & Virginia Howarth	<p>We wish to protest in the strongest possible terms regarding the possible siting of a recycling plant at Woolsbridge Road, Ashley Heath. There can have been little or no information posted to those affected and we have only heard of this within the past 48 hours. We are extremely concerned. As residents of Heath Road, St. Leonards for many years, it would appear that we will be almost one of the closest properties to this plant. If the plans go through then this would surely mean a large reduction in value of our property should we wish to sell in the future. Of great concern is that there would appear that a very tall chimney is to be built to dispose of the smoke etc., after burning of rubbish. How is this going to affect us? Are we to be unable to open our windows each morning for fresh air as we always have done? If this plan goes ahead it would surely affect attendance at Moors Valley Country Park which is there for residents and holiday visitors to avail themselves of the various health giving activities in the surrounding areas. Might this plant not put off people from using Moors Valley in the future? I'd be interested to know the views of Moors Valley! The use of a "C road" Horton Road " to transport the waste, in presumably heavy lorries, would be catastrophic. Since we have lived here this road has gone from a country lane to a very much used road by all types of vehicles. Only recently when driving along from the Ashley Heath roundabout to Lions Lane, we were forced to mount the pavement/bank in order that a huge lorry carrying a large mobile home could continue its journey in the opposite direction. Luckily there were no pedestrians using the pavement/bank at the time. The condition of the surface of this road is extremely poor " regular use by such vehicles transporting waste would only add to its poor condition. There is much congestion at various times approaching the Ashley Heath roundabout where a long tailback along the Horton Road exists. Again recycling vehicles would add to this problem, possibly causing gridlock on the roundabout with knock-on effect to the A31. We must also remember that this facility would be extremely close to a site of Special Scientific Interest, Lions Wood Reserve. Surely this has been considered by the council! The Castleman Trailway is much used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders. We ourselves take advantage of having this</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								fabulous trail close to our home and walk it regularly. We dont think we would want to walk the trail if we had to pass by the recycling plant. Surely it would make more sense, if this site is to serve the whole of Dorset, to put this plant in the centre of Dorset in open ground away from residential areas, not on the countys most Eastern extremities. Financially, it costs us dearly to live in this beautiful area and we had hoped to enjoy to continue living here. We urge you to strongly consider siting this facility elsewhere.			
PS D-WP 276	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	Mr & Mrs Kos	The Horton Road is only a category C road, and we have already found ourselves on many occasions having to pull over to allow larger vehicles to pass. With the increase in volume of HGV vehicles this would make this an even bigger problem. The condition of the road at the present time shows signs of breaking down with evidence of pot holes and this would also worsen. People residing close to the Horton Road and also those enjoying the close proximity to Moors Valley where they can cycle, would be subjected to increase in noise and pollution which would ultimately impact on their lives.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 278	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs John & Carole Cowe	We are responding to the suggestion of a Woolsbridge waste plant. We feel that this is a very bad idea for a number of reasons: The Horton Road is already excessively used. Large vehicles constantly use this road and there is frequent congestion now. If more large lorries are forced to use the road there will be more congestion and more delays. The road surface will be further damaged which will result in costly repairs and therefore again, more delays and congestion. The lorries will cause more pollution in the environment including noise pollution. There will likely be more accidents, as the road is very narrow in some places. The waste plant itself could lead to an incinerator being introduced there in years to come. That could be disastrous to the environment surrounding it. The pollution levels could be hazardous to the local wildlife, vegetation and to people living in our area. Even without an incinerator, the pollution caused by the lorries and possibly from the separation and cleaning of the waste could also be hazardous. We have SSIs in our area. These have been protected by preventing building projects within certain areas close to the SSIs. It seems ridiculous to even contemplate polluting these precious sites. If the Horton Road becomes even more congested then drivers will take other routes. This could mean that they cut through other roads such Braeside Road congesting these areas also. There is at least one deer enclosure and some farms close to the proposed waste site. Local noise and pollution could well be very detrimental to these. To summarise, we are vehemently against the proposed Woolsbridge waste plant for the reasons outlined above.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 298	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Peter Ruff	I STRONGLY object to the proposed plans to construct a waste recycling plant at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate on the grounds of pollution both to the air and the surrounding environment, which consists of SSSI sites and river courses. The existing Horton Road will be made more dangerous to both cyclists and pedestrians with the vastly increased HGV movements. I am also very concerned about the devaluation of properties in the surrounding areas, mine included.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 231	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs Houghton	<p>It has been brought to my attention that there are proposals for a large recycling plant at Woolsbridge that is in close proximity to where we live. I should like to object to the proposed plan on the following grounds: Horton Road/Woolsbridge Road Traffic Issues The Horton Road is a C class road that is currently in my view providing unsuitable for existing traffic. The impact on the road surface of an increased number of heavy goods vehicles would be substantially and would increase the lack of safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motor vehicles. Pedestrians using the footpaths on the Horton Road already feel unsafe owing to the speed and closeness of passing traffic. The Woolsbridge Road does have a weight limit on it but that is not to say that heavy vehicles will not use that route as a short cut to avoid the Ashely Heath Roundabout. This road is also a school access route which has safety implications. Environmental If permission is granted then there is the possibility that there could be a change of use of the site at a future date to include an incinerator waste unit. This would be detrimental to local residents given the prevailing winds and the contamination of air quality. Additionally, this would also affect the successful Moors Valley County Park that is nearby. Also, the nearby Lions Hill reserve is a site of scientific interest and could sustain environmental damage. Positioning This site would not be at the centre of the County; in fact it would be on the on the most easterly border. Surely from a financial aspect this does not make sense. Additionally it has been suggested that it would be best placed adjacent to a railway line thus saving the impact on the environment by not transporting waste by road.</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 239	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Michael D Smith	<p>Legal Compliance Context: I have extensive experience of Waste Planning and Implementation of Waste Policies and Schemes. In particular I was one of three Senior Officers responsible for developing, securing acceptance of the Hampshire Waste Scheme, including public consultation, public examination, implementation and operation. I have also appeared as an expert witness at a number of public examination hearings of Environmental Schemes including Waste, Energy from Waste, District Energy. It is weak in following National Policy and Legislation: It claims compliance but each claim is tenuous and generally contrived. Sustainability Appraisal: Overall the appraisal is disappointing and weak, lacks examples and claims factors are reflected in the draft plan when those factors are not properly reflected. Notable exceptions are listed in my response to Question 5. Duty to Co-operate: Only with other Dorset Authorities, no real evidence of co-operation with other Authorities particularly as 15% of waste will be imported from outside Dorset. The origin of that Waste is not clear. No clear details of other organisations with whom co-operation has been undertaken, only implied in places which one has to search for. Local Development Scheme: It is difficult to both trace and follow within the LDS how the Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken. It is therefore not possible to ascertain the roles of each local authority in the appraisal and consequently the respective contributions from each authority. Consultation: This has been very poor. On plans such as these with such enormous impact on communities extensive consultation on every aspect of the plan is essential. One example of this is the proposal for the Woolsbridge Site (Inset 1). There was no communication from the County Council or the Waste Partnership on this controversial proposal. The only reference that I saw was a feature in a free community magazine which most people bin as junk mail. The period for representations was woefully short and included the Christmas and New Year periods, even then the web site was known to be unavailable for one day during the period. "It was in every way a good and short period for delivering bad news". The traffic conditions on the Horton Road are already poor. The road is narrow and is heavily used both for normal and</p>	To make the document sound in respect of site allocation the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate proposal (Inset 1) should be removed from the site allocation plan. The whole strategy needs to be fundamentally revised as described in Q4 above.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>commuter traffic. Traffic going to and from the Moors Valley Country Park is considerable all year but even more so from April to October. Sadly the road is regularly used as a "rat run" by HGV's to and from the Ashley Heath Roundabout and the B3078. The Horton Road is very narrow, only 18 feet in places and there is frequently insufficient room for vehicles to pass. The emissions from all these vehicles is considerable as measurement will demonstrate. Noise and air pollution is already high in what is largely a dense residential area to the South, with the forecast growth in waste this it will only become worse. The health risks from poor air quality are high and will be further heightened by the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate waste proposals. The glib proposal for more traffic generation is worrying and demonstrates an alarming lack of knowledge of current traffic conditions and road size and capacity. The proposal to produce RDF and SRF is irrational and will only serve to increase dust and emissions. There is no indication where these fuels will be used but they will have to be transported offsite. There is a suggestion that the plans will generate employment, however the job creation will be small and unskilled. For reference look at the waste facilities in Hampshire. Overall the waste strategy is weak and ill conceived. It is approximately 40 years out of date and reflects 1970's thinking. The concept of the Circular Economy and proximity should be strongly reflected in the actual planned facilities, they are not currently so reflected. Why are there no plans for a Materials Recycling Facility in Dorset? Why is there no Energy from Waste plant proposed? All these facilities and other complementary ones could be collocated on a single site as is the case in Hampshire, significantly reducing the need for considerable onwards transportation with all its attendant pollution and cost. In the 21 st Century it does not make sense to draft waste management proposals that do not have these type of facilities. Dorset should look at the Scandinavian models and emulate the best of those. It could also learn from Project Integra in Hampshire. Facilities need to be well thought out and integrated. Many local authorities around the UK are embracing these modern concepts but the Dorset model shows no attempt to meet modern waste management thinking. It is suggested that the strategy is totally revised in line with modern thinking. It is also</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>suggested that the Waste Partnership engages expertise with an understanding of these concepts. There are many examples of good practice in the UK, sadly this proposal will come nowhere near any of the best UK strategies. It is suggested that they look at the best of Veolia's and Suez's Schemes and incorporate the best features of their schemes into the Dorset proposals. I would be happy to work with the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Officers and Members to bring about a step change improvement in Sustainable Waste Management in Dorset.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 241	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Gillian Rix	I wish to object to this proposal for the following reasons. The Horton Road is not suitable, being a class C road and extremely narrow in places, for the lorries that use it now therefore completely unsuitable for the type of lorry required for this type of transport. At the moment the road is in an extremely bad state being full of pot holes. To take a walk along there to visit Moors Valley is unpleasant due to the amount of traffic and is dangerous to cross the road. What will happen to all the waste water the area around is a SSSI and therefore not somewhere to dispose of waste. There is a car boot sale in a field nearby on Sunday mornings resulting in a great deal of extra traffic using the road. When permission was granted for this it was for a few Sundays. Residents living along the Horton Road are finding it increasingly difficult to get out of their drives. If this proposal goes ahead it then makes it easier for future activity to be added. Considering all these points it is essential a more suitable site is found.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 243	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ms Eve Cowan	With reference to the proposed bulk waste facility at Woolsbridge Trading estate, Horton Road, I would like to register my objection to the use of this site. An article in the St Leonards and St Ives Directory recently stated in the headline that an incinerator is being considered there and I feel the local environment totally unsuitable for an incinerator. This site is meant to boost local employment but this scheme would not involve many workers. However, it would involve a lot more traffic with heavy lorries moving regularly to and from the site. Neither Horton Road nor the roads leading to it - Braeside Road, Woolsbridge Road and Lions Lane are suitable for this extra heavy traffic - Horton Road in particular is hardly coping at present with the flow of traffic. At present we use the waste disposal facilities at Verwood and it seems to me that extension of this site (in the forest) would solve the problem of increased waste far better than the proposed site at Woolsbridge. I know that this site is just within the Hampshire border, but surely with a bit of co-operation this could be a joint Hants/ Dorset venture? I look forward to hearing the outcome of your deliberations on this matter.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 253	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Mike Rix	<p><b>OBJECTION No. 1: ACCESS ROADS INADEQUATE FOR LARGE VEHICLE TRAFFIC</b> The access road (Horton Road) between the Ashley Heath roundabout &amp; the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate plus the section from Three Legged Cross is C rated. The whole road is totally unsuitable for the proposed high sided/wide/heavy waste transfer vehicles. ie the road narrows down to 18-0 in places. The road surface &amp; construction is not suitable for the excessive weight of these vehicles. Current damage to surface, curbs &amp; pavements is currently due to large/long/heavy vehicles. We observe frequently large/wide vehicles carrying Portacabins riding on the pavements/verges in order to pass other traffic plus traffic from the opposite direction. Worst case: Portacabin lorries, single &amp; double deck buses, weekly local rubbish/recycle vehicles passing each other.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION No 2: INCREASED AIRBOURNE POLLUTION</b> ie SMELLS, DIESEL FUMES, ETC. This is inevitable particularly from diesel powered vehicles, generators, etc.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION No 3: RIVER POLLUTION (SSSI)</b> Again inevitable due to leaks, human operator errors, rats, etc.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION No 4: NOISE</b> High frequency &amp; particularly low frequency noise from machinery &amp; vehicles.</p> <p><b>OBJECTION No 5: ON DECOMMISSIONING, THE SITE WILL HAVE GROUND CONTAMINATION.</b> What are the long term proposed for returning the site to Greenfield or Brownfield status?</p> <p><b>OBJECTION No 6: VEHICLES EXITING THE WOOLSBRIDGE ESTATE.</b> Vehicles turning right onto the Horton Road, towards the Ashley Heath roundabout, are crossing a blind bend increasing the chances of more accidents.</p> <p><b>ALTERNATIVES</b></p> <p><b>ALTERNATIVE No 1: CONTINUE THE EXISTING TRADING ESTATE ROAD THROUGH TO THE PURPOSE BUILT ROUNDABOUT ON THE A31:</b> This would relieve 95% of the Horton Road problems.</p> <p><b>ALTERNATIVE No2: LOCATE THE PROPOSED WASTE SITE TO NEARER THE POINT OF WASTE GENERATION:</b> ie Reduce road transport to a minimum rather than to the East edge of Dorset.</p> <p><b>ALTERNATIVE No 3: REUSE THE NOW UNUSED RAILWAY SPUR AT WINFRITH:</b> Refer to Alternative no. 2 above. Use rail transport rather than further clog up the roads. Reduce diesel road vehicle pollution.</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							NOTE: Road traffic is increasing on the Horton Road due to the popularity of the Moors Valley Country Park PLUS traffic to the Ashley Heath Sunday Boot Sale.			
PS D-WP 261	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ann Pitt	I would like to write to express my serious concerns over the logistics. I am amazed that any Dorset councillor would not be aware of the traffic congestion around this area. Neighbours in this area frequently use a rat run to avoid the congestion at the Ashley Heath and Horton Road junction, what with mobile home and tanks being transported. We frequently have to resort to the verges, heavens knows what would occur with heavy traffic from all areas of Dorset. The A31 from before Ringwood to the Ashley Heath roundabout is also a nightmare. In fact the council already has plans in effect to try to alleviate some of the congestion at the Verwood turn off and Ringwood, due to traffic delays. The A31 in the Summer with all the traffic going to the West Country is avoided by all, my family actually leave their homes late at night to avoid delays during the day, 1 hour during the Summer is nothing. On top of this you have Dorset's No 1 attraction in Moors Valley Park, which already causes hold ups. I am not		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							sure that anyone has taken the logistical issues around this site into consideration. This is a really a serious issue, nothing to do with NIMBYism. The current congestion is already an issue.			
PS D-WP 271	Inset 1 - Wooldsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Miss S Murphy	With reference to the above plan I fully and wholeheartedly oppose this for the following reasons outlined below: This will increase traffic on an already heavily burdened road. Horton Road is a category C road which is not designed for heavy traffic and is constantly in a state of disrepair already. My property constantly vibrates with the current heavy traffic and this will only increase " see point 1. This is a constant source of irritation and upset on my personal wellbeing. The plans show that the designated area for the plant is for essential employment . The Plant will not provide an increase in this as it will be predominantly automated, thus negating itself. The proposed Plant will be adjacent to an area of SSSI, this must be protected and preserved. Access from Horton Road leads to the highly successful and attractive Moors Valley Country Park which gives enjoyment to young and old. An increase in HGVs along this road will increase the safety risk to families and cars that use this access. To reiterate the beginning of this letter, I totally oppose this plan.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 279	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr A Barber	<p>Movement of Waste - Proximity Principle Whilst I appreciate the need to manage waste safely, and acknowledge that it should be dealt with as close as possible to where it is produced, I do not feel that the Woolsbridge Industrial estate is the right place for a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility to be sited. This is because waste will be travelling from Christchurch and Poole to a facility which you state in your Draft Waste Plan Site Options to be "in a poor location resulting in waste travelling greater distances". You state in Policy 1- Sustainable Waste Management , that facilities should adhere to the proximity principle through being appropriately located relative to the source of the waste. You have also said that Objective 2 in your Vision and Objectives , is that facilities should be "located in appropriate locations as close as practicable to the origin of the waste in order to reduce the total mileage waste is transported" . In allowing the facility to be built at Woolsbridge, you would not be adhering to your own principles, or to the vision and objectives that you have set out in the plan. Site Options - suitability In your Draft Waste Plan Site Options , you have listed the details of three other sites that would be suitable for Bulky Waste Transfer/Treatment. The first of these sites, Area 2 &amp; 3 Ling Road, Mannings Heath Poole is an industrial estate, on employment land, which already has planning permission from 2013 for a bulky waste facility to be built. You have stated that the site is strategically well located and no significant sustainability issues have been identified. Why then are you not seriously considering this site? The second site Hurn MRF, Parley is an established materials recycling facility, and you say it has potential as a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility. Why then is this site not being seriously considered? The third site, Blunts Farm is according to you well located to serve Wimborne, Ferndown and the surrounding areas. Again it is strategically well located, is allocated for employment use and is close to the A31 access route. This site is equally well suited for the bulky waste transfer/treatment facility. The County Council have failed to enlighten us as to why it has chosen Woolsbridge over three other sites that would be better choices for the bulky waste transfer/treatment facility. If as you have stated "it is likely that one facility</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>would be adequate for treating bulky waste" , why would you not choose to use the Mannings Heath or Blunts Farm sites, which by your own admission would be strategically better for the purpose? The County Council have also said that Thermal Treatment i.e. incineration as part of waste recovery can be more industrial in nature ... and give rise to higher traffic movements ... it is therefore considered that the most appropriate locations for such facilities are on employment land or within already developed areas". Both Mannings Heath and Blunts Farm are on areas of employment land, and have or will be further developed. In your Policy 2 - Integrated Waste Management facilities , proposals for waste management facilities which incorporate different types of waste management activities, at the same location, or are co-located with complementary activities, will be supported..." Given that you want to build the facility on an area of employment land, and are keen to co-locate facilities, it is only a matter of time before an incinerator becomes part of the plan for Woolsbridge. This is a point that has not been overlooked by local residents despite your attempts to conceal it within your policy draft. Transport links The Woolsbridge Industrial estate is served by Horton Road, which is a category C road and is not part of the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Map. When assessing the suitability of sites, the National Planning Policy for waste requires the waste planning authority to consider the capacity of the existing and potential transport infrastructure to support the sustainable movement of waste. Building a bulky waste/treatment facility would generate in excess of 30 HGV movements per day. The co-location of facilities i.e. an incinerator, would further increase the volume of HGV movements. The cumulative impact of additional traffic to the Horton Road would substantially alter the existing traffic flows. The limited width and capacity of the road, the condition of the surface and safety issues regarding safe cycle and pedestrian paths, as well as the impact that increased flow of HGV's would have on the environment and local amenity, are a cause of major concern. It is clear that the existing road network is not adequate for the amount of additional HGV movements associated with the proposed facility. This is something that the County Council has done nothing in its waste plan to ameliorate.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 281	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Margaret Hunt	I would like to object to the wools bridge industrial estate recycling centre proposal. This objection is on a number of reasons. Firstly you have a legal obligation to inform the residents within 5 miles of the proposed site your intentions which you failed to do. Also the environmental impact on this area which is significantly protected. You are in breach of Highway code by seeking to add to traffic impact especially on Ashley Heath roundabout which was at full capacity by 2016 and traffic air pollution is at breaking point. Quality of life for the residents will be affected by air pollution as well as well as the wildlife suffering in an area that is ssi protected. I am very angry that myself and others just yesterday found out about these proposals. Why were myself and others kept in the dark?		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 283	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Michael Burns	Unsound because:- I do not think that the document is not compliant with the national policy and the county council policy on heath & safety, pollution & noise. It is possibly not legal because it appears to be based upon incomplete & inconsistent information. With reference to paragraph 4 I submit further comments:- By reading various Council documents it is apparent that outline planning permission has been granted, for the site, and whilst this application is for a waste transfer only, it does not preclude an extension, at a later date to include further types of waste management including an incinerator plant. Given that the site is close to an area populated by 36000 within an distrance of 5km, not to mention a major Tourist attraction at Moors Valley Country Park 1.5km away I would think that this is unacceptable. This I would also suggest that the consideration of the Public House, the stated 11 domestic properties and 2 caravan sites is somewhat misleading as to who will impacted by this proposed installation With regards to the Woolsbridge Road and Horton Road, which currently feed the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate this is a class C road and was not designed for the HGV usage that it now has to cope with. Woolsbridge road does have a 30mph speed limit, 7.5tonnes weight restriction and 2 cycle lanes which further restrict the width of the road. The Horton Road is very narrow with a speed limit of 40mph and is a C class road. The road does not have any lay-bys for buses to pull into, and no protection for passengers alighting from a bus or waiting at a bus stop. Both road pass through areas of desirable mixed properties with	I consider that the proposed waste plant at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be removed from the waste proposal plan unless at the very least access for all HGV vehicles is provided from the Azalea roundabout (existing) on the A31 to the south of the estate, and not by the Horton Road. I suggest the removal of the Woolsbridge Ind. Est. from the waste proposal plan. However if this Plan goes ahead it should only be accessed by all HGV's from the Azalea roundabout on the A31 to the south of the estate.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								very little street lighting. At the end of this letter I have attached a section from a Report prepared 2016 for Dorset County Council by Eunomia Research and Consulting Ltd, who are located in Bristol and contains comments from Highways England which I understand to say that the current road access is not adequate for any substantial increase in traffic to the Woolsbridge Industrial Site. These comments, by English Highways, I would suggest further stress the importance of installing a new road from the Azalea Roundabout on the A31 to the South of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. I would also like to stress that many families with small children visit Moors Valley and the 3 caravan sites and any increase in pollution near these sites will be against national and council policy.			
PS D-WP 297	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	David & Nancy Young & Blackwell	We are very unhappy with the news that Dorset County Council of thinking of placing the above at this site. Horton Road is totally unsuitable to have large waste vehicles using this very narrow road. We live in St. Leonards and the prevailing winds would carry any pollutants in our direction which would cause an effect on the price and living conditions of properties in this densely populated area. The Woolsbridge site is totally inadequate for this type of operation. We suggest you find a far more suitable site nearer to the coast where the pollutants would blow out to sea and would not affect the inhabitants. We are two very annoyed local residents who feel that we are having this waste facility literally dumped on us. We cannot wait for the next local elections.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 282	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs RJ & Cl Davey	We strongly disapprove of the draft proposal above, including the EfW Incinerator to be built along with storage facilities at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. Main objections Bulk Waste to be transported via the Horton Road into Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Traffic to intermix with Bulk transport along a busy road opposite Moors Valley Park which is used by thousands of people each year. Estimated these lorries every 10 minutes for 8 hours a day. 100m high incinerator plus out buildings. Why spoil a lovely natural beauty spot when only 3 miles north the existing waste site could be used on the Verwood Road. We hope the powers to be will see the local concerns		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 318	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Eric & Sally Churchill	We have read the proposal with some concern. Specifically: 1) The quoted increase in the volume of HGV traffic movements on an already busy road and the effect of adding traffic lights at the junction on the flow of traffic. 2) Environmental risks are apparent - both from waste water run off and existing water level issues, as well as the inherent nature of the proposed materials being handled on the site 3) The fear that once the principle of waste handling has been established in a limited way, then there is the risk that the operation can be both expanded and changed in nature in the future without any public recourse. Already a 10 metre tall building is being mooted which I suspect is much taller than anything currently on the estate. In summary, East Dorset is a relatively rural area and there ought to be somewhere further away from urban areas for this type of facility which still retains reasonable transport links for the necessary traffic which the site must generate.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 317	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs John Yerbury	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed construction of a Recycling Plant on the nearby Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. My objection is based on the negative impact that such a development will have on the local area. The following issues that concern me can be summarized as environmental and health &amp; safety. Both of these affect the house owners and their families who live in the local area and also, potentially, members of the public using the Moors Valley Country Park. The sensitivity of the area surrounding the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate with regard to rare or endangered species will be evident from the existence of the SSSI and the fact that the Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust has acquired a large tract of land nearby for the protection of endangered invertebrates. Can you tell me whether or not an environmental impact assessment has been carried out by the Planning Department for this proposed development and whether Natural England has been consulted regarding its potential impact on the SSSI. Moreover, why would there be an environmental impact? This falls into two categories: impact on nature and impact on people. The proposed development is within an attractive wood of mixed-species, largely hardwood trees which include ancient oaks. The fact that a substantial wooded area around the proposed site is completely free from human habitation or visitation (save by the land owner on a very infrequent basis) means that the area is an ideal habitat for birds, small mammals and invertebrates. In terms of impact on people " both home-owners and land-owners " there would be serious impact if the (Recycling Plant) development proceeds. These people have invested in property or land in the reasonable expectation that they can enjoy the benefits of the openness, tranquility and privacy offered by a rural location that is " they thought " protected in perpetuity by its designation as Green Belt. The establishment of a facility in this Green Belt area for the general public can only negate these benefits, with noise and vehicle exhaust pollution becoming key factors. The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is close to the Moors River flood plain that incorporates a SSSI. If waste treatment involves washing processes then how is any potential overflow to be prevented from ending up in the Moors River? It is suggested that up to 30000 tonnes of waste per year</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								might be moved along the Horton Road. The handling of Bulk Waste may involve up to 10 HGVs per day driving in and out of the Recycling Plant. Already there is a huge traffic impact from the Industrial estate. The route from the A31 to Woolsbridge Industrial area is a C class road, I believe, now beyond its economic capacity at certain times of the day (morning and evening rush hours) with current traffic patterns.			
PS D-WP 356	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	No	No	Individual	Mrs Glenys Hazlehurst	Although access will be made on site, the Horton " Ringwood C Road remains unchanged. This is a very narrow, twisty road, already very busy with large lorries causing other drivers and cyclists to veer on to pavements " a hazard for pedestrians. This road also passes through housing areas in both directions. The site is adjacent to an SSI area, near the Castleman Trailway frequented by pedestrians, cyclists & horse riders and near to Moors Valley Country Park which is so successful, creates healthy income and attracts a great many visitors so a great deal of traffic. The original plan for Woolsbridge Industrial Park was to create new employment with a minimum of person per space taken up. This plan would not conform. During 2017 and again in 2018 the Horton/Ringwood road has	A more central site would surely be more appropriate with better and good road links " or rail links. This would help with pollution levels and be more cost effective reducing longer mileage runs. Surely the recycling plant needs to be environmentally advantageous to outweigh the negatives in operating it. I think this form is extremely difficult	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							had numerous road works in operation lasting months. With extra heavy lorries, the road surface will deteriorate more again so feel it is not fit for the envisaged extra traffic.	to follow and fill in. Firstly " Page 3 " Policy No. etc. have had to be searched for " no information given on form " Why? Unfortunately I feel it will put off many people who otherwise would like to voice an opinion. Is this its purpose???		
PS D-WP 358	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Molly Garrod	I attended the meeting today held in the Village Hall to discuss the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan and Waste Plan Pre-submission Draft. I listened to the proposals put forward and do not believe that the Woolsbridge site is a suitable location for the installation due to the following reasons: An increase in traffic on an already congested Horton Road. The road is a country lane in parts and as such unsuitable for the type of vehicles that would be involved in the movement of waste. The road surface, already pot holed, could not sustain the impact large vehicles would make on a daily basis, making this even more dangerous for other road users particularly cyclists. With the increased volume of traffic would come the safety of pedestrians crossing the road especially for anyone going for a walk in the Moors Valley Country Park. With the increase in traffic along this road I am sure there would be an element of drivers looking for a quick route to the A31 and associated roads who would start using the residential roads as a rat-run and these roads are not suitable for large commercial vehicles or heavy traffic. There are also a large number of nursing/care/residential homes along the Horton Road and I think they would suffer noise pollution if the volume of traffic increased. It is not only the Horton Road that would suffer. The waste must come via other routes, i.e. A31, A338 etc. and these roads are already very busy without further traffic. I am concerned about the water waste this site would generate. What would happen if there was an accident and the detergents/chemicals used in the cleaning of the waste was inadvertently discharged into		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								the river or surrounding areas. I do not believe this site will provide sufficient employment for the area. I think that this proposal is the thin end of the wedge. I think after the first phase of the waste plan a second would be submitted for further expansion which could include an incinerator which would be totally unacceptable considering the dangerous pollutants that would be released so close to so much housing and an award winning Country Park. As a waste plan is needed for the whole of Dorset it should be sited centrally in the county to avoid unnecessary travel to the site. I do not believe this site offers anything of benefit to the area or the community. The Woolsbridge site is a high end industrial estate and having a waste treatment plant is not in line with the other businesses currently on this site.			
PS D-WP 360	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	R A Luxton	My concern is related to vehicle movements particularly for the following reasons. a) The width of the Horton Road/Ringwood Road is 6-6.3 metres wide with a single narrow pavement on one side of the road. This necessitates pedestrians to cross the road several times to access the pavement. Please refer to attached leaflet regarding lorry size and weights. b) The number of heavy goods vehicle movements of up to 10/day (well over 3500/year) plus staff car movement is unacceptable for this minor single carriageway. c) From the Ashley Heath roundabout and from West moors/Three Legged Cross to the junction into the industrial estate there are care homes, a school and particularly private residential homes for the entire length of the road. d) The inhabitants of these properties will suffer noise and vibration due to the vehicle movements. e) The carriageway will be littered with material blown from the heavy goods vehicles during transporting waste to the proposed site. (An		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>example of this A31 Ashley Heath roundabout) f) The additional heavy vehicle movements will have a substantial impact on the already congested Horton Road particularly at peak times and during school holiday periods when families are visiting Moors Valley Country Park. I urge the Parish Council to lodge an objection to the Woolsbridge Ind Estate proposal for a Waste Treatment Facility for the above reasons. It would affect the quality of life for the residents particularly those living in properties along the routes outlined above and greatly increase dangers to pedestrians and cyclists.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 362	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Alan MacKenzie	<p>I wish to register my objection to the above proposed scheme for the following reasons: Increased traffic along the Horton Road. The Horton Road, even as it stands today, is unfit for purpose for the current levels of traffic it carries. Regular weekday traffic is very heavy, particularly in the section between Ashley Heath and the roundabout at Three Legged Cross at the turnings to West Moors and Verwood. At times, the numbers of vehicles using the road make it extremely difficult to turn safely onto and off from it at Woolsbridge Road / Lions Lane and out of the One Stop shop adjacent. If the above scheme goes ahead, this already crowded road will be further congested by the passage of the large, 27-ton lorries servicing the plant, bringing waste in, returning empty and/or carrying processed material out. Type of traffic using the Horton Road. Since there apparently is no restriction on the routes heavy vehicles may follow there will, inevitably, at some times be instances where these waste transfer lorries approach from either end of the Horton Road. At some points, particularly around the Wigbeth area, the road is no more than eighteen feet in width " virtually a country lane " and totally unsuitable for HGVs. In such areas these vehicles stand to create unacceptable hazards to other road users, especially cyclists and horse-riders, to say nothing of the damage caused to roadside verges and to the road surface itself " though this latter point applies to the entire length of the Horton Road, which was never built or intended to carry large numbers of heavy vehicles. Environmental impact of proposed plant. Since waste material is, apparently, to be cleaned on site before being transferred elsewhere, there is the question of where the cleaning agents in use will end up when they are finished with. There is, I would consider, a danger of their washing down into the Moors and Crane Rivers, both environmentally sensitive areas. There is also the question of odours emanating from the plant which, potentially, could affect businesses such as the Three Cross public house adjacent to the estate and the Moors Valley Country Park down the road from it. Employment created at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. I understand that one of the regulations governing the development of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate concerns the types and level of employment generated by said</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>development. As it seems likely that the proposed plant will be large automated, very little employment will be generated to offset the potential disruption created in other areas. Adverse effects on other businesses. As well as the other deleterious effects of having the regular passage of 27-ton lorries along the Horton Road, it is also possible that their presence will adversely affect business at the Three Cross pub (see above). Will patrons wish to sit in the beer garden with these things thundering past? Similar problems could be caused at the Moors Valley Country Park, where passing lorries will generate air-pollution and difficulties of access, potentially discouraging patrons. I hope that the above points will be closely considered before any decision is taken to go ahead with this less-than-satisfactory scheme.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 364	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Claire Benzmann	Further to the useful public meeting with regard to the proposed Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Waste Transfer Plant, I must put forward my serious concerns about such a proposal. I have been resident in St Leonards for the past 57 years & have witnessed the enormous growth of the area to its present almost full capacity. The relatively narrow Horton Road is already dangerously unfit for the present volume of heavy traffic that daily uses it & is certainly not even adequate for an extra constant passage of 25 + ton lorries. The impact on residents, Retirement homes, businesses and the very popular Moors Valley Country Park all on this road would be totally unacceptable. It has been indicated that the outgoing waste would be shipped out of the country, in which case a Plant built nearer the ports would seem sensible & would minimize the disruption & cost of the whole project. It was also not made clear how many days of the week the Plant would be functioning & how many heavy lorries could be expected per day. The suggestion at the meeting was vaguely fifteen, which seems a rather conservative estimate, unless those fifteen were doing more than one journey per day & then, of course the return journeys would double the road use. I hope that the above objections & comments can be taken into consideration before it is too late to halt this ill-advised project.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 366	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	Yes	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs Wilfred & Sheila Hulland	1. The Horton Road is completely unsuitable for the extra vehicles of this size and weight. The curbs are already being broken up in places. 2. Any other route to the site (West Moors, Horton or Verwood) which would be used by the lorries would be most unsuitable. 3. Pollution of the Moors rover and surrounding land is a cause for concern, for water drain off and air pollution. 4. The only way this site should be considered would be from Access from the A31, which is already very busy with traffic now. 5. A site nearer to the centre of East Dorset would be a better option, preferably with rail access.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 368	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three		No	No	Individual	Mrs Linda Brown	1. Horton Road, leading up to Woolsbridge, is a C road, which has too much traffic already. 2. Horton Road will be further damaged by the large lorries needed to carry waste materials. 3. Horton Road is very narrow in places, making it dangerous. 4. More traffic will increase pollution levels, affecting people and animals. 5. Roads leading to Horton Road already		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Legged Cross						become congested at regular intervals. This proposal will only add to the problem. 6. This project will not provide many jobs for people, so has no merit in proceeding. 7. There is concern that if this project goes ahead, it will continue to grow in future years.			
PS D-WP 370	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Max Mayo	I am absolutely against this plan for the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate due to the unsuitability of the access road, namely Horton Road. 1. The road is only 18 feet wide in places and over the years quite a few properties have been damaged by vehicles using this road but we have been informed that the number of reported incidents is within acceptable limits. We believe that many are not reported but just repaired. 2. Pavements gouged by heavy vehicles which are too wide for this road. 3. Concern that property vibration from heavy traffic will only increase with additional heavy vehicles should this plan go ahead. 4. Having just one pavement/one side it is very dangerous for pedestrians, they cannot face traffic, therefore have to walk single file to avoid overhanging wing mirrors. 5. Unknown environmental issues i.e. air, river pollution, which may affect local schools, care homes and everyone's quality of life.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 372	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs E Macree	I understand that the County Council are considering sites for this plan, one of which is the Woolsbridge Industrial Site. When I moved to Ashley Heath twenty years ago I was given to understand that when permission was granted for this industrial site it was envisaged for a link road to be built connecting it to the A31 to take the heavy traffic. This road was never built and as it would cross what is now designated a sensitive area is not likely to be built. The only access to the Woolsbridge Industrial Site is from the Horton Road which is a class C country lane. The structure of this road was not designed for heavy traffic and the existing traffic means there are constant road works causing disruption. The lane itself is single lane in each direction and twists and turns. In places the road is so narrow that wing mirrors beside the road will testify the problem for cars as well as lorries. Horton Road meanders through forest and farmland and is dotted with residential homes and a dementia care home. We already have a problem with the existing heavy traffic using this road and to expect it to cope with lorries from		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								all over Dorset is surely not a viable option. Whilst an industrial site is the obvious choice for building this sort of waste facility, one with good access to main roads is in my opinion essential.			
PS D-WP 355	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr Brian Hazlehurst	In 4 you have two separate issues Not legally compliant and unsound Support the Site Plan I do not support the Plan.	You go on to issues 5, why it is unsound. I feel you are putting the document out to confuse the public. Complaints Horton Rad/Ringwood Road is a T road. Try it at school holidays. Early morning and early evening. Moors Valley County Park at school holidays time a nightmare. You already allow loads far in excess Horton Road width loads with complete mobile homes on them. As local residents we have to pull onto the pavements for these vehicles to pass. In the future I may remain in the Road so all traffic will be halted let the police sort that out.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 357	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes		Individual	Mr & Mrs K Brooks	We consider the document is unsound because the allocation of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as the only bulky waste transfer/treatment facility in the whole of Dorset is totally unjustified, particularly in view of the wide ranging environmental, employment and transport issues as detailed in our comments provided on the attached sheet. The extent of the mitigation costs and conditions required would render this site unviable. Consequently the proposal to create a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would be undeliverable and therefore not effective ie one of the 4 tests of soundness. We consider the document is unsound because the allocation of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as the only bulky waste transfer/treatment facility in the whole of Dorset is totally unjustified, particularly in view of the wide ranging environmental, employment and transport issues as detailed in our comments provided on the attached sheet. The extent of the mitigation costs and conditions required would render this site unviable. Consequently the proposal to create a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate would be undeliverable and therefore not effective ie one of the 4 tests of soundness.	The wide ranging issues highlighted in our attached comments would be extremely difficult to mitigate and any substantial improvements would be very expensive to achieve. The location of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is on the eastern edge of Dorset and consequently is not central to the needs of the whole plan area, entailing unnecessarily long HGV journeys from most areas of Dorset. The existing waste site at Mannings Heath was granted planning permission for a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility in 2013 although not built. The document does not explain why the Mannings Heath site is not included as a possible bulky waste facility. Clearly, Mannings Heath would be far easier to reach from most areas of Dorset. The construction of the previously proposed direct link road between the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and the A31 strategic road at the Azalea roundabout is a firm prerequisite of any allocation of a new waste facility at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. Comments on Why we Consider the Pre-Submission Draft Waste	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>Plan December 2017 is "Unsound" regarding the Allocation of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a Waste Transfer/Treatment Facility Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is specifically referred to in Section 5 - Spatial Strategy, Section 7 -The Need for New Facilities and Section 8 - Recycling. Section 5 - Bulky Waste: The Plan Document states:- "Up to 23000 tonnes per annum of bulky waste will need to be diverted from landfill during the Plan period up to 2033. This will be addressed through the provision of a strategic facility for treating bulky waste, located in East Dorset." The Plan Document goes on to state "Land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate (Inset 1) has been allocated to address this need." Section 7 - Need for New Facilities: Section 7.41 states:" Planning permission was granted in 2013 to allow a facility at Mannings Heath to accept bulky waste arising from household recycling centres, to bulk up waste and transport it to an energy recovery facility out of the Plan area. To date, this facility has not been built and there are no other facilities that can treat bulky waste in the Plan area." Section 8 -</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>Recycling -Identified Need 5 -states : "A bulky waste treatment facility is required to enable Dorset move towards the aim of net self sufficiency, divert this material from the residual stream and manage it further up the waste hierarchy. It is proposed to achieve this through allocation of land at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate (Inset 1) and a criteria based policy (Policy 5). Section 8.27 states : Bulky Waste Transfer/Treatment -Allocated Site - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate (no alternative sites mentioned for this purpose). This raises a fundamental question: Since the site at Mannings Heath has already gained planning permission for this purpose why is the Mannings Heath site not allocated for this purpose and why does the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, which because of environmental, employment and transport issues, should not be granted planning permission, appears to be the only site being considered for bulky waste transfer/treatment? Employment Issues Policy VTSWb of the East Dorset Core Strategy clearly states " The</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>permitted extension of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be used for Office and Light Industry (B1), General Industry (B2) and Warehousing and Distribution (B8). Waste handling was not considered for this site and consequently the projected Bulky Waste /General waste transfer facilities would lose the clear objective of creating relatively highly skilled employment for East Dorset. Environmental Issues Any proposals for a waste operation where waste is recycled, stored, treated and disposed of would need an "Environmental Permit ". This must be applied for prior to allocation of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate site. The Southern extension of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is adjacent to the Moors River SSSI, which has not even been identified in the Document as a "Sensitive Receptor". The site is also adjacent to the Holt and West Moors Dorset Heathland and consequently an ecological survey would be required prior to allocating this site as a waste facility. Part of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 and flooding is shown on Dorset County Council's</p>		



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>surface water maps. Clearly, a detailed Flood Risk Assessment is required to include assessment of flood risk from all sources prior to allocating Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a waste facility. Incredibly, Moors Valley Country Park, which is effectively just across the road from the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, is not even mentioned in this Document. Moors Valley Country Park is one of the most popular tourist destinations in Dorset. Surely, all potential environmental issues should be fully assessed in detail prior to allocating Woolsbridge Industrial Estate as a Waste Transfer/Treatment facility? Transport Issues When the development of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was conceived in the early 1980' s the clear intention was to construct a new short distance link road directly from the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate to the A31 Trunk Road. Indeed, the Azalea Roundabout on the A31 was specifically constructed for this purpose, but in the event, was not built. Consequently, HGV's have been allowed to use Horton Road through the prime</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>residential area of Ashley Heath and St. Ives to reach the A31 at the Ashley Heath Interchange with the A338 Spur Road. Horton Road is a "C" class road, which could be described as a country lane, and is not fit for purpose for the current level of HGV movements, let alone any projected substantial increase. Significantly, Horton Road is not shown on the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Map in Section 12.20 Diagram 10 as either a "Strategic Route Network" or a "Primary Route Network". Horton Road is clearly too narrow to safely accommodate HGV's. Considering that HGV's have a minimum width of 2.5 metres, excluding wing mirrors, the full width of the road at approximately 6 metres only leaves a gap of 0.5 metres to the centre of the road, inclusive of the distance from the kerb (where one exists). Incredibly, mobile homes are constructed at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and are transported on very large lowload articulated trailers with a resulting width of over 4 metres up to the A31 at the Ashley Heath Interchange. Dorset Police have confirmed in writing that "the Police</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>have no duty in law to provide escorts for abnormal loads and it is the responsibility of the haulier to ensure that each movement is conducted in a controlled and safe manner". However, experience proves that even in a medium sized family car, prompt evasive action is required when meeting such wide loads. The potential danger of such a wide load approaching a 30/40 tonne Waste Disposal HGV in the opposite direction at any point along Horton Road does not bear thinking about !</p> <p>. Despite the complacency of the Highways Agency, Dorset County Council and Dorset Police, the manufacture of mobile homes at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate should be totally banned until an appropriate direct link road to the A31 has been constructed. We are informed a Council Survey in Horton Road over the past 7 years has shown the level of accidents to be "nominal". Yet local residents in Horton Road report there have been 3 serious accidents in the past 12 months !</p> <p>. Approximate calculations using the information provided</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>suggest there could be at least an extra 10,000 HGV movements per annum on Horton Road between the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and the A31/A338 Intersection. In some respects the size and weight of the HGVs is more important than the numbers. The weight of the HGVs will substantially increase the surface wear of the already marginal surface on Horton Road. Furthermore, visits to the nearby Moors Valley Country Park are very popular with cyclists, for which there is absolutely no provision whatsoever. Incredibly, proposals for a pedestrian crossing to reach Moors Valley Country Park from the footpath side of Horton Road have recently been refused by Dorset County Council, ironically because the traffic level is insufficient !. Air pollution resulting from HGV's is also a major problem. Although carbon-di-oxide CO2 from petrol engines contributes to the adverse effects on climate change, the much higher levels of nitric oxide NO, nitrous oxide N2O and damaging particulates emitted from all diesel engines have a far greater adverse effect on the health of humans, particularly the young and</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									old who may have asthmatic and bronchial conditions. Indeed, the problem is so serious the Government is embarking on a policy of detracting from using diesel cars and phasing out internal combustion engines. However, the development of battery powered HGV s remains a long term dream and consequently for the next 40 years we are left with highly polluting HGVs which will significantly increase the adverse health effects on our local residents as well as the many visitors and walkers to nearby Moors Valley Country Park. Clearly, the construction of the initially proposed direct link road between the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and the A31 Strategic Road at the Azalea Roundabout must be a firm prerequisite of any further planning application to extend Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for any purpose whatsoever, let alone a Waste Disposal Facility.		
PS D-WP 359	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Janet White	The proposal is not convivial to this residential area. The access road - Horton Road, is not better than a countryside lane which at present takes far too much heavy trucks going to and from the small industrial units on the Woolsbridge Ind. Est. We also have the 'oversized' fuel trucks of the military visiting the West Moors site. When facing one of these trucks coming from the opposite direction that you are driving, you must come to a stop and bring your vehicle to the curb or onto it if you want to keep the side of your car intact.	The traffic on the Horton Road is extremely heavy during the summer months due to families visiting the Moors Valley Country Park and queuing is not uncommon on the entrance to said site. To add HGV vehicles to a 'lane' such as Horton Rd	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									is insance. No thought seems to have been given to the 'feeder' roads increase in HGV usage and the disruption to the residents along those roads ie Woolsbridge Rd. and Lions Lane. This is my main objection to this site being used. Suggest Blunts Farm as this has already a dual carriageway in place.		
PS D-WP 361	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	Mr David Blanch	Objection to the proposed waste management site on Woolsbridge Industrial Estate The location is on the eastern boundary of Dorset, rather than a central location, which will involve maximum travel requirements through the county's congested roads with its inherent environmental problems, i.e. traffic pollution, etc. The approach roads to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate are only 'C' classification roads and are not suitable to cope with additional 28/30 ton lorry movements. The road is too narrow to cope with present traffic. The area is very close to SSI designated areas and river. The proposed waste processing plant would require toxic cleaning fluids, which would also need to be transported to and from the site, in addition to the delivery of the waste and the subsequent recycling of the cleaned waste. Toxic spillage in this designated area would be an environmental disaster. The industrial area is supposed to create quality jobs for the local workforce. The majority of this type of work would be mechanized and, therefore, result in very few low grade jobs. The Horton Road would be the main approach road to the industrial estate, is also the main approach road to the Moors Valley Country Park. A million visitors a year visit this park and it has won many awards for recreation and environmental pursuits. Any additional traffic movements along this road would cause environmental issues to this park and would be detrimental to its visitors. If this waste management site receives approval, there would be no way to prevent this site of having a change of usage in the future and to become larger or incorporate a waste incinerator, with even more environmental issues for		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							the area and the close proximity of quality housing. The infrastructure of the road will degrade rapidly by the weight and frequent use of these additional vehicles, causing the road to degrade, requiring complete reconstruction. The road is used by cyclists, walkers, horse riders and local residents. These large lorries will completely engulf the road space (only 18' wide in places.) Local property prices would decline with this facility being located here. The foundations of the properties would also be vulnerable due to road vibrations from large, heavy vehicles.			
PS D-WP 365	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr G Macree	I understand that the Council are looking for sites for this Plan is the Woolsbridge Industrial Site. The only road from this site is the Horton Road. This road is at best only 18 ft wide is classed as a C road. The road is already heavily used far beyond the original intention, and is in constant need of repair with Heavy Traffic already present. The additional 30 movements a day 15 in and 15 out will very quickly make this road unusable with the amount of repairs needed. This so far only deals with the waste coming into the site, once it has been sorted washed etc it then will be transported to some other site with more 30-40 ton lorries on the Horton Road. As with all County Council Plans these are usually on the low side when it comes to traffic movements and its not very long before an increase is required. Little notice seems to have been taken as to the effect on the Business Nursing and Dementia Homes along the road also the widely regarded Country Park. Whilst a site is needed for this		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							Plan, Woolsbridge is not the Site for this building, a site with good access to the site, sorted, near main roads.			
PS D-WP 367	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Richard Brown	Horton Road is not suitable to take the volume of extra traffic this proposed scheme will generate plus the extra expansion of the industrial site without direct access from A31 which was planned many years ago. We already have to put up with Moores Valley car boot and all the heavy goods taking short cut to access A350 to Shaftesbury.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 369	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Gill Mayo	I am absolutely against this plan for the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate due to the unsuitability of the access road, namely Horton Road. 1. The road is only 18 feet wide in places and over the years quite a few properties have been damaged by vehicles using this road but we have been informed that the number of reported incidents is within acceptable limits. We believe that many are not reported but just repaired. 2. Pavements gouged by heavy vehicles which are too wide for this road. 3. Concern that property vibration from heavy traffic will only increase with additional heavy vehicles should this plan go ahead. 4. Having just one pavement/one side it is very dangerous for pedestrians, they cannot face traffic, therefore have to walk single file to avoid overhanging wing mirrors. 5. Unknown environmental issues i.e. air, river pollution, which may affect local schools, care homes and everyone's quality of life.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 371	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three	No		No	Individual	Mr Steven White	I understand this site to be allocated for multiple small industrial units and sold with this type of development in mind. To increase employment and economic growth for the local community that would harmonize. Instead, many large trucks using small access roads, disturbance to people and creatures that enjoy the close proximity of 'SSSI' land. Also the smell from	To make this document sound/suggest the site is central to East Dorset thus reducing pollution and road miles needed to transfer waste. Very likely in an unpopulated area	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Legged Cross						concentrated waste blown by the wind across residential areas, let alone the noise of industrial reversing sirens.	with good road and rail links. somewhere close to Dorchester springs to mind. Close to Dorset County Council Offices.		
PS D-WP 373	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	Individual	Mr Rebecca Flay	Policy 1 - location - the facility should be Dorset Centric not on the eastern edge thus keeping total mileage that waste is transported to a minimum. Policy 2 - Opening heading - how long before further waste development facilities are developed on the site? Policy 12 - Transport & Access - The routes to Three Legged Cross are completely unsuitable and do not comply with designated HGV routes. For example, the Horton Road is only a 'C' class road and only 18' wide in places. I have many environmental and safety issues including: damage to verges, drain covers and pot holes. Noise and smell of diesel fumes. Safety of pedestrians and cyclists - and my wing mirrors when I am driving at busy times access from one's property onto Horton rd. is already difficult without adding more traffic. Vibration - heavy lorries cause my house to vibrate - pictures on the walls constantly need straightening. All of these factors devalue my property and impact on my lifestyle. Policy 13 - Site related traffic impacts - see previous reps Policies 16,17 & 18 We live in an area of significant natural beauty and the ecological impact of further pollution by dust and particulates from the facility must not happen. We are surrounded by SSSI's, the Moors river, the award winning Moors Valley County Park and we have a duty to protect it.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 375	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mr David John Eagles	I most strongly object to proposed waste transfer site at the Woolsbridge industrial park for the following reasons; All of the approach roads to the site are unsuitable for the extra heavy traffic which this site would require. Horton Road/Ringwood Road are class 'C'. If using a satnav from the A31 you will be directed down Woolsbridge Road which is even more unsuitable. The site is subject to flooding and any waste water runoff is likely to end up in the Moors River which is surrounded by SSSI. Moors Valley County Park is in a direct line of the prevailing winds and the smell from the proposed site would ruin the enjoyment of hundreds of thousands of visitors yearly.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							Some of the family's ride to the park on bicycles and the extra traffic would put these in danger.			
PS D-WP 377	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mrs Jane Williams	I totally disagree with the proposals in respect of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Waste Processing Facility. Horton Road cannot take any more traffic it is not suitable. The site is far too close to houses. Proximity to Moors Valley County Park. Potential health problems and air pollution.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 379	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Barry Andrews	proposed location is unsafe and unsound. Increase in traffic on local roads particularly Horton road. Increase in air pollution to locality, close to 2 county parks and residential areas.	It should be sites away from residential areas in the centre of county. Railway links could be used to provide transport of waste materials.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 374	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	Individual	Mr John Brown	Road access to the proposed site at Woolsbridge Rd Industrial Estate, via Horton Rd is not adequate for the following reasons; Horton Rd has a weight limit restriction. Creating additional HGV traffic on this road flouts the spirit of this legal restriction by encouraging additional HGV use of the road. The road is not even a 'B' road and is not suitable for the existing HGV loading. It is far too narrow for traffic of this type. It has to be regularly maintained due to wear and tear from exiting traffic. The additional HGV traffic will cause additional damage and large disruption when repairs are carried out. The additional HGV's will create pollution for local residents and children. Suitable access for this site would not use the Horton Road. New Access to and from the A31 would need to be provided. A number of environmental concerns with this site mean that the proposal is not sound; The situation at the eastern edge of the authority means longer HGV journeys would be required with resultant increased environmental impact. Potential leakage of detergent and other cleaning chemicals would effect		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								the local SSSI site and the Moors Valley The Moors Valley Country Park, an important local leisure facility, would be adversely impacted by the increased HGV traffic There is also concern that the facility will grow and be extended to include other waste processing with the resulting further detrimental environment impacts.			
PS D-WP 376	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		Yes		No	Individual	Mr & Mrs Bernard & Rosemary Stocker	The Horton Road is already a problem due to traffic volume. There is no easy diversion so whenever road works are needed, traffic might have to be used which always causes long delays. The same problems occur with traffic build up for any reason e.g. accidents, cyclists, pedestrians and especially on car-boot sale day. Access from side roads is a lengthy wait. There is only one proper crossing on this road for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders etc. the road is very narrow in places and has very few safe over taking areas. This can only be made worse with the extra lorries needed for the proposed site. The position of the site is totally unsuitable for use by vehicles travelling from all over Dorset.	We don't feel there are any changes possible which would make this a suitable site.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 378	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				No	Individual	Mr John Nicholson	Unsound Horton Road is not designed for heavy traffic. Adding to the number of HGV's on the road would be a hazard to vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. It is a narrow 'C' class road.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 382	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Valerie Eagles	Waste for Woolsbridge is unsound for the following reasons. Ringwood forest and Moors Valley County Park have become a recreational area for not only local but people from large towns introducing them to the countryside having to contend with a large number of heavy lorries going down the narrow Horton road (apparently category C) with their attendant smell and pollution will give people the wrong impression of our great British countryside. We are well aware of how bust unpleasant and dangerous on such narrow roads it would be for people living close to the Horton Road, Woolsbridge Road and surrounding area as we get a considerable amount of traffic including heavy lorries going to Woolsbridge and the other industrial estates already. Also as a layman the proposed land appears to be a very wet area and if you build there where will the water be sent especially as there is a large area beside the site that is classified as a SSSI. I strongly object to the use of this site for a waste processing plant.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 384	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	Individual	Mr Patrick Lander	Horton Rd will be the main route to the Woolsbridge site. This road is a C class road not intended for the traffic it now suffers. The road surface is already breaking down with the current lightweight vehicles. 30 movements/day of heavy lorries will inevitably seriously damage this road further. The first bend off the Ashley Heath Roundabout is dangerous involving frequent minor accidents which are unlikely to be reported. The entrance to the Sheiling School (Special Needs) and the new St. Ives House Care Home for elderly and dementia make this section very vulnerable. Increased heavy lorry traffic plus site worker traffic will increase the risk to vulnerable youngsters and old people. (I was involved in a shunt before Christmas caused by a special needs student running into the road. Increased traffic will reduce house prices close to Morton Rd. Woolsbridge Road + Braeside will be used as shortcuts by traffic heading to the new site. This is human nature and given though both roads are weight limited, they are not policed in anyway. No consideration has been given in the plan to the effect of site pollution on the Crane/Moors River which flows beside Woolsbridge Industrial Estate through a site of special scientific interest, SSSI The site is unlikely to provide any benefit to local residents in terms of employment or other amenity.	Much of the problems in points 1, 2, 3 + 4 above would be alleviated by connecting Woolsbridge Industrial Estate to the A31 as originally intended. The difficulty with this is the SSSI I understand. However, although this would be costly so too would any road repairs to Horton Road be costly and extremely disruptive to local residents.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 386	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mrs Maureen Smith	<p>HORTON ROAD This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and/or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and this is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy vehicles especially when stuck in traffic.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing. ENVIRONMENTAL There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of the Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include an integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								detrimental to the residents of St Ives/St Leonards/ Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the southwest would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. FINANCIAL The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.			
PS D-WP 388	Inset 1 - Woolbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross			No	No	Individual	Mrs Susan Miller	Additional traffic along the Horton Road, which is a Class C road and unsuitable for HGVs. The road is only 18ft wide in places "barely a country lane and is crumbling/damaged at each side in places due to over use as unsuitable traffic is already using it. Potential additional traffic going through St. Leonards village. Some HGVs could take a short cut to the Woolbridge Industrial Estate. The roads are already in disrepair in St. Leonards. The proposed waste facility is very close to Moors Valley Country Park. This is an award winning park that is very busy and attracts visitors from afar. The Moor River runs through the park, this could become polluted, which would be detrimental to the river, wildlife and the Park. Visitor nos would be affected and the Park is a SSSI site/area. Air Pollution " although the facility is said not to add to air pollution in the area, there will be additional air pollution from the additional HGVs and staff vehicles. Also, how can it be proved there would be no air pollution from this facility?	The site of the waste facility should be more in central Dorset to minimise traffic mileage and be more accessible for all areas of Dorset usage.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 390	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Graham Trotter	I wish to register my objection to the proposed plan for the location of the Mineral Site and Waste plan, at the Woolsbridge Industrial estate. I Have been living in Ashley Heath, Horton Road for 14 years and the traffic has got worse every year on year. The very popular Moors Vally country park and the Ashley Heath car boot held every Sunday has increased the traffic so much I can take up to 5 mins to get out of my drive. I am only let out if some kindly person slows down and stops the traffic to allow me. Also we have steam rollers, static homes (which take up nearly the whole width of the road) and even coveys of Army vehicles. These vechicles send vibrations throughout our house and all our neighbours houses this will lead to causing permanent damage to our house. So now the thought of 15 large rollaway (doubling to 30 of you count both ways) Waste lorries thundering past constantly if unbelievable. The Horton Road isn't a Motorway, A road, B road it's a country lane it cannot take all this heavy and constant traffic. Also all these extra lorries will make it harder for Fire engines and service vechicles to reach their destination quickly, we are quite often see fire engines attending fires, near Moors valley area.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 392	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross		No	No	Individual	Mr Keith Miller	1. Additional traffic along the Horton Road, which is a C class road and unsuitable for HGVs. The road is only 18 feet wide in places - barely a country lane and is crumbling/damaged at each side in places due to overuse, unsuitable traffic already using it. 2. Potential additional traffic through the St Leonards estate/village. Some HGVs would take a short cut to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The roads in this estate/village are already in disrepair. 3. The proposed waste facility is very close to Moors Valley Country Park. This is an award winning park that is very busy and attracts visitors from afar. The Moors river runs through Moors Valley Country Park. This could become polluted, which would be detrimental to the river, wildlife and the Park. Visitor numbers would be affected. The Park on SSSI site/area. 4. Air pollution - although the facility is said not to add to air pollution in the area, there will be additional air pollution from the additional HGVs and staff vehicles. Also, how can it be proved there would be no air pollution from the facility?	1. The site of the waste facility should be moved more towards the centre of Dorset. This will minimise mileage and be more accessible for all areas of Dorset to use.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 394	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs D Cottee	We are writing with our objections to the proposed waste plan for Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. Firstly because of all of the pollution that would be emitted into the local environment, some of which is a SSSI site. Secondly because of the local road infrastructure, at the moment the Horton Road often has large vehicles that are sometimes unable to pass each other without mounting the pavement, this is without having the increased HGV traffic that this plant would cause, cyclists and pedestrians would both be put in danger. The pollution from the increase in traffic would also have an effect on the health of them many people living on this route in and out of the site. This road already has long queues to join the A31/A338 during the morning rush hour, increased HGV vehicles would add to this congestion right by the entrance road to The Sheilings School. Thirdly this proposed site would have a detrimental effect on the value of local land and property.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 396	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Colin Smith	The following are my concerns: Notes for comment item 4 of form HORTON ROAD This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and \ or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and this is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy vehicles especially when stuck in traffic. EMPLOYMENT The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing. ENVIRONMENTAL There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of the Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include an integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be detrimental to the residents of St Ives/St Leonards/Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the southwest would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. FINANCIAL The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.</p>			
PS D-WP 398	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr James Baker	<p>1. Unsuitable access. Horton Road is already overborne with traffic, including many HGVs. 2. Damage to SSSI. Residential constraints imposed by SSSI IRZ prevent development so should be applied in this instance too. 3. Increased pollution. An increase in pollution from both the site and increased vehicular movement will have an adverse affect on local</p>	Move the site to an area that will have a less profound affect on the local community and the quality of life of those nearby.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							community. Its disgusting that this is even being entertained.			
PS D-WP 400	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mr Edward Johnson	This document is profoundly unsound, proper consideration has not been given to the local economy or rural surroundings. The surround land is SSSI contamination would be inevitable. Local jobs would not be increased as these plants are fully mechanised, in fact local jobs would diminish because the working environment would become potentially hazardous. The economy would suffer. The Ringwood/Horton Road is not a classified road - it could not sustain 35 HGVs per day.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 402	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Barbara Forrest	I wish to lodge my objections to the plan and feel that it is unsound for the following reasons. There is no direct access from a Major Road Given the fact that there is no direct access from the A31, the Horton/Ringwood Road will again be used to gain access to the industrial estate via rural villages and mostly narrow residential roads. The Horton / Ringwood Road is only a category C rural road, and less than 18 feet wide in places. We have already had a ten fold increase in traffic over the last 20 years causing a problem with wide vehicles, road damage, vibration and gaining access to many business and amenities. Even the possible alternative new access to the site, via Oakfield Farm will still have to open onto the Horton/Ringwood Road and the same traffic problems apply, even with traffic lights!! When the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was first given permission for development, it was on the proviso that there would be a direct access road from the A31 which was suitable for all modes of vehicle. This never happened, the road was never built, but the estate was given permission to continue, with some restrictions on businesses, expansions and vehicle weight limits . We the residents of this have never really been properly consulted on any of this expansion and its impact on the surrounding areas. 2. Numbers and weights and types of vehicles likely to use the Road At a local public meeting it was mentioned that there may be up to 10 or 15 lorries a day, taking to the plant. Looking at the Waste Plan Site Allocation, this will be very variable depending on what type/types of facility are built there. Possibly in the region of 2000 or more of one way movements per year, with no weight limits stated. But how can they only be one way? What goes in has to come out!! 3. The outline planning permission application is very loosely worded re waste transfer and could be very open ended . If full permission is granted, what else is likely to be built there in the future and would this result in further heavy traffic, more environmental pollution, and further intrusion into the surrounding green belt and areas of SSSI which border the proposed site. 4. This proposed site is on the very edge of the East Dorst County Council Boundaries. Its a long way to bring waste to be recycled when there may be something more suitable centrally and which would reduce the risk of damage to the roads and surrounding environments. 5. Safety		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>issues Local people and visitors use this road for cycling, walking and horse riding. (There are already traffic jams in the summer months due to the number of people accessing Moors Valley, other local events, and frequent road repair works!) Local people already pay heavily for the privilege of living here in more ways than one. 6. Flooding and Pollution According to residents very local to the Woolsbridge site, who attended the public meeting, the areas surrounding the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate has had a history of flooding in the past and there has been some pollution of the surrounding areas. As this proposed waste site has an area of SSSI on its boundary and may use water in the recycling processes, will the drainage and sewerage facilities on the estate be suitable if there are problems disposing of contaminated water. 7. Impact on Sensitive receptors and Disruption to Tourism and Employment Along the length of the Horton/Ringwood Road there are woodlands, leisure areas, natural wildlife habitat, and areas of SSSI and this is likely to be affected by any more increase in heavy traffic to the Industrial estate as there is no direct access from the A31. The award winning Moors Valley Country Park, The Castleman Trailway, The Three Legged Cross public house and restaurant, all lie along the Horton/Ringwood Road. They bring in a lot of visitors and tourists to the area who are also able to use the Camping Sites and Bed and Breakfast facilities along this road all of which would be hindered by even more traffic/heavy smelly lorries along this road. As this plant is likely to be automated, does the provision of possibly a small amount of employment locally at the site, outweigh the cost in terms of damage to the environment, roads, safety, house and business owners and tourism, and if permitted, will this development then lead on to even more expansion into the green belt near the site, resulting in even more heavy traffic along the Horton/Ringwood Road.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 404	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs Lynn & Michael Firth	<p>Horton Road not fit for use The road is currently too narrow for safe use at only 18ft wide in places This is only a C class road with tight, blind corners Dangerous road for cyclists Poor quality side footpath and non-existent some of the way Currently it is almost impossible to cross this road as it is too busy During road works Sept to Dec 2017 there were long delays most of which were due to inadequate remaining width for lorries to get through Detrimental to the Health and Welfare of Local Residents Although there are some local cycle ways and bridleways it is too busy to get to them at the moment and deteriorating with the increase of general traffic without extra-large Lorries Difficulty for residents to get to local amenities (shops, garden centre, pub, restaurant) walking and having to cross the road Large Lorries would bring greater pollution, road wear and tear, erosion of the verges, damage the trees and kill more wildlife More road delays would deter tourists visiting 'country' resource at Moors Valley Traffic would deter visitors to the Old Peoples' Homes on this road Accidents would increase and become far more serious or fatal for car users, cyclists and pedestrians The Woolsbridge Road rat run from the A31 to the Horton Road is already subjected to many speed camera checks as it is dangerous. Extra Lorries pounding along it through a residential area would compound issues Toddlers being taken to the Nursery on the High Street affected Patients attending the Doctor's surgery, the Clinics and the High Street Chemist affected (Many slow, disabled, elderly and vulnerable people) Young children cross Woolsbridge Road on their way to and from the nursery, Infant and Junior schools on Sandy Road and there is no provision to aid crossing the road School buses collect and drop teenagers and College students at stops along Woolsbridge Road, private buses and scheduled public buses. They have no crossing provision and it is dangerous for them already Location Why transport Dorset waste to an extremity of the county increasing mileage, pollution and costs? A central location would be far more sensible Freight carried by train is much less polluting and the infra-structure already exists The type of employment at this mostly mechanised unit will not be in line with local plans This is an SSSI area and as such should not be built on River Moor through the designated area is an important environment. No</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								pollution can be allowed to enter it Area is on a flood plain and building on it is unsuitable and will put surrounding properties at higher risk			
PS D-WP 410	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	Ms Judith Thornhill	I wish to object to the proposed siting of the waste treatment plant at Woolsbridge industrial estate for the following reasons: Increased heavy traffic. As a C class road Horton road is already struggling to cope with the volume of heavy traffic using it to access the estate. Slow moving HGVs turning right out of the estate already cause a potential hazard which will be worsened whether the same or an additional access is used. There is a bend at this point in the road and several accesses close together including Homelands and Ashley Heath industrial estates The siting, partially within flood plains 2 and 3, close to SSSIs, important tourist attractions such as Moors Valley and the various caravan sites as well as being upwind of residential areas seems totally inappropriate. Siting within the county. This site is on the extreme eastern fringe of Dorset. Waste therefore has to travel much larger distances, with associated costs, both economic		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							and environmental, than if it was more centrally situated within the area it is planned to serve. The land is designated for employment use. As the plant will be largely mechanised the increased employment opportunities for the local residents will not be significant enough to compensate for the loss of green space.			
PS D-WP 399	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	No	No	Individual	Mrs Linda Johnson	This document is profoundly unsound, proper consideration has not been given to the local economy or rural surroundings. My caravan park draws tourists to the local area and they support many local businesses and jobs. The building of this waste plant would severely detract from the local landscape including from the popular Castleman trailway. The negative affects this plant will have on the local area will serve to reduce tourist numbers, therefore reducing the revenue injected into the local economy.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 393	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr & Mrs Alison & Martin Townsend	Horton Road This C Class Road is not suitable for current traffic. With the current estimation of 3500 heavy vehicles per year for single journeys, and 7000 heavy vehicles for return journeys, (not allowing for growth in waste year on year and/or change of use) Horton Road, and adjoining roads are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The increase of heavy vehicles would add to existing damage to the road surface. The road was not built to take heavy vehicles, and is too narrow in places for large vehicles. There has been damage to grass verges when large vehicles have had to veer off the road to make the corners, and there is a danger to pedestrians. At present there is a potential danger to cyclists using the road, and this would increase with the addition of the number of heavy vehicles. At present pedestrians walking along and crossing Horton Road feel unsafe with large vehicles passing them, due to the size and speed of the vehicles. I have noticed that there are more pedestrians walking, as the local bus service has been reduced. There could be damage to properties due to vibration. There would be more pollution from heavy		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>vehicles especially when stuck in traffic. Employment The waste transfer unit would be an almost fully mechanised industrial unit. Therefore there would be limited employment. There would be minimal or no use of local labour. Personnel employed from out of the area would have to commute as there is a limit of available housing. Environmental There would be particulates from heavy vehicles released in the environment, especially when stuck in traffic due to unsuitable road and congestion. Washing recyclables could cause chemical spillage into the surrounding area which is designated an SSSI site, inclusive of Moors River. The area is also on a flood plain where any major or minor spillage would cause environmental damage. The installation of this waste transfer unit would not benefit the health and well-being of the local community, and would also be detrimental to tourism for the very successful Moors Valley Country Park. At present the Park provides health and welfare benefits to all. Once permission has been granted for the area to be designated a Waste Transfer Site, there is a possibility that there could be a change of use of the site, to include integrated waste policy which would include an incinerator waste unit. This would then be detrimental to the residents of St Ives/ St Leonards/ Ashley Heath and Ringwood because the prevailing wind from the south-west would contaminate the air quality and could cause serious health issues not only to adults, but also to young children and unborn children. Have Natural England and ARC been consulted as there could be environmental damage to Lions Hill and Avon Heath as well as Moors Valley. Financial The siting of the waste site would impact on the valuation of properties in the area. Would not the siting of this unit be more financially beneficial if it were situated in the centre of the county (East Dorset) rather than on the boundary with Hampshire? Also would it not be more beneficial to the environment if this waste unit were sited near a railway line, to save the impact on the environment, rather than transporting waste by road.</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 381	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No		No	Individual	Mrs Sorrel Conquest	I would like to comment on the unsustainability of the site proposed. I live along the Horton Road and believe it is already over-used and dangerous for the many home owners with driveways on to Horton Road, myself included. More heavy traffic, plus the likelihood that slower moving heavy vehicles will encourage drivers to overtake will add to the danger. Horton Road is a 'C' road, is a primary route for emergency vehicles and the narrowness of the road will impact these vehicles too, probably causing delays to them, one again increasing the risk of accidents.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 383	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Ms Carol Elizabeth Leniston	I found filling in the forms impossible to complete with regards to the above document with my objections as this form is designed to make it as difficult as possible for people who are not familiar with this process. I have therefore found it necessary to write a letter with my objections which are as follows. Roads Horton Road is only a C class road and is not designed for heavy traffic. Its width is insufficient for some existing traffic e.g. Static Homes on trailers which force oncoming motorists off the road and onto the pavement which may well damage their steering geometry. It is already used as a rat run by HGVs going to Shaftesbury. These cause damage to the road surface and to the drains which then subside. This is dangerous for cyclists who can be thrown into the path of following vehicles. The suspension of cars can also be damaged. More HGVs will only worsen the situation. The current vehicle movements along Horton Road include those going to Moors Valley Country Park, which has approximately 800,000 visitors a year, say a minimum of 200,000 vehicles creating 400,000 vehicle movements per annum. If local vehicle movements are added in this is a vast number for a C class road. Pedestrians have to negotiate narrow footpaths fearful of the wide vehicles passing only inches away. The footpath from the Ashley Heath roundabout is on the south side of the road as far as St Ives Park. Pedestrians then have to dodge traffic to continue on the footpath on the other side of the road as far as the pedestrian crossing near the One Stop where the footpath reverts to the south side again. The Ashley Heath roundabout is already congested as can be evidenced by the long queues which can build up on Horton Road as far back as the recreation ground. Further vehicle movements from		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>this proposed waste plant will exacerbate the situation. It is already difficult to get on to the roundabout because of the volume of traffic around it from the A338. HGVs have an even more difficult time because they are slow moving and are more accidents are likely to occur. Local Employment The proposed waste facility will be automated as much as possible and I fail to see any significant employment opportunities for local people. Environment There is no mention of potential impact to the local environment with regard to potential pollution of the local area which includes Moors river and Moors Valley Country Park and Forest both of which are designated SSSIs. These areas regularly flood in the winter.</p>			
PS D-WP 385	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross					Individual	Mr Rex Baker	<p>I am writing to you to express my objection to the proposed location of the above site at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross. I have several concerns over the proposed Woolsbridge site. Firstly, the increase in the volume of heavy traffic on the B3078. As I understand it, this is a category C road and in places is no more than 18 feet in width. If this plan were to be located at the Woolsbridge site it would mean approximately up to additional 9000 heavy vehicle movements a year using this road. This is something the road is not suitable for. Thank goodness, the number of major accidents on this road is currently relatively low but, and I stress, the number of current minor incidences of wing mirrors being damaged is high. With the increased heavy vehicle movement and working purely on the "percentage theory" it is very likely the accident rate will increase. As I understand it the vehicles will be coming from</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							most parts of Dorset. Surely logic dictates that the best position for the site would be a more central location. I believe the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate was built for light industrial use and to provide employment. It is clear the location of this plant at Woolsbridge does not fit either of these categories. Further Woolsbridge is surrounded by SSSIs and the Moors Valley. I believe, despite possible counter claims, that micro particles will be released into the atmosphere. This is not acceptable, not only for the environment but also the health of the hinterland. I shall be grateful for your comments on these concerns.			
PS D-WP 387	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Timothy Jones	Access " Horton Road is in places less than 18 wide. Once designated as a waste site an incinerator can be added at any future time. Impact of Particulates into Water Courses. Our application for allotments was refused as nearby site was designated as SSSI. If not fit for allotment it is not fit for Waste Site. Horton Road is clearly not suited for the additional number of HGVs. Increased CO2 emissions from vehicles. Consider Winfrith as an option; it has rail access.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 391	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr & Mrs Brian & Ros Parker	We wish to object to the building of the Industrial Waste Unit on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. We understand it will involve the Horton Road supporting the traffic of large containers. This road is incapable of managing this sort of vehicle as was witnessed by the recent incident when a container lorry was flipped on its side. This is a totally unacceptable way of using roads in a residential area.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 395	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	S M Trotter	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposal for the location of the Mineral Site and Waste Plan. I have lived on the Horton Road, for 14 years and seen the traffic increase considerably. The heavy lorries that pass my home at speed, cause us to feel vibrations all over the property which must surely be causing damage. 30 extra, larger, 28 ton vehicles, will not help the situation. This road is classed as a category 'C' road and therefore as such, is not big enough for these lorries at the moment, to pass by each other safely, in certain parts. When the large roll along lorries with full size static caravans travel on the road, other vans and cars etc, at time, mount the pavement outside my bungalow to allow them to pass. This is considerably dangerous. What would happen when the proposed lorries meet with the rollalongs? Every Lorry that passes quickly causes pedestrians to become unsteady as they are buffeted by displacement of air. In a residential area with largely elderly people, any increased traffic - 30 per day - will only see this happening more often. We frequently see fire engines go past, meeting a 28 ton lorry coming the opposite way would surely cause problems in certain parts of this 'C' class Road. Because so many vehicles use this road all day, repairs are frequently needed. Each time traffic lights are used causing very long tail backs. Traffic emits fumes which can be smelt by us in the garden. This is not good for the general population of this residential area. I fear the roads would need to be repaired more frequently and, if they are not, would cause more accidents as a result. We all have experienced difficulties in exiting our drives, an increase in traffic will only make matters worse. How long would it be before the Woolsbridge Road was used as a cut through either by mistake or design to reach the target site quicker? More pedestrians would be at risk I fear and experience the same problems as we do on the Horton Road before too long. Moors Valley has become increasingly popular over the years causing extra traffic particularly weekends and holiday times, cars need to turn right or left into the area causing long hold ups as a result, this would not be helped by adding these lorries into the mix. This Road simply can't take any more traffic, this WILL lead to the potential for even more accidents. Lastly but importantly the proposed site is: Too close to SSI's, the</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>Moors Valley River, and a Deer Farm. All of these would be at increased risk from pollution downwind of the prevailing wind, as would Moors Valley and schools in the surrounding area extending to Ringwood which lies at a lower level. If this proposed site goes through how long would it be before incinerators were then added? There must be better areas more suited to this proposal. Those having a less direct effect on high paying council tax people, and the surrounding environment of this lovely part of Dorset, which is so sensitive. I implore you to think again.</p>				

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 397	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	Yes	No	Individual	Mr Ronald Evans	<p>What amazes me is that the chosen site is as far as could possibly be imagined from the various sites where these very large vehicles will be coming from. These large vehicles will be polluting the air of the various areas from which they originate to achieve access to a distant site where they will be depositing their loads and THEN GOING HOME AGAIN and in doing so will deposit another unnecessary dollop of pollution on their journey home. Surely this suggestion is a nonsense. It would undoubtedly be better sense to find a central site where all 'delivery vehicles' could go to with absolute minimal pollution. If that site cannot be found then we must not allow ourselves to be pushed into the position of 'the best worst option'. We must not forget that this is a proposed re-sorting site and remember that up to 9,000 more lorry movements would be required to take the sorted material on to its final final destination (wherever that might be) with the resulting additional pollution and roadway damage. Horton Road is very much a country lane with difficult bends and narrows to 19 feet at one point and already large vehicles seem to have problems in passing. It has been calculated that in excess of 9,000 additional vehicle movements will take place each year. It will not take too long before Horton Road will become too damaged to use if this application is agreed. The resulting roadworks will necessitate the road being closed or traffic control being used. This is totally unacceptable. The alternative is for roads such as Braeside Road and roads leading from it being used by these large vehicles going to the new depot. These roads are already in poor condition and it would be an additional cost for East Dorset District Council to swallow and local Community Charge payers to repair. The nearest residence to the proposed site is 200 yards from it. A gentle breeze will allow contaminated air to easily reach it but we must remember that that St. Leonards and St. Ives are a mere hop, step, and a jump further on and will be affected by any such escaping from the site. We could always build a colossally-high chimney to alleviate any such happening. Such expansion would of course allow an increase in opportunities for further 'recycling' activities being created on the proposed site perhaps up to an industrial scale as is possibly being thought of by those who prepared the 'final draft of a Waste</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Transfer and / or transfer / treatment of bulky waste . The words 'treatment of bulky waste' and the inclusion of 'and / ors' with ~/s create in my mind a slow and subtle move towards greater rather than, a limited activity. Is this the intended agenda? The existence of such a site would undoubtedly come to the notice of those who would share our 'piece of heaven and greedily reduce their 'offer price' with great relish . I hope that this ill-judged and poorly thought-through suggestion is given the boot it deserves and allow us to get back into the lives we previously enjoyed without being pestered by those who would change that which we cherish.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 401	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mr Andree & Phil Hinxman & Gibbs	<p>We oppose the granting of any type of permission for and type of waste site to be granted on the Woolsbridge Industrial Park, off the Ringwood Road, Three Legged Cross. The new phase is supposed to be of a high end employment opportunities which this certainly is not. A waste facility would be more appropriate positioned more centrally in Dorset to cut long movements of traffic and therefore pollution.</p> <p><b>SENSITIVE AREA</b> The site is among large sensitive areas of Green Belt which sites many SSSI's and Dorset heathland. The area proposed was in fact green belt and lifted from this recently without our knowledge and we live right across the road. It is also close to many nationally designated sites of nature conservation such as the Moors Rivers Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Holt and West Moors (SSSI), Lions Hill (SSSI). Also a number of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) are situated including the farm next door.</p> <p><b>FLOODING</b> The area is also at risk of flooding. Our fields and drive flood but they are not included within flood risk boundaries. The site proposed drains into the Moors River (SSSI). Any chemical spillage will pollute this sensitive area. We notice that the flooding survey only ever mentions the current and proposed development, nothing about the effect that it will have on the neighbouring property and land around as once covered in tarmac and concrete it is obvious flooding by run-off will increase and therefore any accidental spillages.</p> <p><b>POLLUTION</b> We live in a valley hence 'Moors Valley' so any drifting of noxious, poisonous gases and particulates would stay here and will drop on us. If you walk to the end of our property you can see quite clearly that we are in a valley and we are only at 27m above sea level. No wind is going to help disperse any nasty particulates. And when it rains it is likely to be acidic covering us and our properties in muck. The smell from a waste plant using chemical cleaners and large vehicles would hang in the area particularly us as we are only across the road. We already have some strange smells here on occasions. The noise pollution will be intolerable because of large rumbling lorries in and out all day all of them going past our property. We already have rattles from the windows and ornaments with the traffic we have now. Our rafters also squeak and groan, we are very worried that a further increase of traffic will</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>affect the very foundations of the house. Rush hour(s) already starts about 06:00 and goes on for several hours, we just don't get a break from it. And starts again about 16:00. Even on a weekend there are visitors to Moors Valley and in addition the Ashley Heath Car Boot and the car trailers for Ringwood Cheetahs on Sundays 9 months of the year. When the roads are wet the noise from the current traffic, of which a third is industrial, increases. If there are waste vehicles too it would be horrendous. Nearly all HGVs use diesel engines that emit dangerous particulates and fumes polluting our air. This has detrimental affect on our health and particularly on mine as I suffer from chest infections. The risk of any detergent being leaked into the area, in particular the areas of the Moors River and it's protected banks, would be an environmental nightmare waiting to happen. The past behaviour of the developers that own the phase 1 of the industrial park is horrific. As the ponds have been polluted over many years and they have been warned about it and yet they still did not clean them up for many years. Why would we believe that any of the next phase would be any better. ACCESS The road to the site is a 'c' class road and is not suitable. This road is already at breaking point that it actually takes the same mph at rush hour that it does in London. The vehicles would be too heavy and too big causing a lot of damage on the road and a have a major impact on our health. The road would need constant mending as it does now. It has many potholes, sinking drains and crazing areas. There are in fact many accidents along this road of which not all get reported therefore not included in any council/highways figures. It would be a case of 'chicken' if a waste vehicle faced a Rollalong 'exceptional convoi'. We already have to drive on the pavement to let Rollalong through. This is not safe. The Hinton Road and Ringwood Road are not 'fit for purpose'. CONSEQUENCES If any permission is granted it would be granted so loosely that anything could be built there under 'waste' which could mean an incinerator chimney, and because of the sensitive areas could be as high as 100m. This height is enormous, only 23m short of the spire at Salisbury Cathedral and even higher than most structures in London. Respect for the local character of the area would not be shown by agreeing to any waste facility in this area. Value of our property would be severely</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>affected by any kind of waste development. For the comments made above we strongly oppose any waste facility on the Woolsbridge Industrial Park.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 403	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs E V Marks	<p>I understand that representations regarding the above must be submitted to the Mineral &amp; Waste Planning Policy Team at Dorset County Council by 31st January and would ask you to please register my objections to the proposed Re-cycling Cleaning Facility being considered for the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate at the appropriate meeting. Firstly, I would like to state that I believe strongly in re-cycling, and do my best at home to fill my "green top" bin correctly with all appropriate items and rinsed plastic containers. My husband and I also exercise a World War II-style approach to food waste, i.e. we do our best to not make any! Now on to my representations: Those Councillors who live on, or near to the Horton Road, from the A31 roundabout, all the way through Three Legged Cross to Horton, and beyond, will be only too aware of the traffic levels experienced throughout the day. This already includes lorries of considerable width, requiring even a small family car like my own, to be slowed and pulled over towards the kerb in order to maintain the driver's side mirror in one piece. The proposed 15 waste lorries, in and out of the Industrial Estate (i.e. totalling 30 journeys, but, no doubt, stealthily increased over time) will simply add to the congestion, road damage and road traffic accidents. On the week day when the refuse lorry is proceeding along the Horton Road, the traffic comes to a virtual standstill in both directions. Trying to get the on-coming traffic to concede is difficult enough, without extra-large re-cycling lorries attempting to manoeuvre around the refuse cart. Now, with regard to the access road into the Industrial Estate. From 08:00, there is a continuous stream of parked cars along the right-hand side of the road when turning in from the Horton Road. Those Councillors who are unfamiliar with this road, should drive down when an average-sized lorry is travelling in the opposite direction. It is time to hold your breath, squeeze in, and hope your wing mirrors will not be smashed by the on-coming lorry or the parked cars when you attempt to move over! If, as I understand it, the "15" lorries will be travelling from all over Dorset, it would make sense to site the facility more centrally in the county. What is the point of making heavy vehicles with waste from the western, northern and southern reaches of Dorset travel across to east Dorset? Any final decision should be influenced by the fact that the</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>vehicles have quick and easy access to a major road and not a circuitous journey along minor roads, noting, of course, that the Horton Road is designated as a "C" road. Hardly suitable for further heavy-duty vehicles. Also, if you have ever attempted to cross the Horton Road at any point, it is a very scary prospect indeed. If the proposed plant is a cleaning/washing facility for the waste, prior to being transferred to a processing plant, where will the foul water be disposed of? The proposed location is very close to a river and a Site of Special Scientific Interest. If there is a flood as a result of heavy and prolonged rainfall, will the land and river be contaminated? It is not only the Horton Road which would be affected. The Woolsbridge Road is, and will continue to be used, as a rat-run, quite possibly by some of the 15 lorries. There is a speed limit of 30 mph, but you wouldn't think so ..... No doubt, the Council will instruct a third-party to conduct a scientific and environmental examination of the possible output from such a facility in terms of pollutants, particulates, odours and noise and not accept a submission from the operator without due diligence. Moors Valley Park is an outstanding tourist attraction for the area and is also cherished by the local population. It would be unforgiveable if it was directly damaged by emissions mentioned in 8 above. Thank you for taking the trouble to read my letter and trust you feel my observations are relevant and reasonable.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 405	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross				Individual	Mrs Lynn Firth	Horton Road not fit for use The road is currently too narrow for safe use at only 18ft wide in places This is only a C class road with tight, blind corners Dangerous road for cyclists Poor quality side footpath and non-existent some of the way Currently it is almost impossible to cross this road as it is too busy During road works Sept to Dec 2017 there were long delays most of which were due to inadequate remaining width for lorries to get through Detrimental to the Health and Welfare of Local Residents Although there are some local cycle ways and bridleways it is too busy to get to them at the moment and deteriorating with the increase of general traffic without extra-large Lorries Difficulty for residents to get to local amenities (shops, garden centre, pub, restaurant) walking and having to cross the road Large Lorries would bring greater pollution, road wear and tear, erosion of the verges, damage the trees and kill more wildlife More road delays would deter tourists visiting 'country' resource at Moors Valley Traffic would deter visitors to the Old Peoples' Homes on this road Accidents would increase and become far more serious or fatal for car users, cyclists and pedestrians The Woolsbridge Road rat run from the A31 to the Horton Road is already subjected to many speed camera checks as it is dangerous. Extra Lorries pounding along it through a residential area would compound issues Toddlers being taken to the Nursery on the High Street affected Patients attending the Doctor's surgery, the Clinics and the High Street Chemist affected (Many slow, disabled, elderly and vulnerable people) Young children cross Woolsbridge Road on their way to and from the nursery, Infant and Junior schools on Sandy Road and there is no provision to aid crossing the road School buses collect and drop teenagers and College students at stops along Woolsbridge Road, private buses and scheduled public buses. They have no crossing provision and it is dangerous for them already Location Why transport Dorset waste to an extremity of the county increasing mileage, pollution and costs? A central location would be far more sensible Freight carried by train is much less polluting and the infra-structure already exists The type of employment at this mostly mechanised unit will not be in line with local plans This is an SSSI area and as such should not be built on River Moor through the designated area is an		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							important environment. No pollution can be allowed to enter it Area is on a flood plain and building on it is unsuitable and will put surrounding properties at higher risk			
PS D-WP 409	Inset 1 - Woalsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Yes	Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Marjorie Evans	QUESTION 4 + 5 LEGAL COMPLIANCE CONTEXT What amazes me is that the chosen site is as far as could possibly be imagined from the various sites where these very large vehicles will be coming from. These large vehicles will be polluting the air of the various areas from which they originate to achieve access to a distant site where they will be depositing their loads and THEN GOING HOME AGAIN and in doing so will deposit another unnecessary dollop of pollution on their journey home. Surely this suggestion is a nonsense. It would undoubtedly be better sense to find a central site where all 'delivery vehicles' could go to with absolute minimal pollution. If that site cannot be found then we must not allow ourselves to be pushed into the position of 'the best worst option'. We must not forget that this is a proposed re-sorting site and remember that up to 9,000 more lorry movements would be required to take the sorted material on to its		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>final final destination (wherever that might be) with the resulting additional pollution and roadway damage. Horton Road is very much a country lane with difficult bends and narrows to 19 feet at one point and already large vehicles seem to have problems in passing. It has been calculated that in excess of 9,000 additional vehicle movements will take place each year. It will not take too long before Horton Road will become too damaged to use if this application is agreed. The resulting roadworks will necessitate the road being closed or traffic control being used. This is totally unacceptable. The alternative is for roads such as Braeside Road and roads leading from it being used by these large vehicles going to the new depot. These roads are already in poor condition and it would be an additional cost for East Dorset District Council to swallow and local Community Charge payers to repair. The nearest residence to the proposed site is 200 yards from it. A gentle breeze will allow contaminated air to easily reach it but we must remember that that St. Leonards and St. Ives are a mere hop, step, and a jump further on and will be affected by any such escaping from the site. We could always build a colossally-high chimney to alleviate any such happening. Such expansion would of course allow an increase in opportunities for further 'recycling' activities being created on the proposed site perhaps up to an industrial scale as is possibly being thought of by those who prepared the 'final draft of a Waste Transfer and/or transfer/treatment of bulky waste'. The words 'treatment of bulky waste' and the inclusion of 'and/ors' with 's create in my mind a slow and subtle move towards greater rather than a limited activity. Is this the intended agenda? The existence of such a site would undoubtedly come to the notice of those who would share our 'piece of heaven' and greedily reduce their 'offer price' with great relish. I hope that this ill-judged and poorly thought -through suggestion is given the boot it deserves and allow us to get back into the lives we previously enjoyed without being pestered by those who would change that which we cherish.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 3	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford		Don't Know	Don't Know	Pinder Cox & Co Ltd	Mr Mark Stanton	Thank you for your letter dated 30 November 2017. My comments concerning your plans are as follows: The plans mean my staff will be forced to work in a smelly working environment The stench will prevent us from opening the office windows. Our office in the summer is like an oven because of the tin roofing so we have to open the windows Just because Sunrise 'Business Park' is already a dump it doesn't mean it's a good location to park a waste site next to it The proposals will do wonders for the local rat population We cannot move premises because of the shocking lack of purpose-built offices in Blandford Forum The stink will be offputting for our clients and we may fail to attract new business The proposals do not result in any financial benefits for my company I trust that my constructive representations will encourage the planners to have a rethink and come up with a more intelligent plan in an alternative location.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 16	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford		Yes	Yes	Blandford Forum Town Council	Leani Haim	Blandford + supports the site allocation for a waste management facility on land to the south of Sunrise Business Park. The B+ Neighbourhood Plan continues to try and secure sustainable development in this part of the town and recognition that development, such as this, for necessary infrastructure is considered to meet exceptional circumstances to justify its location in the AONB is welcomed.		Your support is welcomed	
PS D-WP 112	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	Objection in Principle Whilst this AONB acknowledges the structure of the Spatial Strategy, page 28, it is objecting to the relocation of the existing Blandford Waste Management Centre that is within an Industrial Estate to a new site, on Greenfield land, within this AONB. The Partnership for the Cranborne Chase AONB agreed at its meeting on 26 th October 2016, Action 4.1 of the Minutes, that 4.1 The Panel endorsed the principle that the nations finest landscapes, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, are not places for the importation of waste for treatment, processing, or disposal.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 119	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford				Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Mr Richard Burden	Without Prejudice Comments Relating to the Potential Blandford Site. The AONB acknowledges the positive approach of the Waste Planning Team and their specialist advisors to engaging with the AONB Team. Whilst this AONB maintains an objection in-principle to the introduction of waste handling and treatment facilities at the site south of the Sunrise Business Park it is happy to contribute to discussions on that site, on a without prejudice basis, in the spirit of minimising the potential impacts on the AONB if a proposal ever proceeds on that site. Sunrise Business Park itself is a bit of an anomaly on the outside of the Blandford Bypass. It does, however, predate the construction of the Bypass and, to date, there have been no developments implemented outside the Bypass. The Bypass does, therefore, effectively contain Blandford and is characterised by its rural nature, its hedges and roadside trees. The Site Assessments carried out to inform the Waste Planning Teams deliberations should, of course, take account of the structures on the sites. It is, however, clear that the Strategic Assessments provided have considered the visibility of the sites as they currently are, undeveloped. The impact of structures in the order of 11 metres tall, approximately twice the height of the supermarket to the south of the site, is a key matter that should be evaluated. The proximity of the supermarket on the south side of the Bypass, with substantial numbers of people visiting it, does not seem to have been considered in the assessment of the community acceptability of a household recycling centre and waste transfer centre. The roundabout between the C13 and the A350 is the high point of the Blandford Bypass and the land to the north east of that junction is, therefore, in a high point relative to both Blandford and the Bypass. Approaching from the south east the land is considerably higher than the road and so the appearance of buildings on this site would be significantly higher than their measured height above ground level. The L shaped proposal appears to maximise the road frontage which would maximise the impact on the landscape as perceived by users of the roads. A less harmful approach would be to set the structures back from the two roads. That would also provide space for additional planting for screening purposes between the roads and the potential		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							structures. if the access to the site is taken from either the roundabout or the A350 it would significantly prejudice much of the existing planting and screening. It is noted in the supporting documents that re-establishment of meaningful screening would take in the order of 15 years. I agree with that assessment and for screening to take that period of time is unacceptable in one of the nations finest landscape. The option of accessing the site through Sunrise Business Park has a number of advantages. Not only does it use an existing access off of the C13 it also means there could also be scope on the site for promising parking for workers at the Business Park that none of the established road side hedge and tree planting is disturbed. The development considerations on page 11 of inset 2 should mention explicitly that paragraphs 115 and 116 of NPPF apply. In connection with light spill the emphasis should be on how this is avoided. A structural native tree and shrub planting scheme should be at such a scale and size to achieve immediate screening and integration. This needs to be stated so that there can be no misunderstanding about the importance of screening on this site. It is recognised that the setting back of the buildings has been identified but the need to excavate into the ground to drop the structures and enable the potential development to appear as an extension of the Sunrise Business Park in scale and form needs clearer emphasis. Furthermore the need to retain, protect and enhance the existing tree/hedge belts also needs to identify those to the south west side of the site			
PS D-WP 127	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford		Yes	Yes	Savills	Mr Cliff Lane	On behalf of the Davis family. We support, in principle, the use of Land south of Sunrise Business Park in Blandford (Inset Map 2) for the development of local waste management facilities for the transfer and recycling of waste. However, further discussion is needed with the County Council regarding the site's detailed configuration and other matters.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 134	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Don't Know	Yes	Don't Know	North Dorset District Council	Mr Edward Gerry	<p>Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford The Council notes that Policy 3 (Sites allocated for waste management development) sets out that Land South of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford Forum (Inset 2) is allocated for a waste management centre, which would comprise a modern split level household recycling centre and transfer station. Appendix 3 of the plan correctly outlines that the land which is allocated for development is greenfield and currently in agricultural use. Furthermore, and more importantly, it is detailed that the site is situated in the Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As outlined by NDDC in previous consultation responses the area of land that is allocated in the plan is located outside of the existing settlement boundary for Blandford Forum, as defined by the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan (2003). It is also situated outside of the employment growth areas identified in the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016) (LPP1). Given the site is located in the Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs AONB paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is of relevance. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF states, amongst other things, that "Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty . Paragraph 116 of the NPPF details, amongst other things, that " Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. NDDC notes that the Waste Planning Authority considers that the site would meet an identified need for which no other suitable alternative site has been found. Additionally, that the site is considered to present exceptional circumstances and sufficient public interest to justify a location within the AONB. If the Inspector who examines the plan agrees with the Minerals Planning Authority in this regard then NDDC considers it essential that suitable provision is made within the plan to ensure that the harmful impacts on the AONB, which would result from new development, are satisfactorily mitigated.</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 170	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	As previous comments mention, development of a Household Recycling Centre here, as is being considered, would need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base, including information on trip distribution and timing, particularly as there is a possibility of an increased number of trips over that of the existing site. However, given the location of the site we do not expect that there will be a significant impact on the SRN and so do not require mitigation to be identified for us to support the allocation of the site in the plan. Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 218	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	FZ1 No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and biodiversity The site should be assessed for its ecological value and ability to support protected species e.g. Any hedgerows surrounding the site should be retained where possible, where not possible appropriate mitigation and compensation measures should be put in place. Hedgerows are important habitats for wildlife including birds and bats and some have the potential to support the protected dormouse. Opportunities for enhancements in and around the development should be considered. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 recognises that the planning system should aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Groundwater and contaminated land The site is close to an SPZ 1 (300). The nearest abstraction point is 800 m. Location is likely to be greenfield, but site investigation could be required. Aquifer is in a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ) and the area is designated as a surface water protection zone. Superficial Aquifers are unproductive, overlying Principal Aquifer Seaford Chalk Formation. Protection from infiltration to the aquifer is needed, drainage to foul sewer will be required in drainage strategy. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc Any waste material used during the construction should be handled in the correct manner, using the appropriately licenced waste carriers etc. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological/ contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 194	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford					Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	24km north-west of BOH. As a household waste recycling centre, as long as it is managed correctly, there should be no issues for BOH.			
PS D-WP 2	Paragraph	1.6	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Richard Jones	The letter sent to local residents dated 30th November does not show the significant and large development - Lidl- a food retailer which is now trading across the road from your proposed waste handling facility. As such is does not represent the current situation.	Accurate map showing Lidl. More comment about the increased vehicle movements that would result from the proposal.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 257	Inset 2 - Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford				Wyatt Homes	Mr Tim Hoskinson	<p>Policy 3 " Sites allocated for waste management development and Inset 2 " Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford Wyatt Homes are supportive of the principle of the proposed allocation for a waste management centre on land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford. This location is well served by existing infrastructure with good links to the highway network. The wider area to the east of the proposed waste management centre (north of the A350 and east of the A354) has the potential to accommodate a sustainable, high quality urban extension that can make a significant contribution to meeting the future growth needs of Blandford. This proposal has already received considerable support from the local community, in particular through the emerging Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan. An indicative framework masterplan and a number of supporting technical studies have previously been prepared and submitted to the Council on behalf of the landowners. The submitted Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan includes a proposed allocation (Policy 1) on land to the north and east of Blandford Forum for a mix of uses including: housing; employment; primary school; community hub; cycle, pedestrian and bus connections; public open space; and relocated allotments. Dorset County Council has highlighted the need for a new primary school to serve the northern part of Blandford. We understand the current requirement is for a 2.1 hectare site to accommodate a two-form entry school, with potential to increase to three forms of entry to meet future growth needs. The indicative framework masterplan prepared by the landowners for the land north east of Blandford Forum shows the new primary school with playing fields located to the east of the proposed waste management centre, positioned to connect with the existing footbridge over the A350. In order to ensure the proposed waste management centre is compatible with the wider proposals for north east Blandford, care will need to be taken in the detailed planning and layout of the facility. The development considerations listed at Inset 2 of the Waste Plan should be amended include a reference to the aspirations of the Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan for the wider north east Blandford area, with an assurance that site will be designed so that it would not</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								prejudice the opportunity to deliver a new school on adjoining land.			
PS D-WP 10	Inset 3 -	Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	Yes	Yes	Yes	Individual	Mr richard glindon			Your support is welcomed.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 12	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham					Mrs Jeannie Cooksley-kar	I have just read of the plans to move the recycling plant from Shaftesbury to Gillingham in view of 1800 new homes to be built in Gillingham. But more than 2000 new homes have recently been built in Shaftesbury, with more new homes being built in Coppice Street and at the top of New Road, plus several hundred more planned to be built on the site of the existing cattle market. Do you really think all the existing and new residents will travel to Gillingham? The road from Shaftesbury to Gillingham is already grid-locked in the morning due to a high volume of traffic going to Gillingham Station, and due to the busy school run. My husband and I are conscientious recyclers but we will not be able, or willing, to drive to Gillingham. If you take away the local recycling plant in Shaftesbury which is ALWAYS busy, it will just encourage a new wave of fly-tipping in the Shaftesbury area! This will cost huge sums for the Council to clear away. Many people recycle mattresses at Shaftesbury. We do not want to see those dumped in town! If a Recycling Plant is needed in Gillingham, why not build a Second one rather than just move the much needed recycling centre in Shaftesbury.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 32	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				Vail Williams LLP	Mr Ben Christian	SAM has never stated that it supports the principle of a Household Recycling Centre or any other Waste Management Development on its land as part of the Southern Extension to Brickfields Business Park. SAM does not support the proposed allocation due to the potential detrimental impact on its land or its current or future operations. The factors influencing this decision include highways and amenity/quality of life and non-planning matters relating to the lack contractual development agreements.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 135	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	Yes	Yes	Yes	North Dorset District Council	Mr Edward Gerry	Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham The Council notes that as part of Policy 3 (Sites allocated for waste management development) land within the extension to Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham is allocated for a household recycling centre to replace the existing Shaftesbury household recycling centre. The proposed facility would serve the residents of Shaftesbury, Gillingham and surrounding villages. The area of land identified is an allocated employment site and is currently undeveloped, allowing scope for the development of a modern facility well located to serve both Gillingham and Shaftesbury. Consequently, the Council supports the proposed allocation.		Your support is welcomed	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 139	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	No			Individual	Charlie Starkie	In order to make a success of the new Brickfields Business Park extension it will need to be as attractive as possible to potential clients. Siting a Waste Recycling Centre as the first new occupant is likely to: a. preclude many potential businesses, and b. restrict take-up to companies at the lower end of the food chain.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 154	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Bernard May	This is unsound because it has not properly considered the effect of traffic due not only to the new waste site but also to the southern extension and other development such as Shaftesbury. Through traffic as well as local traffic will be effected adversely since the access from the north will still have to come through Le Neuburg Way and traffic from the south will cause hold ups on the Shaftesbury Road since at peak times the traffic already backs up to the roundabout at Orchard Park.	It is necessary to consider a new relief road to the east of the town to prevent the town coming to a standstill during peak times. Since Gillingham is the main service area for the north of the county it will become considerably busier with all the new developments and the planned link road between the B3081 and B3092 will not help with all the additional through traffic and make it very congested for local people and create considerable air pollution due to the increased traffic density and inevitable standing traffic . The New Road/Station Road junction bottle neck cannot be mitigated by minor adjustments to this junction. With any problems on the A303 causing diversions through the town it will all grind to a halt unless proper provision is made to ensure Smoot traffic flow through the main route. The proposals do not satisfactorily do this.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 220	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	FZ1 No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity There must be an adequate buffer provided to protect the River Stour and Lodden. Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes. Water quality Surface water drains to tributary of the River Stour upstream of Longham (public water supply). Site very close to River Stour and Lodden. Therefore careful consideration of the site drainage must be taken. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 171	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	Previous comments remain pertinent. The trip estimates for the site are not at a level where a significant impact on the SRN would be expected, however as noted in the earlier comment, development should take into account routing of HGVs to/from the site, and the suitability of junctions on the A303. Given the location of the site we do not expect that there will be a significant impact on the SRN and so do not require mitigation to be identified for us to support the allocation of the site in the plan. Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion, and any		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							forthcoming application would need to provide information on trip distribution and timing.			
PS D-WP 288	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	DWT welcomes the revision to the boundary of the allocated site to remove the area which overlapped with the Flood Zone.		Your support is welcomed.	
PS D-WP 233	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				Individual	Charlie Starkie	I have various comments and objections to the proposal to build a Household Waste Recycling site on the Brickfields Business park, as set out below. My house is one of those identified in the Plan as being within 250m of the proposed site, which implies it is likely to be affected by it. I find it troubling that it has not been considered appropriate to solicit my views on this Plan, or at least appraise me of its existence. I agree with the Councils own Landscape Officer that the proposed Waste site will have a negative impact on the significant landscape value of this pleasant green space accessible on foot from Gillingham. I walk there on most days of the week, along with many others. I agree the development should not go ahead. As a regular user of the footpaths identified on the plan for over 20 years I have witnessed the increasing regularity of flooding from once or twice to many times a year. Accidents happen and waste sites are no exception. It will be impossible to guarantee no significant contamination of the Lodden and Stour rivers adjacent to the site, rivers which have only made clean in the last few years after previous industrial contamination. Local traffic around Gillingham has significant capacity issues, particularly at the New Road / Shaftesbury Road traffic lights. Adding a steady stream of waste vehicles waiting in long queues at the lights to get to and fro to the Waste site would be an unpleasant nuisance for the many local residents on the route. The Draft Waste Plan Update 2016 Consultation, Section 11 states, in "Deliverability / Viability that - It is understood that the landowner has no objection in principle to the proposed use. This is		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							in complete contrast to the Comment by the landowner herein. This will place a heavy unforeseen burden of cost and time to this proposed site development.			
PS D-WP 195	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				Individual	Mr Paul Knight	40.5km north-west of BOH. No issues		Noted	
PS D-WP 235	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	No	No	No	Rowles Davis LTD	Ms Rachel Rowles Davis	Mr Turner objects to the proposed Brickfield Business Park allocation on grounds of adverse landscape, environmental, noise nuisance, highways, flood risk and deliverability issues. Additionally, Mr Turner is concerned that although he and his neighbours have been correctly identified by the Council as being within 250 metres of the proposed development, neither he nor his neighbours have been consulted directly by the Council. They only became aware of the potential site allocation three days ago after the chance discovery of a site notice on a secluded footpath. LANDSCAPE: Development at Brickfields Business Park would have significant adverse landscape and visual impact issues. The surrounding area has been identified as having significant landscape value by the Council's own Landscape Officer, who has recommended that the site is not brought forward. Mr Turner concurs with this expert view with regard to the adverse impact on the extensive open views across the surrounding countryside. More particularly, the proposal would adversely impact the setting of the Grade II listed property, Madjeston Farm House (List entry Number: 1110299), to an unacceptable degree. The Council does not appear to have considered the impact on the	Please see answer to question 4 above.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							<p>listed building. ENVIRONMENT: Development of a waste facility at Brickfields Business Park would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents and businesses, who would suffer from the effects of odour, dust, etc. Mr Turner is also concerned that there is a risk of contamination to adjacent watercourses. These risks has been identified by the Environment Agency and Mr Turner would concur with their expert opinion. FLOOD RISK: Parts of the site are in Flood Zone 2 and furthermore the site is adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3.Ā, Mr Turner is extremely concerned that the change of use from agricultural land to hard-standing or a large area of roof would mean increased flood risk resulting from water running off from the impermeable surfaces downhill onto the land below within Flood Zones 2 and 3.Ā, It is noted that the Environment Agency flag up the need for a Sequential Test, which clearly indicates that other sites not within or adjacent Flood Zones 2 and 3 should be developed in preference to Brickfields Business Park. HIGHWAYS: Gillingham has significant traffic issues which will only be exacerbated by the development of the site at Brickfields. Capacity issues have been identified by the local highways authority in relation to junction signals at Station Rd/New Rd and also New Rd/Shafesbury Rd. Highways England has similar concerns about the site, particularly stating that junctions onto the A303 on several routes to the site were less suitable than routes to and from other proposed sites. Mr Turner concurs with these expert views, to which he would add that the amenity of residents close to the proposed route would be compromised by the increased pollution, smells and noise nuisance caused by the resultant heavy traffic. DELIVERABILITY: The site has significant deliverability issues which relate to the unwillingness of the landowner for the Brickfields site to be used for the proposed development; and also the robust objections of statutory consultees such as landscape and environment professionals and of nearby residents and businesses who would be significantly adversely affected. The fact that this land is not available due to the owner's objections would cause considerable cost and delay to any plans to develop this particular site.</p>			
PS D-	Inset 3 - Brickfields				Individual	Miss Sonia Adlem	I would be most grateful if you would kindly accept this email as notification of my concerns in respect of the proposed plan for the Brickfield Business Park,		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
WP 299	Business Park, Gillingham						Gillingham. I have only just been made aware of the Plan through a neighbour who happened to come across a Notice whilst out walking his dog. I have therefore not had any opportunity to consider the Plan in any detail to be able to consider the issues and how it will impact upon the local community. I make the following points in haste so as to comply with the deadline which I understand is 5pm today. My concerns are as follows; I believe that I live within 250 metres of the proposed site. I have not been consulted directly. I have not received any written communication to give me the opportunity to take part in the consultation process. I appreciate that the Brickfield Business Park has been earmarked for expansion but this Plan will have a far reaching impact upon the local community in terms of noise, traffic, pollution etc. It will be open most likely for 7 days a week all year around. There will be no respite for those living in or around Gillingham The development will have a detrimental impact on the landscape. The proposed site is next to a river and in a flood zone.			
PS D-WP 237	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	No	No	No	Individual	Mr Simon Duffin	The draft recognises the 6 residences within 250m of the proposed site. Our own is one and we received no effective notice. The scope of the document is too huge to assess with so little time available. I believe the draft may not be legally compliant as the area south of Brickfields is earmarked for business use and I wouldn't class a council funded recycling facility a business. One commentator points out that its presence might dissuade others from using the site. Many informed consultees have raised questions regarding traffic capacity that the proposed site seems ill-equipped to answer. Building such a facility so close to water courses seems environmentally problematic too.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 219	Inset 3 - Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	No	No	No	Individual	Ms Rachel Rowles Davis	Mr Turner of Madjeston Farmhouse objects to the proposed Brickfield Business Park allocation on grounds of adverse landscape, environmental, noise nuisance, highways, flood risk and deliverability issues. Additionally, Mr Turner is concerned that although he and his neighbours have been correctly identified by the Council as being within 250 metres of the proposed development, neither he nor his neighbours have been consulted directly by the Council. They only became aware of the potential site allocation three days ago after the chance discovery of a site notice on a secluded footpath. LANDSCAPE: Development at Brickfields Business Park would have significant adverse landscape and visual impact issues. The surrounding area has been identified as having significant landscape value by the Council's own Landscape Officer, who has recommended that the site is not brought forward. Mr Turner concurs with this expert view with regard to the adverse impact on the extensive open views across the surrounding countryside. More particularly, the proposal would adversely impact the setting of his Grade II listed property, Madjeston Farm House (List entry Number: 1110299), to an unacceptable degree. The Council does not appear to have considered the impact on the listed building. ENVIRONMENT: Development of a waste facility at Brickfields Business Park would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents and businesses, who would suffer from the effects of odour, dust, etc. Mr Turner is also concerned that there is a risk of contamination to adjacent watercourses. These risks has been identified by the Environment Agency and Mr Turner would concur with their expert opinion. FLOOD RISK: Parts of the site are in Flood Zone 2 and furthermore the site is adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3. Mr Turner is extremely concerned that the change of use from agricultural land to hard-standing or a large area of roof would mean increased flood risk resulting from water running off from the impermeable surfaces downhill onto the land below within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is noted that the Environment Agency flag up the need for a Sequential Test, which clearly indicates that other sites not within or adjacent Flood Zones 2 and 3 should be developed in preference to Brickfields Business Park. HIGHWAYS: Gillingham has significant traffic issues		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							which will only be exacerbated by the development of the site at Brickfields. Capacity issues have been identified by the local highways authority in relation to junction signals at Station Rd/New Rd and also New Rd/Shaftebury Rd. Highways England has similar concerns about the site, particularly stating that junctions onto the A303 on several routes to the site were less suitable than routes to and from other proposed sites. Mr Turner concurs with these expert views, to which he would add that the amenity of residents close to the proposed route would be compromised by the increased pollution, smells and noise nuisance caused by the resultant heavy traffic. DELIVERABILITY: The site has significant deliverability issues which relate to the unwillingness of the landowner for the Brickfields site to be used for the proposed development; and also the robust objections of statutory consultees such as landscape and environment professionals and of nearby residents and businesses who would be significantly adversely affected. The fact that this land is not available due to the owner's objections would cause considerable cost and delay to any plans to develop this particular site.			
PS D-WP 23	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Ms Debbie Weller			Your support is welcomed	
PS D-WP 123	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate	No	Yes	No	ACS Group of Companies	Mr Stuart White	Impact on sensitive receptors The Plan states no properties within 250m. However ASC Buildings Unit 14 and units 14A and 14b property boundary is less than 50m away. Traffic/Access Proposed traffic movements on a daily basis will increase onto an already heavily used access (main) road. All on road parking on Blackhill road will be affected which will lead to inconvenience to current users and increase the risk of road traffic movements. Pollution Prevention Dust, smell and vibration would have an adverse effect on existing ACS Laboratories. Prevention measures have not been stated or any environmental monitoring details		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							haver not been document to show evidence of pollution. Air Quality inc dust Air quality management must be addressed due to the sensitivity of the ACS chemical laboratory situated in building 14B			
PS D-WP 173	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	Whilst close to the SRN, the trip estimates for the site are not at a level where a significant impact on the SRN would be expected. Highways England does not therefore require mitigation to be identified for us to support the allocation of the site in the plan. Development at this site does not raise any major concern, however Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion, and any forthcoming application would need to provide information on trip distribution and timing.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 221	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Flood Zone 1. Site is within 200m of Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, Holton and Sandford Heaths SSSI. Also approx 400m from Poole Harbour SPA, Ramsar and SSSI. No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. No flood risk concerns from our point of view; our Flood Risk Standing Advice applies in respect of surface water drainage. However, as this is ~major development within Flood Zone 1 the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) will be the planning consultee in respect of surface water drainage. Fisheries and biodiversity Site is within 200m of Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, Holton and Sandford Heaths SSSI. Also approximately 400m from Poole Harbour SPA, Ramsar and SSSI. Natural England must be fully consulted. It has been identified there are sand lizard records very close to the proposed site " priority species and habitats must be protected. Groundwater and contaminated land We would have no objection from a groundwater protection point of view subject to Standard Conditions for the protection of land from contamination. A site investigation and risk assessment will be required for the site due to its location, if there is any below ground		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							work (including foundations/hardstanding). The water table is likely to be high and underground oil storage tanks may not be suitable Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA, particularly due to proximity of the site to the Holton Heath SSSI. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 289	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	DWT is pleased to note that protection of the verge areas close to the proposed development site against damage, particularly from traffic moving to and from the site, is included in the Development Considerations. These SNCI verges contain a variety of different species-rich grass types, including neutral, calcareous and dry acid grassland with a large number of Dorset Notable species and two Nationally Scarce species.		Noted.	
PS D-WP 196	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath Industrial Estate				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	17km south-west of BOH. Confirmation that all waste would be stored indoors and a monitoring programme to ensure the site's housekeeping is strictly managed to ensure no outdoor waste that would attract birds.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 309	Inset 4 - Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Inset 4, land at the end of Blackhill Road, Holton Heath (WP 15 in Update, WP PK 01 in original draft): EDFoE has no issue with this site. Development considerations : should include preparation of a comprehensive management plan .		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Industrial Estate									
PS D-WP 8	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mr Terry Sneller	Mr Terry Sneller	The main issues for West Dorset related to the provision of new waste facilities in the west of Dorset including: additional green waste composting particularly in the west of Dorset, expanded sewage treatment facilities to serve Maiden Newton additional waste facilities around Dorchester comprising: expanded Household Recycling Centre (HRC) provision provision of a Waste Transfer Station provision of a waste vehicle depot The proposed reconfiguration / expansion of Household Recycling Facilities at Louds Mill, Dorchester is supported subject to: adequate mitigation of the impact of increased traffic on nearby properties; the development of the not restricting further employment development on the Louds Mill employment site; and the future expansion of the Dorchester Sewage Treatment Works not being restricted especially given the potential level of growth being considered for Dorchester through the review of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 178	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	This site has been allocated in the draft pre-submission Waste Plan, as a Household Recycling Centre. As previous comments state, this site has potential to impact on the SRN due to its proximity to the SRN. It is noted that proposed new housing in Dorchester may increase trips to the site. However, given the existing HRC on the site, and that access from Dorchester would likely not use the SRN, this is not considered of major concern to Highways England, and as such we therefore do not require mitigation to be identified at this stage to support the allocation of the site in the plan. Highways England require a robust transport evidence base, providing information on trip distribution and timing to support an allocation at this site, particularly to establish to what extent traffic to/from the site may use the SRN.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 222	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	<p>FZ1 SPZ2 Drain and pond in site Area of site shown to at risk of surface water flooding River Frome near site boundary No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below.</p> <p>Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Although site area smaller than 1 hectare, a FRA (focussed on management of surface water run-off) may still be required given the development is considered ~major. Fisheries and Biodiversity Site is close to the River Frome, which is a SSSI. Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage. Groundwater and contaminated land Site is located in SPZ2; Groundwater Protection Zone. High groundwater levels “ site needs drainage. Chalk aquifer “ Principal designation. Described as brownfield land. Whilst there is unlikely to be an objection in principle, this site is relatively high risk. The nearby River Frome is very close and an SSSI, whilst the Chalk aquifer is a Principal aquifer used for Public water supply. It is likely that infiltration to the ground would not be acceptable and that the drainage system is separated from the groundwater. As the site is brownfield, site investigation and a piling (if used) risk assessment will be needed. If contamination of soils and groundwater is encountered at this site it is likely to be required to be removed or treated. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of resident and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 263	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester				Historic England	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	The Heritage Assessment (Context One Archaeological Services, 2017) emphasises the considerable sensitivity of this site in relation to the setting of the adjacent Neolithic Henge. Unfortunately the assessment fails to indicate how the site contributes to the significance of the Henge and its setting and the historic inter relationship to the River Frome beyond. As a consequence it is not clear from the evidence provided the degree of harm to the significance of the affected designated heritage asset, the form of such harm, and therefore whether it is possible to mitigate any adverse impact. This in turn affects the ability of the local authority to demonstrate the allocation accords with national policy. Due to the national importance of the Henge it is vital this matter is addressed before the principle of the allocation is agreed. It is important to note that Planning Policy Guidance (PGG) is clear that evidence needs to inform what is in the plan and shape its development rather than being collected retrospectively. Therefore the implications for the setting of heritage assets should not be overlooked or "parked" to a later application stage. Historic England would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 290	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	DWT is disappointed that this site has been retained in the allocation of sites within the Pre-Submission Draft plan. The site is surrounded by an extensive system of drains and water meadows, with a number of the drains and ditches flowing from alongside the site directly into the River Frome SSSI. For these reasons Dorset Wildlife Trust does not believe that this is a suitable site for further waste facilities. However, we note the requirement for comprehensive species surveys and mitigation measures to ensure no adverse impacts on the River Frome, plus appropriate enhancements to be put in place. Such measures must include substantial areas of wet woodland planting to buffer and protect the river from any pollution, and all landscape and mitigation planting must be of native species.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 165	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester				Dorchester Town Council	Ms Louise Dowell	At the meeting of Dorchester Town Councils Planning and Environment Committee on 8 January 2018, Members considered the most recent consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan. While noting that comments were being requested on the legal process of the Plan, Members wanted to resubmit their objection to the ongoing commitment to the Louds Mill site, which they considered was a totally inappropriate site. They also commented on the proposed increase in residential housing planned for the area approaching the Louds Mill site (Flax Factory site and sites either side of the bypass off of St Georges Road) which would be negatively impacted by traffic to and from Louds Mill Household Recycling Centre. Further, the ongoing development at Poundbury and other residential expansion in the Town and immediate vicinity would create higher demand for household recycling services and this added to Members reasoning for wanting such services to be located away from residential areas, outside of the Town. Comments for resubmission: Planning and Environment Committee " 21 September 2015 (Special Meeting) Dorset Waste Plan Consultation Members discussed each of the proposed Dorchester sites, taking into account the pros and cons of each. Note was made that the majority of exiting waste transfer lorries would be heading to the east of the county. A key point agreed was that the site of a new Household Recycling Centre should be out of the town, with easy access to the bypass, to keep traffic away from residential areas. Also with limited development sites available for housing within the town, these should be reserved for residential use rather than for use as waste sites. Further issues discussed included: WD01 " Monkeys Jump - there were some access issues and mitigating measures would be required to protect the AONB; WD02 " Old Radio Station - considered to be a very suitable site particularly as it was already developed and access issues could be addressed. It would be important for exiting lorries to use the bypass to travel east not to pass through the town; WD03 " South of Stadium Roundabout - there were concerns about flooding, impact on the cycle path/heritage i.e. Maiden Castle/the AONB and the implications of the Planning Inspectors final report on the Local Plan were		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>mentioned; WD04 " Charminster Depot - considered to be the best site for the vehicle depot; WD05 " Stinsford Hill - Access was good and exiting traffic could travel east very easily. This was considered to be the best site for both a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility. WD06 " Rainbarrow Farm - due to traffic concerns relating to the Monkeys Jump roundabout, there was uncertainty about the suitability of this site. WD07 " Loudsmill - Members considered this to be the most unsuitable site for any waste facility due to its proximity to residential housing, the narrow access road much with unsuitable surfacing and restricted exit roads leading to the bypass. WD08 " Parkway Business Farm - considered to be a potential site for the Household Recycling Centre although the deliverability issues appeared to make it unrealistic. Also the point was made that there could be better use for the site as employment land. Recommendation That Council supports the views of the Planning and Environment Committee and that Dorset County Council is advised that: Dorchester Town Council supports development of a Household Recycling Centre outside of the town; Dorchester Town Council considers that site WD05 " Stinsford Hill " is their first option for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility with suitable mitigation to protect impact on the landscape environment. Second option would be WD02 " Old Radio Station and third option would be WD01 " Monkeys Jump with mitigation measures to protect the AONB; Dorchester Town Council supports WD04 " Charminster Depot as the Vehicle Depot; Dorchester Town Council does not support the use of WD07 " Loudsmill " for any use as a future waste site. Planning and Environment Committee " 6 June 2016 Draft Minerals/Waste Sites Plan Update 2016 Committee members had looked at the update to DCCs Draft Minerals/Waste Sites Plan and were disappointed that Louds Mill was still identified as the preferred site for Dorchesters household recycling centre. Members considered that the wider area of land identified north west of Stinsford Hill should be the only household recycling centre for the town as this was a much more appropriate site being away from residential areas. The Committee reiterated the comments made at their meeting held on 21 September 2015 about these sites and agreed that these should be resubmitted to DCC. Resolved That</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								DCC be advised that Dorchester Town Council considers that (Site WP10) Stinsford Hill is their first option for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility and that it does not support the use of (WP11) Loudsmill for any use as a future waste site.			
PS D-WP 197	Inset 5 - Loudsmill, Dorchester					Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	40km west of BOH. No issues.		Noted	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 7	Inset 6 - Old Radio Station, Dorchester	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mr Terry Sneller	Mr Terry Sneller	The main issues for West Dorset related to the provision of new waste facilities in the west of Dorset including: additional green waste composting particularly in the west of Dorset, expanded sewage treatment facilities to serve Maiden Newton additional waste facilities around Dorchester comprising: expanded Household Recycling Centre (HRC) provision provision of a Waste Transfer Station provision of a waste vehicle depot The proposed Waste Transfer Station and Waste Depot at the Old Radio Station to the west of Dorchester is supported subject to adequate mitigation of landscape impact especially given its sensitive location within the Dorset AONB. Similarly the impact on neighbouring residential properties should be given full consideration at the planning application stage.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 35	Inset 6 - Old Radio Station, Dorchester	Yes	Yes	Yes	Dorset AONB Team	Mr Richard Brown	The AONB Team has previously stated that the use of this site would not necessarily generate significant adverse landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB, subject to appropriate design and mitigation. The site is located within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site occupies a relatively elevated location within the Dorchester Downs landscape character area, as defined by the AONBs Landscape Character Assessment. Although the site is already developed, it is in a sensitive location and visible from elevated locations, particularly toward the South Dorset Ridgeway, including Maiden Castle. In developing the site as a waste transfer facility, the overall aim should be to maintain the baseline position, as far as possible; to mitigate any additional effects arising from new development, and to achieve enhancement opportunities. A landscape-led masterplan approach is recommended, with reference to the following design considerations. Maintaining the baseline position: Retain the existing façade of the southern elevation Retain, safeguard and manage existing tree and shrub planting within the site Insofar as possible, the new structure should occupy the footprint of the existing building/s. However, this approach should not be strictly applied if it will result in a design that notably increases the apparent scale and mass of the building/s. Mitigating additional effects Suitable high quality materials should be used to achieve an aesthetically pleasing and low impact outcome. The use of recessive colours, non-reflective finishes,		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>natural cladding and/or textural variation may reduce the perceptibility of the development within wider views and reduce an industrial appearance of the development within closer views. The scale and mass of the building should be minimised. It may be necessary to set the building down at a lower level than the existing levels in order to achieve this. Furthermore, careful consideration should be given to the roof design, avoiding the use of a flat roof, which could appear overtly industrial if viewed on the skyline. Furthermore the mass of the structure/s may be addressed through variations in the design of the elevations " i.e. through apparent, if not actual, compartmentalisation. Security fencing, where strictly necessary, should be designed and positioned so as to minimise its visual impact from outwith the site. External lighting, where strictly necessary, should be designed and positioned to minimise light pollution. It should be recognised that the elevated location of the site may require further adjustment of lighting in a downward direction than might otherwise be necessary. Furthermore the hours during which external lighting is used should be minimised. New soft landscape treatment is likely to be required. This should be used to help integrate the development, particularly from undeveloped countryside locations. The new planting should augment the existing planting and may mimic the appearance of a hanger copse woodland, which is a recognisable landscape feature found elsewhere in the chalk downland context. Achieving enhancement The colour of the facade of the southern elevation could be changed in order to reduce its contrast with the surrounding environment. A review of signage, furniture and associated infrastructure should be undertaken in order to consider opportunities to reduce and centralise such features. This approach could extend to road signage in the surrounding area in line with the Dorset Rural Roads Protocol. Careful consideration should be given to the design of the gateway to site, including any boundary treatment and signage. Additional soft landscape treatment should utilise appropriate native species, provide enhancement opportunities for wildlife and help to conserve and enhance landscape character.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 177	Inset 6 - Old Radio Station, Dorchester				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	As previous comments, Highways England welcome the decision to allocate this site as a Waste Transfer Facility as opposed to a HRC. Highways England recognise that the trip estimates for the site operated as a transfer facility / depot are not at a level where a significant impact on the SRN would be expected (2,000 HGV movements per year, 10 cars per day, for the Transfer Facility, and 24 one way HGV movements and 40 staff cars per day for the depot). Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion, and any forthcoming application would need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base, providing information on trip distribution and timing		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 223	Inset 6 - Old Radio Station, Dorchester				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	FZ1 SPZ3 (most of site) No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage. Groundwater and contaminated land Site is located in SPZ3, Chalk aquifer " Principal designation. Whilst there is unlikely to be an objection in principle, this site is relatively high risk. The Chalk aquifer is a Principal aquifer used for Public water supply. It is likely that infiltration to the ground would be acceptable using a SUDS based strategy, assuming contamination is not discovered, and separated from groundwater (no infiltration) if contamination is discovered. As the site is has historical uses that may have been contaminative and will require demolition, site investigation and a piling (if used) risk assessment will be needed. If contamination of soils and groundwater is encountered at this site it is likely to be required to be removed or treated due to its location in SPZ3. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								considered for outputs and processes. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 198	Inset 6 - Old Radio Station, Dorchester					Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	45km west of BOH. Confirmation that all waste would be stored indoors and a monitoring programme to ensure the site's housekeeping is strictly managed to ensure no outdoor waste that would attract birds.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 389	Inset 6 - Old Radio Station, Dorchester					Individual	Mr Charles Anderson	Further to my call this morning I write to confirm that I remain positive about the Radio Station site being used a waste transfer station. As I mentioned I am somewhat concerned that DCC have perhaps not coordinated their plans with Dorset Waste Partnership. I understand from Simonds and Samson, DCC have contracted out their bus operation and they (S&S) have been engaged by DCC to sublet the areas occupied by both the bus station and the county rangers. So unless the timescale of the sublet of the bus station is coordinated it may conflict with DWPs plans. Also would DWP be content that a third party occupied the Rangers premises ?		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 17	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				Hurn Parish Council	Mrs Nicola Shaw	At a meeting of Hurn Parish Council on Monday 8 th January 2018, Parish Councillors resolved to respond to the consultation of the Draft Dorset Minerals and Waste Plan, as follows. DRAFT WASTE PLAN Hurn Parish Councillors strongly object to the inclusion of Inset 7 - Intensification of site including the management of non-hazardous waste at Eco Composting, Chapel Lane, Hurn. Councillors feel that the overall proposed intensification of waste tonnage through the site from 260,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 530,000 tpa is unacceptable in this location. 1. In particular, Councillors object to the proposal to increase the currently permitted 10,000tpa of residual waste to up to 160,000tpa with a Waste to Energy (WtE) Plant. The currently permitted 10,000tpa of residual waste was granted for disposal in a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) Plant which has never been built. Therefore, this proposal, in reality, is not actually to increase throughput from 10,000tpa (although granted) to 160,000tpa, but to increase from NIL to 160,000tpa. Currently no residual waste at all comes to this site. 2. The Eco site is located immediately adjacent to Bournemouth Airport, which is one of the 2 largest employment sites in Dorset. The Aviation Business Park prides itself on offering high quality employment accommodation. Aim Aviation moved into new premises in 2016, and Curtiss Wright moved into their new Headquarters in 2017. Both of these employers have around 500 staff each. The Bournemouth International Growth (BIG) Programme is to, (quote) Provide the single largest employment opportunity in the south east Dorset conurbation with the potential to create up to 10,000 new highly skilled jobs over the next decade . It will release up to 60 hectares of prime, flexible employment land for high quality new business premises at Aviation Business Park . 3. The Aviation Park has already experienced serious odour issues from the Eco Composting Site, which has resulted in bad press for the Business Park and one business has been given an air conditioning unit, as even after mitigation, on some days the business still cannot open their windows due to smells from the Eco Site. Eco Composting has a history of odour issues and the Environment Agency has placed enforcement measures on them in the past. 4. It is our understanding that the storage and processing of		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								residual /putrescible waste will cause odour. Also the incineration process will cause odour and emissions. Whilst no doubt, the usual mitigation will be offered, The Parish Council considers that to import up to 160,000tpa of residual putrescible waste to the Eco Site (when currently none is imported), in close proximity to the Aviation Business Park is an unacceptable HIGH RISK, which could damage the BIG Programme which is championed by the Dorset LEP. 5. It is noted that a stack height of 100m is proposed, which is unrealistic and inappropriate in this location, so close to an airport. 6. In addition, the Eco site is located very close to Dorset heathland SSSIs and the Moors River SSSI. Processing of this huge amount of waste via incineration will cause emissions which could be detrimental to the sensitive habitats. Currently there are no such emissions in the area. 7. The proposal will more than double the waste throughput through the Eco site, which will also massively increase the vehicular movements. The draft Plan suggests an increase from 560 to 840 vehicles per day. Roads surrounding the site are already heavily congested at peak times and this huge addition of HGV traffic will have a major detrimental impact by increasing congestion, especially for those employed at the Airport site. Since the traffic assessment was carried out the access road to the Berry Hill treatment works has been constructed. This will significantly increase the number of HGV movements. This increase has not been accounted for and therefore renders the traffic assessment invalid. All the causes of traffic both existing and planned need to be accounted for. Hurn Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed intensification of waste tonnage through the Eco Composting site from 260,000tpa to 530,000tpa.			
PS D-WP 145	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley		No	Yes	No	Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Mr Mike Thompson	We write to you on behalf of Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd (Eco) and with reference to the Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft, which is open for consultation from 1st December 2017 to 31st January 2018. The period of consultation relates to the Plans legal compliance and 'soundness' - whether it is considered to have been positively prepared and whether it is considered to be: justified, effective and consistent with national policy. These written representations refer to the Eco site at Chapel Lane in Parley, which is identified as an allocated site under Appendix 3 of the Pre-Submission	1. We submit that the red line boundary indicating the extend of Eco's Parley site should be extended to include an additional 1.04ha 2. We submit that Eco's Parley site has the potential to manage up to 220,000tpa of residual waste as opposed to the 160,000 tonnes per	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>Draft. More specifically, the site is identified on Inset Map No. 7. We welcome the proposed allocation of the Eco site at Parley, as referred to under Policy 3, which states that the site is allocated for its potential for intensification and re-development, including facilities for the management of non-hazardous waste . We also welcome that the site has been assessed for its potential to manage residual waste. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW Eco operate a comprehensive waste management and recycling facility at Chapel Lane in Parley and have been promoting this site for the prospective development of an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) to help deal with the Countys residual waste requirements. In this regard, we have made previous written representations during the consultation periods for the Draft Waste Plan, dating back to September 2015. As set out in our previous written representations, Eco are working alongside a development partner with a view to developing an ERF on the site at Parley. This project is being progressed with reference to the wider site and the over-riding objective of safeguarding existing and approved operations on the site, which provide an important service to Dorset County Council. WYG Planning are advising Eco with regard to the Waste Local Plan and drawing on our understanding of the sites planning history, we are advising on various planning considerations and environmental sensitivities that need to be taken into account as part of the project. Eco and their development partner have undertaken a feasibility study and technical analysis of the existing site, in order to inform the optimum location for an ERF. This process has indicated that the original western portion of the site provides the most suitable location to accommodate an ERF and Ecos development partner is seeking to design a facility that could accommodate a throughput capacity of up to 220,000 tonnes per annum. The proposed ERF design and site master-plan are currently being progressed by a specialist architect and space planner, with a view to providing a bespoke design which incorporates necessary design measures that are required for both aviation safeguarding and emissions dispersion, as well as taking account of operational requirements. OUR WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS ON THE PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT Having regard to the ~soundness of the Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft,</p>	<p>annum referred to in the Pre-Draft Subission.</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>we consider that the Plan is consistent with national policy and is broadly justified in terms of its policies. However, we would question whether it is effective and as such, our written representations relate to two specific points pertaining to Inset Map No. 7, which may be summarised as follows: 1) We submit that the red line boundary indicating the extent of Ecos Parley site should be extended to include an additional 1.04 hectares of land; 2) We submit that Ecos Parley site has the potential to manage up to 220,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) of residual waste, as opposed to the 160,000 tpa referred to in the Pre-Submission Draft. The planning justifications for both of the aforementioned points are set out in detail below. 1) Proposed Red Line Boundary of Site Inset Map No. 7 indicates a red line boundary for the site, which is based on the existing and permitted development, which was approved in August 2016 (Planning Ref: 8/14/0515). Please see Figure 1 below (attached) We are submitting that the red line boundary should include an additional 1.04 hectares of land, as indicated in Figure 2 below. The site accommodates a number of existing waste streams and processes and has planning permission for further processes that have yet to be constructed. Currently, the operating and approved activities include: ¢ Green waste composting; ¢ Soils and aggregates processing and recycling; ¢ Waste wood processing and recycling; ¢ Small Biomass Burner for waste wood; ¢ Road sweepings waste recycling; ¢ Drying Plant for processing of non-ABPR liquid waste; ¢ Bio-Energy Facility for waste wood (permission implemented, but not yet constructed); ¢ Anaerobic Digestion Facility for food waste (not yet constructed); ¢ Solid Recovered Fuels (SRF) Facility (not yet constructed). The proposed development of the ERF on the western part of the Eco site would necessitate the relocation of the existing composting processes. The composting processes are fundamental to Ecos operation at Chapel Lane and the over-riding objective is that these processes are safeguarded as part of the ERF project. It is therefore proposed that the ERF will form part of a reconfiguration of the wider site, with the composting operations relocated to the eastern/central part of the site. The existing composting operation has been operating within a constrained space in recent years and the relocation of the process to a new area within</p>			



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>the site would facilitate a more efficient operation. In order to reflect the planned reconfiguration of the site, an indicative masterplan drawing is being prepared to illustrate how the wider site would function with the ERF in place. The proposed red line boundary for the site is informed by the indicative masterplan and the need to safeguard the current key waste management processes " green waste composting, wood waste processing, food waste transfer, soils recycling, etc. The additional 1.04 hectares of land would essentially bridge the gap between the original western part of the site and the approved reed-beds at the eastern end of the site. The red line boundary that Eco are proposing for the site allocation has become necessary, in order to accommodate the inclusion of the proposed ERF and its associated infrastructure within the current site boundary. Eco can accommodate the ERF without requiring a like-for-like extension of the current site. This reduction in Ecos currently permitted operating site area will be accommodated through streamlining of the current site activities and a consolidation of the environmental management and services functions of the site. The overall site will therefore maximise resource efficiency, with a focus on recycling and recovery. In addition, the extension of the boundary is related to the need to address very specific environmental and airport safeguarding issues which could not be adequately addressed without siting the ERF at an angle to the rest of the site, so requiring a larger land take within the current permitted site boundary. In this regard, it is proposed that the established site boundary will be increased by approximately 1.04 hectares to accommodate the overall reconfiguration of the site. This increase in site area is less than that taken by the change in the ERF operating area. In addition, the increase in the overall throughput of the site over the Plan period will be facilitated through the widening and upgrade of Chapel Lane and the enhancement of the junction between Chapel Lane and Chapel Gate. These road improvement works were approved as part of the planning permission and associated Section 106 Agreement for the last comprehensive planning application (Planning Ref: 8/14/0515). The potential for increased resource efficiency can be demonstrated through a detailed look at the specific requirements of the relevant waste streams. Hence, the currently</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>permitted site at Parley has an area of approximately 15.44 hectares. Within this area, Eco is permitted to process some 266,000 tonnes per annum of waste, through various processes, some of which interlink. This gives a processing rate of 1.72 tonnes per annum of waste received for each square metre of the operating site. With reference to the red line boundary, Eco are now proposing the site would have a total area of 16.48 hectares. Within this area, the ERF building and associated operational area would occupy approximately 3.95 hectares. This would leave Eco with an operating area of approximately 12.54 hectares. Having regard to the forecasts in the Draft Waste Plan, Eco proposes to be receiving around 402,000 tonnes per annum of waste for recovery or recycling by the end of the Plan period. This gives a processing rate of 3.2 tonnes per annum of waste for each square metre of the operating site. As is demonstrated by the overall figures above, the increase in incoming waste tonnages, coupled with the decrease in actual operating area available to Eco under these proposals will mean that the site will have to become more efficient to allow it to continue to offer the current level of service to Dorset County Council. Eco do not feel this increase in efficiency will be an issue when the site is re-aligned to streamline current working. The more efficiently a waste management site can be used, the smaller area the site requires, thereby reducing the land take for this essential recycling/recovery operation. In order to provide some detail for the above, the following main waste streams and their associated areas are listed in the tables below. Table 1: Green Waste Composting Current Annual Tonnage 50,000 tonnes per annum Current Processing Area 24,770m<sup>2</sup> Current Processing Efficiency 2 tonnes per annum per m<sup>2</sup> Proposed Annual Tonnage 75,000 tonnes per annum Proposed Processing Area 26,860m<sup>2</sup> Proposed Processing Efficiency 2.8 tonnes per annum per m<sup>2</sup> As can be seen from Table 1 above, the proposed changes will mean that the site must improve the use of space for the green waste composting operations. Effectively, the site will have to increase the production per square metre by 40% to continue to deliver the current level of service. As the new compost area will be built for purpose, as opposed to taking over other processing areas, the use of space will be much more efficient,</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>assisting towards meeting the spatial efficiency requirements. Table 2: Total Wood Waste Processing (including CHP Biomass Burner) Historic Annual Tonnage 30,600 tonnes per annum Historic Processing Area 8,170m<sup>2</sup> Historic Processing Efficiency 3.75 tonnes per annum per m<sup>2</sup> Proposed Annual Tonnage 75,000 tonnes per annum Proposed Processing Area 19,530m<sup>2</sup> Proposed Processing Efficiency 3.84 tonnes per annum per m<sup>2</sup> The tonnage and areas used for comparison refer to the historical wood waste processing operation undertaken at Parley, prior to the move of the whole unit to Southampton Docks. This plant has been subsequently returned to Parley. The new plant and CHP Biomass Burner forms the basis for the proposed areas. The spatial efficiency of the wood processing operations will have to improve. On paper, this improvement will only need to be 2-3%, but this does not include the fact that around 2.9 hectares of this area is taken up by the CHP Biomass Burner, which has minimal stockpiling or processing area of its own. In reality, the wood processing will have to operate at around 4.5 tonnes per annum per square metre, a real increase of 20%. Table 3: Inert Construction Waste (Soils) Current Annual Tonnage 85,000 tonnes per annum Current Processing Area 13,500m<sup>2</sup> Current Processing Efficiency 6.3 tonnes per annum per m<sup>2</sup> Proposed Annual Tonnage 120,000 tonnes per annum Proposed Processing Area 15,310m<sup>2</sup> Proposed Processing Efficiency 7.8 tonnes per annum per m<sup>2</sup> The figures listed in Table 3 above demonstrate another need for improvement in the efficiency of the inert construction waste (soils) operation. This will be achieved through rationalisation of the stockpiling of materials and also the recent permission to increase the height of stockpiles. This time, the efficiency improvement will need to be around 24% to maintain current levels of service. Moving the soils processing area to the eastern end of the site (as approved under Planning Ref: 8/14/0515) will improve the total overall efficiency of the site and will also vastly reduce the amount of mud and dust generated within the weighbridge area. In summary, although Eco will be applying to extend the overall site area at Parley to maintain the current level of service to Dorset County Council and the companys other clients, the actual area for Ecos own existing and proposed operations will reduce by around 19%. This will require Eco to</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>streamline its operation further, which the company feels is possible, to allow the proposed tonnages to be processed by the site. In this way, Eco intends to continue to offer the excellent and efficient levels of service currently provided to Dorset County Council, as well as other Local Authorities and commercial clients. In summary, the extension of the red line boundary to accommodate the additional 1.04 hectares of land is considered necessary, in order to partially replace the land take for the ERF and so allow the site to operate efficiently and to continue to deliver its services. We therefore submit that this change would help to make the Waste Local Plan effective. 2) Potential to Manage up to 220,000 tpa of Residual Waste We welcome the fact that the Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft allocates the site as having the potential to manage residual waste. We would however propose that the figure of 160,000 tpa should be increased to circa 220,000 tpa. Chapter 7 of the Pre-Submission Draft forecasts that there will be a projected need for the County to deal with 352,000 tpa of non-hazardous residual waste by 2033. This means that there is an identified shortfall of 227,000 tpa of non-hazardous residual waste that will need to be dealt with by the end of the 15-year Plan period. Table 4: Capacity and Need " Non-Hazardous Residual Waste (tpa) 2015 2018 2023 2028 2033 Projected arisings / need 300,000 301,000 319,000 336,000 352,000 Capacity (recovery and landfill) all facilities 214,000 167,000 142,000 125,000 125,000 Identified shortfall -86,000 -134,000 -177,000 -211,000 -227,000 Further to the above table, the Identified Need Number 7 in the Pre-Submission Draft states as follows: "There could be a shortfall of approximately 227,000tpa in capacity for managing non-hazardous residual waste at the end of the Plan period. There is a need to make provision for facilities to manage residual waste. It is proposed to achieve this through allocation of sites for intensification or development (Insets 7 to 10). Of the four sites identified as having the potential to deal with residual waste during the Plan period, we consider that Ecos site at Parley represents the best location in terms of providing the requisite capacity to meet the identified shortfall. In this regard, we consider that circa 220,000 tpa of residual waste could be dealt with each year, which is almost consistent with the Countys identified shortfall over the Plan period. Eco are working</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>alongside their development partner and it is understood that an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) at this location would need to accommodate a throughput of circa 220,000 tpa to ensure project viability. In this regard, the project construction costs are higher to accommodate a bespoke design that will combine the need for aviation safeguarding with appropriate mitigation of emissions. The proposed site of the ERF lies within the Inner Horizontal Surface of Bournemouth International Airport. As such, Eco and their development partner are acutely aware that aviation safeguarding is of crucial importance to the development of the ERF. In order to acquire a greater understanding of the specific aviation safeguarding requirements, the Project Team has held a series of meetings with representatives of Bournemouth Airports Safeguarding and Management Team. The meetings have provided detailed advice with regard to matters such as the Inner Horizontal Surface, the Airports radar and local flight circuits. Ecos development partner commissioned AviaSolutions and their aviation expert, Mr Darrell Swanson, to provide specialist advice on aviation safeguarding and design. The advice confirmed that the Inner Horizontal Surface is at 54.4m AOD at the Airport, which is approximately 43m above ground level on the Eco site. This sets the height threshold beyond which physical development (the ERF building or stack) would result in a breach of the Inner Horizontal Surface. In addition, the Airports radar covers a distance of 55km or 30 nautical miles out from the airport. Hence, the physical development of the ERF needs to be considered with reference to potential radar reflections and shadows. The key sensitivities include the maximum height of the development in relation to the Inner Horizontal Surface, the impact on the operation of the radar and any impact on the local bird population to which the Airport is very sensitive. Subsequent design iterations have indicated that it is likely that the maximum height of the chimney can be less than the height of the Inner Horizontal Surface and will meet the likely requirements for dispersion of gaseous emissions. With reference to radar, the Project Team is working on innovative design features and material choices that will minimise the impact of the scheme on the operation of the radar. Alternative mitigation techniques are also available to run alongside passive building features and these are</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>being assessed in consultation with the Airport Safeguarding and Management Team. Having regard to bird management, it was agreed with the Airport that a revised bird management plan developed in consultation with the Airport would be undertaken. Generally, it was agreed that the likely result of the bird management plan would be an improvement over the base as-is case. A rigorous process of air quality modelling is fundamental to any proposal for an ERF and to determine the associated height requirement for the emissions stack. The need for a thorough examination of potential air quality impacts is necessitated by the fact that the Eco site is situated within an area where there are a number of sites of ecological interest, including SAC, SPA, RAMSAR and SSSI designations on lands surrounding the site. In this regard, the potential impacts arising from the dispersion of NOx and other emissions need to be fully understood. Having regard to the recent and comprehensive planning history on Ecos Parley site, the Project Team is mindful of the advice of both Dorset County Councils Ecologists and Natural England, and the level of information required for a Habitats Regulations Assessment. Comprehensive air quality modelling is being undertaken, in order to acquire a clear understanding of the projected emissions levels and stack height requirements. As referred to earlier in this letter, the design of the proposed ERF design is currently being progressed by a specialist architect. The building design will be bespoke and will not only remain below the height threshold of the Inner Horizontal Surface, but will seek to incorporate design measures to mitigate any reflection or shadow impacts on the Airports radar. The stack height and location will also be informed by the technical analyses being undertaken by the specialist environmental consultants. At this juncture, it is envisaged that the more height sensitive elements of the proposed building will comprise an alignment that mitigates against the risk of shadow on the Airports radar, whilst also seeking to achieve a height, scale and massing that can be accommodated from a landscape and visual perspective. To this end, the proposed ERF design is very much an iterative process that is dependent on specialist inputs. We would therefore submit that in order for the Waste Local Plan to be effective, it should identify Ecos site at</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							Parley as having the potential to manage circa 220,000 tpa of residual waste per year. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION In summary, we welcome the Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft and the allocation of Ecos site at Parley as having the potential for intensification and re-development, including facilities for the management of nonhazardous waste . We also welcome the fact that the site is recognised as having the potential to manage residual waste. However, we would submit that in order for the Waste Local Plan to be effective, it should include an extended red line for Ecos Parley site to accommodate the additional 1.04 hectares, as well as recognising its potential to manage up to 220,000 tpa of residual waste per year.			
PS D-WP 272	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England concur with the views set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment. The proposal raises concerns about net increases in aerial pollutants on the adjacent specially protected heathlands from transportation and the combustion processes proposed which would be acting cumulatively with a number of existing approved processes. Natural England is concerned that the authorities Waste Plan should have sufficient capacity elsewhere within the plan period to allow for the potential that this site will not be able to come forward. Natural England reminds the authority that where specially protected sites are not in favourable condition there is a duty to enhance them which should not be compromised by proposals which maintain the status quo.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 168	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	It is noted that the estimated increase in daily movements is from 560 to 840, around 30 additional trips per hour. Highways England does not consider this to be at a level that would cause significant impact on the SRN, and therefore does not require mitigation to be identified for us to support the allocation of the site in the plan. As per our previous comments, Highways England would welcome pre-application discussion, and any forthcoming application would need to provide information on trip distribution and timing.		Noted	
PS D-WP 291	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	Given that the proposed extension of this site would bring it adjacent to the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Dorset Heaths SAC/ Hurn Common SSSI, DWT supports the requirement for a comprehensive landscape and ecological scheme for the site, when any proposal comes forward, and particularly for it to include		Your support is welcomed	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							mitigation and enhancement opportunities for the eastern fields to benefit the adjacent international heathland sites.			
PS D-WP 224	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	FZ2 and FZ3 part of site. Authorised and historic landfills Adjacent Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Hurn Common SSSI No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Small part of site FZ2 and FZ3. Some flooding shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site " Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. FZ2 and 3 so Sequential Test may be required by the Local Planning Authority. Sequential Approach required. In accordance with NPPF a detailed FRA required to assess fluvial flood risk, and other sources of flood risk. FRA also to include management of surface water run-off. Fisheries and Biodiversity Site is adjacent Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA/ Ramsar and Hurn Common SSSI. Site borders close to watercourse leading to Moors River SSSI. Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage. Groundwater and contaminated land Existing waste site. This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. The site is currently an authorised landfill site and the new area will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. As the strategic waste planning authority (DCC), should the site need to close for any reason then due to the size of the site alternative contingencies need to be considered to deal with the volumes of waste that would need to be diverted from the site. As with all sites that handle		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>biowastes, whilst we permit sites and appropriate measures are applied this does not necessarily mean that odours and dust will not be present off site at some level. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 284	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				West Parley Parish Council	Mrs Linda Leeding	<p>Representations from West Parley Parish Council on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole pre submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017. This representation is made on behalf of West Parley Parish Council. (WPPC). We thank you for the opportunity to engage with the representation process of the Waste Plan. We are mindful of the fact that at this stage our representations have to be framed in relation to the Tests of Soundness as set out within the National Planning Framework (NPPF). As a Parish Council we do not have sufficient technical knowledge to comment as to whether the pre-submission Sites Plan is legally compliant and has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate Requirements. We have however taken cognisance of the observations made by both Christchurch Borough and Dorset County Councils on this matter, who appear satisfied. In respect of the current spatial strategy, we note it involves a strategic approach to Residual Waste Management. The strategy identifies the need to intensify/redevelop 4 existing operations within Dorset to meet the needs over the plan period. We have confined our comments to inset7-Eco Sustainable Solutions at Parley. This site has been assessed to have an additional capacity of 160,000tpa for residual waste. We further note that Dorset County Council have acknowledged that not all 4 sites will be required over the Plan period. It appears to WPPC that out of all the four 4 sites, the Eco Site has the most current constraints. These include: -impact on European habitats (Nitrogen deposition-on the heathland of Parley Common) -Impaction on strategic flood alleviation measures for the airport strategic employment site -airport safeguarding. -Odour from the site -Traffic, in particular the adverse impact on the B3073 corridor with the cumulative effect of tonnage increasing on their (Eco) figures from 560 movements per day to 840. That is without taking into account the impact of the development for Housing, a large store, offices and shops at the Parley Cross roads site; Berry Hill Sewerage Work traffic, expansion of the Hurn Airport Employment Site; the opening of Parkfield School and the continuing movement of vehicles from the Hurn Court Quarry. The WPPC are mindful of the efforts made by Eco to resolve management issues with the site in a timely manner. However, the impact</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								of all the current and proposed developments in the area means this location is totally unable to sustain further significant expansion at this point in time. The road infrastructure cannot cope. It is therefore this Councils considered opinion that the Eco Site should be deleted at this juncture. We have noted and agree fully with the detailed representations made by Christchurch Borough Council-inset 7,site (Eco) in response to Chapter 6, Policy 3 and adopted by that Council recently. It includes the shared concerns raised by our neighbouring Parish Council of Hurn.			
PS D-WP 310	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley					East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Inset 7 " Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley (WP05 in the update, WP CB 02 in original draft): Waste burning : We in EDFoE strongly oppose the proposed residual waste burning facility. To enable the operator to recoup the capital costs, there is a tendency for large and long-term contracts for residual waste, pushing waste down the waste hierarchy. This makes it difficult for waste management authorities to recycle. Clearing out the toxic flue ash is not nearly as simple or effective as Defra and the Environment Agency believe. Polluting gases also escape. Apart from the major environmental hazards such activity brings, there is no point in burning the waste directly as RDF is already being made in Canford Magna and		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								proposed at Mannings Heath. Other development : In general, EDFoE supports any other development here, subject to safeguards such as buffering from potential floods, as the operators have good environmental credentials. Potential for flood or rain caused water pollution must be closely monitored by the operator and by the Waste Planning authority.			
PS D-WP 199	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley					Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	1km north of BOH. The Airport has had discussions with an operator concerning the increased stack height and continues to object to the proposal; the airport requires more information on exactly what the site operation will be and how the operator intends to manage the likelihood of bird issues.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 301	Inset 7 - Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley				No	FCC Environment (UK) Ltd	Mr David Molland	The Plan indicates there is scope to re-develop and intensify waste management uses on the Eco Sustainable Solutions site and increase the capacity to manage larger quantities of waste. The current proposal is to replace the permitted Anaerobic Digestion plant with a waste to energy recovery plant. Although at this stage the form of technology is not specifically identified the Site is located in the Green Belt, where there is a presumption against inappropriate forms of development. The redevelopment of the Site for waste to energy uses would be considered "inappropriate development, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances could only be justified if it can be demonstrated that no suitable non-Green Belt sites exist. Furthermore, the "Development Consideration for Inset 7 requires that proposals for the Site should demonstrate that there would be no further harm to the openness and purpose of the Green Belt. Depending on the technology and design of a waste to energy recovery plant for the site this could involve development which is much larger than the existing or consented uses, particularly in terms of the heights of the buildings, and will require an emission stack which (depending on the technology and assessment work) is likely to be a minimum of 30-		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								70 metres in height. Taking this into account the Proximity of the Site to Bournemouth Airport could potentially give rise to concerns with aerodrome safeguarding. This will undoubtedly result in further harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and thus any proposal that comes forward on this site for strategic waste to energy uses will need to address the Development Considerations listed under Inset 7. Accordingly, any proposal for a waste to energy plant on the site may not comply with Policy 3 (b) of the Plan and thus would not be deliverable. The allocation of this site conflicts with national planning policy on Green Belt.			
PS D-WP 21	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole		Yes	No	No	Councillor (Borough of Poole) Marion Pope		The public consultation for this site showed intensification of use on land to the south-east of the existing site. Inset 8 of the Site Information document shows it to the west. As there has been no public consultation on this proposal, it cannot be said to have been prepared in accordance with Poole's Statement of Community Involvement. The sustainability appraisal (Impact on sensitive receptors) gives the nearest residential property as 250 metres distant and the residential area of Bearwood approximately 1 kilometre from the site. Poole Council has granted permission for 320+ houses on land south of Magna Road which will not only contribute to urban sprawl but will bring the built up edge of the conurbation much closer to the waste processing site. This is important because Poole Council has always refused to accept reports from the Environment Agency that there have been substantiated complaints of noise and smell from the existing operations. The draft Plan sees the increase in traffic generation as acceptable whereas it has been a major concern for those who live in the area, particularly in Bearwood. It should be noted that Poole's Transport Policy team has objected to a number of planning applications which would have an adverse effect on Magna Road traffic particularly at the junction with Knighton Lane. Among these are the Magna Business Park and associated estate of 320+ houses (Energy from Waste opportunities). The outline planning permission granted on appeal in 2014 was for 16,000 sq. m of employment use on the 17.6 hectare site. The question of housing use did not form part of the appeal. The low carbon energy from waste may only be used for commercial properties; not for	It would not be possible to make a sound plan for this site. Waste processing, however carefully managed can never be entirely nuisance free either from air or noise pollution. Last August Bank Holiday the area was blighted by a stench that made it difficult to be outside. Complaints to the Environment Agency were dealt with swiftly and it appears that bales of recycled material were left in an open sunny spot for the duration of the holiday which caused the stench. It highlights the folly of building houses even closer to the waste processing plant than at present.	Consultation on the extension of this site took place in 2015 - see the Draft Waste Plan (2015). See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							housing. As the developers would now prefer a mixed development on the 17.6 hectares this would appear to be not much of an 'opportunity'.			
PS D-WP 151	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole		Yes	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mrs Janice Doyle	Extension of this site and intensification of use can only result in an increase in noise and obnoxious smells affecting the surrounding area, which are particularly bad in the summer. As a result of the approval by Poole Council for 300plus dwellings on land south of Magna Road and to the east of this site, the urban area will be closer and more people affected. Intensification of traffic generation is also a major concern. The Magna Road is already heavily used and with the development of the houses and the Magna Business Park will further increase traffic using Magna Road and cause further intensification at junctions to the east and west.	Deletion of the extension and the intensification from this policy	See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.
PS D-WP 161	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole					Ramblers Association - Dorset Area	Jan Wardell	This site has been in use for several decades. In the section dealing with Public ROW it only mentions Poole BR 118, it should also mention Poole FP 125, the definitive line of which passes through the site . Although a diversion has been proposed and the appropriate consultation carried out to our knowledge no Order has ever been made and the diversion although possibly in use has not been made legal.		See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.
PS D-WP 176	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole					Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	It is noted that the estimated increase in HGV trips resulting from the increased capacity of the site is 13 additional HGV movements per day. which are not at a level where a significant impact on the SRN would be expected. Previous concerns remain the same, and Highways England would welcome pre-app discussion, and any forthcoming application would need to provide information on trip distribution and timing.		Noted
PS D-WP 273	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole					Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England concur with the views set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (7.2). Natural England advise that where screening is required to visually mitigate the proposal this should be within the facility and not reliant on maintaining vegetation within the designated sites.		Noted
PS D-WP 225	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole					Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	FZ1 Area of site shown to at risk of surface water flooding Historic landfill Lagoons and drains in site. Other waste sites in vicinity. No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in		See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity Site borders SSSI / SAC and SPA to the south of the site. Site is also close to a small watercourse leading to River Stour. Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage. Also there are numerous existing ponds on the Site Allocation Plan however recent aerial photos suggest these are now mostly hardstanding for vehicles. Mitigation for any loss of wet habitat should be provided. A network of ditches and open water is important to maintain the connectivity for species such as bats in the surrounding habitats. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 292	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole					Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	DWT welcomes the requirement for a landscape design and management plan for this site to include the retention of the existing trees and woodland to provide a buffer strip between the site and the SNCI woodland to the south. DWT agree that it will be important to consider the potential impact of continued use of the site on the long-term restoration and the potential biodiversity enhancements which should result from that. The continued delaying of restoration plans for minerals sites constitutes an overall biodiversity loss resulting from such plans, contrary to NPPF.		Noted	
PS D-WP 200	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole					Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	6.5km west of BOH. The airport requires more details about the proposed increased waste management: what is the waste and how is it to be stored?		See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 311	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Inset 8, land at Site Control Centre, Canford Magna (WP04 in the Update, WP PO 02 in original draft): Lagoon area : As we stated before, the lagoon area in the South West, marked off in the map, is inappropriate for development. It should be excluded from the plan. The waste operation must anyway have a wide margin between it and the SSSI to the South, so it is hardly worth developing the lagoon area, even if the lagoon is filled in. Other development : Within the Plan, there needs to be a clear opportunity for the experimental pyrolysis and gasification plant in this site to be expanded, if and when its operation is proven to be viable. Sustainability appraisal : additional foxes only follow their prey, the rats " if you control the rats, you dont need to control the foxes. Development considerations : ecological mitigation must include an extensive buffer between the site operation and the Canford Heath SSSI/ SAC/ SPA. Please also include preparation of a comprehensive landscape and management plan .		See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 189	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know	Individual	Ms Alison Potter	The magna road recycling facility states in its manifesto that it is 500m from Bearwood school the nearest property and 1km from the Bearwood residential area. This however is incorrect information for the future as Poole Council has granted permission for 300 plus houses which will be nearer the site. They state there are no houses within 250m of the site however these new builds will fall in between the school and the site. These homes are going to be subject to the noise, smell, lorry movements and air pollution this site creates. This is already suffered by the residents of wheelers lane near the school. The increase of site will affect the SSI of Canford Heath. Also the increased traffic will affect Magna Road.		See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 302	Inset 8 - Land at Canford Magna, Poole			No	FCC Environment (UK) Ltd	Mr David Molland	The site at Canford Magna, Poole is an existing waste management facility located entirely within the South-East Dorset Green Belt. The Pre-Submission draft of the Waste Plan proposes an extension to this allocation to address the identified shortfall in capacity for treatment facilities during the plan period. The allocation proposes to provide only a small amount of capacity (25,000tpa) which is not adequate to significantly address the identified shortfall. The supporting documentation associated with the allocation notes that the existing waste site is identified in Pooles Development Plan under Policy SSA26 "Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. However, this designation does not include the 0.66ha extension proposed as part of the Pre-Submission Waste Plan and therefore the extension remains unallocated Green Belt land. Notwithstanding this, consultation on the pre-submission version of Pooles new Local Plan closed in September 2017. When the plan is adopted (examination spring/summer 2018), it will supersede all existing policies, including Policy SSA26. The Plan does not propose that the site is allocated as a "Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. It is considered that additional "inappropriate development on this site within the extended area of the waste allocation may have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt and be at odds with the five purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The allocation of this site is not consistent with national planning policy on Green Belt and does not provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable non-Green Belt sites.		See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 105	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole	Yes	Yes	No	Individual	Mrs Sheena Hunt	This document is unsound because the following key considerations have NOT, in my view, been met: Key Development Considerations Proposals should incorporate improvements to ensure safe access and egress to and from the site. Site layout and design should provide capacity to ensure there is no potential queueing on the highway. Careful consideration should be paid to the amenity of local residents and nearby businesses and mitigation built into proposals to reduce effects from odour, dust etc.		The purpose of the development considerations is to set out, for each site, specific requirements, issues and opportunities that should be addressed through any planning application. The Waste Planning Authority will expect applications to show how the development considerations for the site have been addressed.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 274	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Mannings Heath, Natural England concur with the views set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (7.3).		Noted	
PS D-WP 175	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	It is noted that the proposals for this site are for either a SRF facility, or a RDF facility, with the same estimated trip generation for either (approximately 60-100 HGVs movements per day and 20 staff car movements). Comments remain the same - given that there are several routes that can be taken onto/off the SRN depending on sources or destinations of vehicles there is unlikely to be a significant impact on the SRN from development at this site. Highways England does not therefore require mitigation to be identified for us to support the allocation of the site in the plan. Early engagement with Highways England is welcome for any forthcoming applications.		Noted	
PS D-WP 226	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	FZ1 Area of site shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. Historic landfill Other waste sites in vicinity No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water runoff from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. It is likely that the site will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from		Your helpful comments are noted. See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 312	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole					East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	Inset 9, Mannings Heath (WP03 in the Update, WP PO 01 & 04 in original draft): We will object to the MBT (mechanical & biological treatment) plant proposed for this site, where residual waste would be converted to SRF/RDF for burning. The product would be mostly RDF, not SDF, whatever the proposal says. RDF still incurs a gate fee at the incinerator. To enable the operator to recoup the capital costs, there is a tendency for large and long-term contracts for residual waste, pushing waste down the waste hierarchy. This makes it difficult for waste management authorities to recycle. Also, there is already a sufficiently large SRF/RDF maker at Canford Magna MBT, with capacity to expand; also, the experimental pyrolysis and gasification plant there will probably be expanded, increasing capacity to take residual waste elsewhere than Mannings Heath. Once the plant is running, we have no problem with baled and wrapped SRF/RDF being stored outside. However, an alternative to plastic wrapping would be essential to avoid the use of virgin plastic. Site location : The site has moved from that shown in the original draft and update, which is fine as the new site was an "area of search" in the original plan. This move complies with the Officer Response to the update that suggested restricting the waste operation to land owned by SUEZ, who already operate a waste facility here. But what happens to the waste transfer operation if the present building is		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							converted to SRF/RDF? Co-location using the original sites : Other waste activities in the sites originally allocated for waste in the original draft could also be considered in the future. Where practicable, these areas may need a fairly wide buffer from the leisure centre, the superstore, light industry and residences. In the box on RDF, you say SDF as a result of cut and paste. Development considerations : should include preparation of a comprehensive landscape and management plan .			
PS D-WP 201	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	7km south-west of BOH. The airport requires more details about the proposed increased waste management: what is the waste and how is it to be stored? If it is food waste then a Bird Hazard Management Plan will be required.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 303	Inset 9 - Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole			No	FCC Environment (UK) Ltd	Mr David Molland	This small site, only 1.6 hectares, comprises an existing waste transfer station dealing with the receipt, bulking and transfer of commercial and industrial waste. The site consists of a group of waste processing, workshop, maintenance and office buildings surrounded by open parking and storage. Whilst the site might provide opportunities for the development of facilities for the management of non-hazardous waste, these are likely to replace existing local scale recycling uses and would not fulfil a strategic residual treatment role.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 25	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke	No	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Christopher Nother	Proposal 1: 1) Outputs from the process - Insufficient information regarding the following: a) The size of the project and its visual impact on the skyline. b) Its position in relation to residential conurbations and wind direction. c) The close proximity to environmentally sensitive areas (the river Piddle chalk stream and lowland heath). d) Heavy transport traffic generated on an inadequate local road system - unclear proposals regarding routes from other parts of the County. Proposal 2 & Proposal 3: a) Possible run off affecting the river Piddle. c) Traffic problems as suggested in response to Proposal 1	The projected traffic generation figures fail to include the routes to be used and the impact on local roads through residential conurbations such as Bere Regis and Wareham where roads are already inadequate for existing traffic at certain times. Proposal 1 (Advanced Thermal Treatment) fails to indicate the visual impact. Although the site at the moment does not have a major visual impact on the landscape except for users of the adjacent footpaths, any chimney/flue/air cooled condensers may well show for miles and be out of keeping with the rural environment. In addition, it is not clear how much air pollution there would be and how much of this would be contained by by APCR filtering and how much might escape into the environment. With major residential conurbations nearby and in the direction taken by the prevailing wind, more information is required. Proposals 2 and 3: Potential traffic problems have already been mentioned but I emphasise again that existing roads are inadequate for any additional traffic and that designated routes to the	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
									<p>facilities have not been suggested so that those affected can make more informed representation. There are also environmental issues for this location that appear not to have been addressed. The site is in close proximity to the river Piddle and any run off, without adequate buffering, is likely to filter through to the river because of the contours of the landscape in this area. The location itself is within an area of lowland heath which is under serious threat. Any expansion of the site is certainly unwelcome as this would further impact on the ecology and further break up the continuity of heathland tracts that is so essential for the survival of this rare environment. Perhaps a small facility catering for immediate local needs would have little additional impact but what is proposed means the shipping of waste from a much wider area with all the environmental problems that entails. More restoration projects are required to save the heathland and this aspect seems to have been given little thought in these proposals.</p>		

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 141	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke				Individual	Mr & Mrs GD & MS Bayliss	<p>Thank you for your letter dated November 30 th 2017 re the Draft Waste Plan for the areas as above. My wife and I own a property which is within 250m of the Binnegar environmental Park. We live on the 2000 acre Trigon estate, which comprises a working farm (home bred and raised beef, two trout farms, and woodland management), nine cottages, the Grade II Listed Trigon House, and South Trigon Farmhouse, which borders the R. Piddle and is a late Georgian/early Victorian property. All these dwellings lie to the NE of the proposed Waste Plan site, just over the border of the R. Piddle, which in itself marks the southern boundary of the Trigon estate. We would like to emphasise that the Trigon estate is, with the farms, a residential area, unlike the Waste Plan site and surrounding areas across the river to the SW of us which have many working quarries for sand, clay, and gravel. The prevailing wind is from the SW, and our concerns if the Waste Plan goes ahead are: The visual impact and noise from HGV movements on the track leading to the site, which is visible from our side of the river, and the noise from reversing lorries when working on the site. (When the site was in use a few years ago, the hours of work were reduced, as the impact was severe). The smell and poor air quality resulting from the waste management. The trout farm beds, which raise fish from fry to adult, are maintained by free-flowing water from the R. Piddle. In the event of a spillage from the proposed Waste Plan site where it borders the river, the fish in both farms would be seriously affected. Apart from the proposed site affecting the Trigon estate, we consider the most important reason the Plan is unsound is as follows: a) The increase in HGV traffic in the area can only be detrimental to the environment, and will put more pressure on already crowded local roads. Puddletown Road is a very minor road, (we believe rated ~C), but it is frequently used by private traffic and commercial vehicles servicing the industrial sites along its 4.5 mile length. b) The turning into the Puddletown Road from the A352 Wareham - Wool road is very sharp and narrow. Traffic coming from Wool cannot turn left there, all vehicles must travel on to the roundabout outside Wareham, then turn to approach the junction from the right. The traffic then has to be in the centre of the main road in order to access the Puddletown Road,</p>		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								which at that point has a sharp bend to the left and a 50mph speed limit as there are cottages lining both sides of the road. c) On average, the proposed Waste Plan site is scheduled to process some 2000 tonnes of waste per week. The extra volume of traffic in the area would definitely be detrimental to the nearby SSSI, SAC, SNCI, and the AONB with all the wildlife from deer, badgers, birds and newts, many of which are found only in this area of Dorset. We truly hope that all of the above will be taken into consideration when making your decision.			
PS D-WP 174	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke					Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	Proposals for Thermal Treatment Facility, Solid Recovered Fuel Facility, or Refuse Derived Fuel Facility. Given the traffic generation is expected to be lower than that currently permitted for the existing Environmental Park on the site, and the distance from the SRN, this allocation raises little concern.		Noted	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 275	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke				Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England concur with the views set out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (7.3.1)		Noted	
PS D-WP 255	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke		Yes	Yes	Purbeck District Council	Ms Anna Lee	The Council is pleased to see the inclusion of the Binnegar site.		Your support is welcomed	
PS D-WP 227	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Flood Zone 1. Area of site shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. Site is adjacent to Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, and Stokeford Heaths SSSI. River Piddle and associated floodplain is approx 50m to the east of the site boundary. No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity Site is adjacent to Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar, and Stokeford Heaths SSSI. Ecological survey likely to be required at planning application stage. Potential runoff will be the main issue here. It appears from the aerial photographs that the operations are only 40m away from River Piddle. The River Piddle is important for migratory salmonids. It is essential an adequate buffer is maintained to protect the watercourse. Groundwater and contaminated land We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire		Your helpful comments are noted. See also separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							Prevention Plan. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 213	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke	No	No	No	Arne Parish council	Mrs Amanda Crocker	<p>Arne Parish Council have considered this proposal and strongly objects. It is the opinion of this Parish Council that the Waste Plan fails to meet sustainability criteria, and is, therefore, not legally compliant for the following reasons: Sustainability Social and environmental factors have not been taking into account: - There are 24 properties situated along the southern end of Puddletown Road. They already suffer the intrusion of noise and lorry movements on a daily basis. Any of the proposals would significantly add to this. Proposal 1 would also add the visual intrusion of a stack extending to 29m above ground level. In addition, there is a possibility of increased emissions of NOx and ammonia from the combustion of waste on the site. This will be exacerbated by the fact that the stack will be closer to ground level than would normally be the case. No consideration has been given to the effect this will have on these properties and no impacts assessments have been carried out. The Parish Council further believes that the Plan is not Sound for the following reasons: Justification - No surveys have been carried out to assess the possible impact of contaminants entering the groundwater on the nearby fishery or the nearby SPA, Ramsar and SSSI sites. Effective - The Plan states that it is 'understood' that there is a viable and feasible grid connection on the western side of Wareham. This should be confirmed before any action is taken or any decision made. - Traffic - no robust transport plan is included with the proposal and, whilst the Plan may not lead to significant increases in HGV movements in the Dorset and Poole areas, it would lead to very significant increases in movements around the Wareham area. The road network in this vicinity is already stretched to capacity and frequently to breaking point during the summer holiday season. The junction with the A352 is difficult to navigate for any vehicle coming from the west and the Purbeck roundabout at the junction of the A352 and A351 is often congested. The A351 through Sandford suffers constant traffic holdups and the alternative route via the Puddletown Road is narrow and well-used by</p>	The main population of Dorset (65%) lives in the eastern part of the county, but this proposal suggests bringing the material that would have gone to the Beacon Hill site to this site, rather than to a site closer to where it is produced. There are several sites in East Dorset that would be better suited to take this material and would lead to less impact on the surrounding, often rural, road network. The cost of the resultant traffic coming into Purbeck and the damage to roads does not appear to have been considered.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							cyclists and runners. - The speed limit along the Puddletown Road to the south of the proposal, passing the residential properties is 50mph. There are already regular calls for this to be reduced to 30mph as residents find difficulty in exiting their driveways. This section is also a favourite for dog walkers and there are no footpaths here. With lorries getting larger and larger, it is very intimidating to have to have to walk along a narrow grass verge with lorries passing at speed. - All the proposals will lead to an increase in the dust levels around the area. No studies have been carried out to determine what effect this will have on the properties. Consistent with National Policy - In contravention of the Wildlife & Country Act - No studies have been undertaken to fully assess the effect the increase in NOx and ammonia levels, together with the increase in dust will have on the adjacent heathland, local populations of rare breeding birds and reptiles. - The storage of waste on the site will lead to an increase in rats and foxes. No studies have been undertaken with regard to the effect this will have on ground nesting birds, reptiles or indeed, on the nearby properties. - No archaeological assessments have been carried out and the effect on the nearby Scheduled Monument have not been assessed. - No studies have been undertaken to assess the impact of a landfill fire as happened at the Trigon site in September 2014. According to statistics, in the years 2001-2012, the average rate of fires at waste and recycling works was just under one a day. The environmental impact of such a fire at this site would be devastating to the nearby heathland, watercourses and the properties.			
PS D-WP 202	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	24km south-west of BOH. If the site continues to be inert waste type then it will not cause issues however, any food waste proposal or the mentioned composting plant would need some further discussion and certainly a Bird Hazard Management Plan.		Noted	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 293	Inset 10 - Binnegar Environmental Park, East Stoke				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	DWT still has great concerns regarding the inclusion of this site for the proposed intensification of waste treatment activities. The Officers Response to the 2015 consultation stated that: 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. The officer further commented that 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. The comments finished by saying 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 . DWT does not believe that the new proposals negate any of those arguments. On the contrary, the proposals which include the possibility of an Advanced Thermal Treatment facility (gasification) are likely to have a more damaging impact on the surrounding designated International Sites than the previous proposals. The assessment of the county ecologist states that it would lead to increased emissions of NOx and ammonia from the combustion of waste on site, onto the adjacent designated heathland. These emissions are likely to have a greater impact than normal as the stack height will be reduced by the plant being constructed in the 26m deep void of the previous quarry leading to the emissions plume being much closer to the ground than usual. Substantial mitigation measures will be required to ensure no significant impact as a result. In addition the potential effects of noise, dust disturbance from increased traffic and run-off resulting from any of the three proposed options will need to be mitigated to a level which ensures no significant impact on Annex 1 birds or other species typical of the European sites. We accept that the wording in Policy 3 resulting from the HRA Screening report is intended to ensure suitable		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>mitigation as far as practicable at this stage, but still feel that this is not an appropriate site for the above reasons. Finally, we believe that this proposed development will impact on restoration plans for the area, which will make it difficult to be compliant with the Puddletown Road Policy in the concurrent Minerals Sites Pre-Submission Plan 2017.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 5	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton		Yes	Yes	West Dorset District Council	Mr Terry Sneller	The main issues for West Dorset related to the provision of new waste facilities in the west of Dorset including: additional green waste composting particularly in the west of Dorset, expanded sewage treatment facilities to serve Maiden Newton additional waste facilities around Dorchester comprising: expanded Household Recycling Centre (HRC) provision provision of a Waste Transfer Station provision of a waste vehicle depot The proposed green waste composting facility at Bourne Park, Piddlehinton is supported however it should be noted that the Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan has been successful at examination and therefore the plan, as amended, would carry great weight in decision making. The Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan expresses several concerns about further development at Piddlehinton Enterprise Park and Bourne Park. These can be summarised as follows: Access to Bourne Park being through the existing Piddlehinton Enterprise Park rather than via London Row. Due to its sensitive location, adjacent to the AONB and on higher ground, development should be sensitively designed. Lighting on the site should be kept to a minimum to reduce its impact. The historic character of Piddlehinton Camp needs to be taken into account. It is noted that the Waste Plan includes a number of requirements alongside the Bourne Park proposal to guide the development of the site. It is however important that the concerns set out in the Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan are given full consideration at the planning application stage.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 22	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton		Don't Know	Don't Know	Individual	Claire Hudson		Please do not allow even more heavy lorries to come through this Valley. Already, we have at least 200 lorries a day rattling through and, while I appreciate the good work food recycling will do, the carbon footprint incurred transporting these goods will far outweigh the benefits of recycling. Please do not let increased profits at bourne Park make our	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								roads even more dangerous for our children, our elderly walkers, our wildlife and our environment. Please keep me informed as to what else I can do to stop this further danger to our roads.		
PS D-WP 33	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton				Individual	Ms Rebecca Pearce	Yet another waste facility at Bourne Park, ironically garden waste, with the idea that this will be another green policy is far from green. The carbon footprint from transporting garden waste from the west of the county is far greater than any green policy. Quality of life in Piddlehinton has deteriorated over the last few years due to the huge amounts of heavy lorries going up to Bourne Park. Has anyone monitored the heavy traffic in Piddlehinton and the impact on the stone bridge in Rectory Road?		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 66	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	No	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Graham Habgood	Supporting document Inset 11 (Bourne Park) Waste Plan Site allocation paragraph dealing with Traffic generation - states green waste composting capacity will be 6500 tonnes pa - increasing vehicle movements by 35 to 40 vehicles pa. This is hardly credible considering that Section 5 of the plan - Spatial strategy - states that increased levels of collected green waste means there is an estimated shortfall in capacity for dealing with green waste of 37000 pa. As Bourne park is the only new green waste site proposed, this shortfall will fall on its shoulders and therefore increase traffic movements considerably.	Traffic generation and increased vehicle movements should be considered holistically over all facilities at Bourne Park as part of the Draft Waste proposals, before any consideration is given to increasing activities there. Until measures are put in place to stop LGVs from using rat-runs to Bourne Park, Rectory road in particular, there should be no further development. This part of Piddlehinton is in a conservation area and there are already unacceptable adverse impacts on residents and the environment associated with large numbers of LGV movements. The road is narrow with soft verges that are being eroded away and properties facing directly on to the road being subjected to noise, vibration, mud and pollution. There is an ancient bridge over the River Piddle which is a single track and subject to loads of 40 tonnes or more and at the junction with the B3143, which is on a blind bend, drivers have to make a right turn with a heavy slow moving vehicle. In addition there is a bus shelter at this junction where school children wait for and alight from school buses.	See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								Piddlehinton has a high number of 'older' residents, young cyclists, horse riders, hikers and backpackers all sharing roads without pavements with fast moving LGVs. The Site plan Development Considerations states that access to the site must not be via London Row. This should be extended to other roads, especially Rectory Road. All LGVs travelling to Bourne Park must be made to use the A35 Dorchester bypass and B3143 and prohibited from using the rat-runs to access site so that this conservation area is safeguarded for future generations and DCC honour their Rural Roads Protocol.		
PS D-WP 61	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton				Individual	Mr Nick Harland	The predictions of traffic in the Piddle Valley are based on an estimated total increased capacity at Bourne Farm of 6,500 tpa, which (assuming an average load weight of 7.5 tonnes) you say would give rise to 35 " 40 one-way truck movements per annum. Not sure who is doing the maths but 6500/7.5 is 866 movements per annum, and this is only one way! The Local Highways Authority has no objection on the basis of 35-45 but the actual number is ridiculously in excess of this. Have they stopped to question the application - it looks like they haven't? Is this submission in Inset 11 designed to deliberately mislead in order to obtain approval? This comes on the back of an estimated 6500 movements p.a. for the anaerobic digester (25x5x52 from Inset 11). The B3143 is completely inadequate to deal with this weight of traffic and I would like to ask at what stage does the Highways authority judge that there will be simply too much traffic on this already very busy road which acts as the north Dorchester		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							bypass? When I attended the hearing for the AD planning application Councillors acknowledged that this road was already saturated but the AD still went ahead. Now we are to get (if approved) another massive increase in traffic movements.			
PS D-WP 180	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	Inset 11 states that the development of green waste composting based on an estimated total capacity of 6,500tpa would give rise to 35 " 40 one-way truck movements per annum. This level of trip making does not raise concerns for Highways England		Noted	
PS D-WP 228	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	2017 constraints SPZ1 FZ1 2016 constraints SPZ1 FZ1 No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. Flood Risk The Lead Local Flood Authority (Dorset County Council) should be consulted on the proposals as they may have information on flooding relevant to this site. Fisheries and Biodiversity No comments. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is in SPZ1, approximately 250 m from Carters Farm Barn private water supply (PWS) to the north and 500 m of Bourne Farm Piggery PWS to the south. Outcrop Chalk (Principal Aquifer). No objection in principle provided that the following points are addressed. Open Windrow composting has the potential to cause contamination if leachate is not managed adequately. We would expect that the drainage strategy would not allow infiltration or discharge to the ground of leachate or contaminated water and that a risk assessment is completed, Waste management Proposed site is likely to need a Bespoke Environment Permit from the EA. Sealed drainage required due to types of waste on site. All new permits will need to provide an approved Fire Prevention Plan. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological/ Contaminated land risk assessment Environmental Permit		Noted	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 316	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	No	Yes	Yes	Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Mr Mike Thompson	<p>These written representations refer to the Eco site at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton, which is identified on Inset Map 11 in the Pre-Submission Draft. The site is allocated to address the identified need for additional capacity for the management of green waste in western Dorset. We welcome the proposed allocation of the Eco site at Bourne Park for green waste composting. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW The Eco Sustainable Solutions Site at Bourne Park is an existing waste management site with planning permission for an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility, which was obtained in June 2010 (Planning Ref: 1/D/2008/0989). The AD Facility was designed to process 25,000 tonnes per year of organic domestic and commercial waste and 12,000 tonnes of agricultural slurry arising from local pig farms. The facility would generate up to 1,000KW of power, via a CHP engine driven generator, for supply to the Local Distribution Network, whilst the final digestate would be used on farms as a soil improver or conditioner. The AD Facility commenced operation in late-2012, was developed out to fulfil the current Planning Permission in 2015 and is now generating 1,600kW, 60% more than originally planned, due to Ecos operational management and the quality of waste inputs. OUR WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS ON THE PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT The Pre-Submission Draft identifies the Eco site at Bourne Park as being suitable for green waste composting. The Pre-Submission Draft refers to the following development considerations: 1. The scale, height, mass and overall design of all structures, boundary features and other infrastructure, including lighting, should respect the site's overall open character and help to minimise landscape and visual impacts. 2. Assessment of the potential impact on Scheduled Monument 1004550 ('Round Barrow SW of Bourne Farm'). 3. Access to the site should be via the existing Piddlehinton Enterprise Park, avoiding London Row. 4. Phase 1 habitat survey to accompany and inform application. 5. Archaeological assessment and/or evaluation to accompany and inform application. WYG has made previous written representations during the consultation periods for the Draft Waste Plan, dating back to September 2015. We consider that the aforementioned development considerations can be satisfactorily addressed as part</p>	We consider that the Pre-Submission Draft Waste Plan is legally compliant and sound. Our written representations provide clarification on the site assessment.	Our records show that the site is classified as Grade 3 Agricultural Land.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								<p>of a prospective planning application. The Pre-Submission Draft assessed the potential for the site to accommodate a green waste composting facility on the basis of a total capacity of 6,500 tonnes per annum. We wish to provide clarification with regard to the traffic movements that would be generated by this throughput. Based on an approximate average load of 7.5 tonnes, it is anticipated that the green waste composting operation would generate around 16/17 deliveries per week, or 3 deliveries per day. This equates to an average of up to 34 one-way traffic movements per week, or 6 one-way traffic movements per day. The site would also generate a similar number of export vehicle movements, to take the finished compost away from the site, with 34 one-way traffic movements per week, or 6 one-way traffic movements per day. The anticipated traffic movements are set out in Table 1 (See attached written rep for details) The projected figure of 12 one-way traffic movements per day is equivalent to one movement per hour, which we consider can be accommodated by the existing site access and haul route. The Site Assessment underpinning the proposed site allocation also details the site as having a Grade 3 Agricultural Land Classification. We wish to note that the area around the site does have a Grade 3 classification according to Natural England in the South West Region Agricultural Land Classification Plan produced in 2010. However, the western half of the area proposed for the site comprises a mix of poor planted trees and scrub. This planting also extends as a c.10m wide belt along the northern boundary of the area. This means that only around half of the area of the site is available for agricultural use and as such, the impact on availability of agricultural land is not as great as might be perceived. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION In summary, we welcome the Waste Plan Pre-Submission Draft and the allocation of Ecos site at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton as having potential to accommodate a green waste composting facility. In this regard, we consider that the proposed allocation of the site is sound and in accordance with Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework, as it is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p>			

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 313	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton				East Dorset Friends of The Earth	John Gunn & Jenny Ansell	East Dorset FoE supports this site.		Your support is welcomed	
PS D-WP 203	Inset 11 - Bourne Park, Piddlehinton				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	38km west of BOH. No issues.		Noted	
PS D-WP 136	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works		Yes	Yes	North Dorset District Council	Mr Edward Gerry	Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works The Council notes that Policy 3 (Sites allocated for waste management development) allocates Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works for an expansion of its existing activities. The Council has no objection to this proposal. However, any future development should not lead to unacceptable levels of odour to the occupiers of nearby residential properties.		It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan.	
PS D-WP 155	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works	Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Bernard May	Whilst it calls for an odour plan the fact that the proposed site extension takes the treatment works closer to existing properties needs to be properly considered.	Consideration must be given to siting the extension to the west of the existing access lane( other side of the road) to maximise the distance from existing habitations which already suffer odour issues on occasions.	It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan. Issues of odour management will be considered in detail through this application.	
PS D-WP 152	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works	Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Bernard May	The proposed extension of the sewage treatment works moves the site closer to human habitation and will thus extend the current nuisance due to odours from the plant and this does not seem to have been properly addressed .	The extension area for the treatment works needs to be aligned away from existing houses and consideration should be given to extending the plant across the access lane to keep it as far away as possible from the existing houses.	It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan. Issues of odour management will be considered in detail through this application.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 172	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works				Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	As previous comments, additional traffic generation is minimal and does not raise concerns		Noted	
PS D-WP 229	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Flood Zone 1. Area of site shown to be at risk of surface water flooding. River Stour located approximately 60m to the east of the site. No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water runoff from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity The proposed site appears to be on improved pasture or arable therefore the impacts on biodiversity are likely to be minimal. There is a substantial tree lined buffer between the site and the watercourse, as well a railway line, which also provides an artificial buffer between the river and the proposed development. Gillingham is a water vole core area and otters are also known to be present on the River Stour, but these species are unlikely to be affected unless the detailed proposals include impacts on the river and river corridor. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste management If there are any plans to install combined heat and power (CHP) units or any other potentially permissible waste activities that could be caught by existing or new regulations then an environmental permit maybe required. There will be the introduction of the medium combustion directive for instance, which will catch new combustions engines with a thermal input of >1MWthinput and <50MWthernmal input in December 2018. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk		It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan.	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
							assessment Flood Risk Assessment Environmental Permit			
PS D-WP 162	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works				Ramblers Association - Dorset Area	Jan Wardell	Under Site Assessment, Public rights of way it is stated Footpath N64/50 runs through north west corner of site. Footpath N64/51 joins N64/50 at 50m to west of site. Would require diversion of N64/50 and part extinguishment of N64/51. DCC Rangers discussed this with Wessex Water. The Summary states Development would require diversion and part extinguishment of public right of way N64/51. I would agree that N64/50 would need diverting, however, I would question the reason for the part extinguishment of N64/51.		It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan. If the site allocation is retained in the Waste Plan a modification will be proposed to update details regarding rights of way diversions.	
PS D-WP 294	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	DWT welcomes the inclusion of a comprehensive landscape masterplan which aims to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation, trees and hedgerows within the Development Considerations. Such a masterplan should include only native species planting to ensure that enhancements benefit biodiversity as well as landscape.		It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation. Issues of landscape and biodiversity protection will be considered in detail through this application.	
PS D-WP 204	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	41km north-west of BOH. This extension to an existing sewage plant would not cause any issues.		Noted	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
	Treatment Works									
PS D-WP 163	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works		Don't Know	Don't Know	No	Individual	Mr Bernard May	I consider the section is unsound because it does not fully explore the issues related to odour and impact on existing properties. The extension as planned will take the odour and noise from the treatment works closer to existing properties.	It is insufficient to simply require an odour management plan. The proposed site for the extension could be sited alongside the railway line to avoid taking it any nearer to the current properties and although this might take it into the possible flood zone part of the existing works is already within that area so it is essential that this alternative is explored and listed as a requirement in the policy.	It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan. Issues of odour management will be considered in detail through this application.
PS D-WP 380	Inset 12 - Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works			No		Dorset Local Access Forum	Mr Paul Tomlinson	The sustainability assessment of this particular site is unsound. It proposes the diversion of a public footpath N64/50 and the part extinguishment of N64/51. The need to divert N64/50 (presumably onto a new alignment immediately skirting the works) is understood, but no evidence is provided of any need to extinguish any part of N64/51.	The reference to Public Footpath N64/51 should be removed from the document.	It should be noted that Planning permission has been submitted for the expansion of Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works. It is likely that Planning Permission will be granted and the Waste Planning Authority will put forward a modification to remove this allocation from the Plan. If the site allocation is retained in the Waste Plan a modification will be proposed to update details regarding rights of way diversions.
PS D-WP 6	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works		Yes	Yes	Yes	West Dorset District Council	Mr Terry Sneller	The main issues for West Dorset related to the provision of new waste facilities in the west of Dorset including: additional green waste composting particularly in the west of Dorset, expanded sewage treatment facilities to serve Maiden Newton additional waste facilities around Dorchester comprising: expanded Household Recycling Centre (HRC) provision of a Waste Transfer Station provision of a waste vehicle depot The proposed expansion of the Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment		Your support is welcomed



Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan		Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
								Works is supported subject to adequate landscape mitigation and consideration of the impacts on the internationally protected Poole Harbour wildlife site.			
PS D-WP 36	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works		Yes	Yes	Yes	Dorset AONB Team	Mr Richard Brown	The AONB Team considers that the use of this site would generate some adverse landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB. There may be opportunities to mitigate these effects through design and a comprehensive landscaping plan. The site is located in the Upper Frome Valley landscape character area, close to the settlement of Maiden Newton. The pattern of development in this area is concentrated within the valley floor. The broad scale valley containing the site is incised with frequent coombes, such as Langcombe Bottom, where the proposal is located. Such coombes generally have a more intimate character than the wider valleys and can be particularly susceptible to change. Of the options presented it is considered that option A is likely to be less harmful to the character of the area, principally because the option B would extend development onto higher ground, which would be likely to make the it both more prominent and widely visible. Overall the AONB team recommends that the development would require a detailed landscape assessment and effective mitigation measures, detailed within a comprehensive landscape plan.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	
PS D-WP 277	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works					Natural England	Nick Squirrel	Natural England does not object to the proposed extension in respect of Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar. Under the Urban Waste Water Directive the water company is required to remove 75% of nutrients from additional urban development and the District will need to ensure that additional residential units are nutrient neutral through the Nitrogen Reduction in Poole Harbour SPD.		Noted	
PS D-WP 179	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works					Highways England	Mr Steve Hellier	As previous comments, additional traffic generation is minimal and does not raise concerns.		Noted	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 230	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works				Environment Agency	Ms Katherine Burt	Flood Zone 1. River Frome is approx 200m west of the site. Small area of site shown to be at risk of surface water flooding at edge of site. No objection to the proposed site allocation, provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage. Also subject to addressing the comments raised below. This development is required because of improvements required under the Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. Flood Risk No flood risk concerns from our point of view. Our Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA) applies in respect of surface water drainage. Fisheries and Biodiversity There are records of the Marsh Fritillary butterfly in the lowland calcareous grassland, where the extension is proposed and further investigation may be needed. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste management If there are any plans to install combined heat and power (CHP) units or any other potentially permissible waste activities that could be caught by existing or new regulations then an environmental permit maybe required. There will be the introduction of the medium combustion directive for instance, which will catch new combustions engines with a thermal input of >1MWthinput and <50MWthernmal input in December 2018. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Contaminated land risk assessment Ecological study Environmental Permit		Noted	
PS D-WP 206	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works				Bournemouth Airport	Mr Paul Knight	50km west of BOH. No issues.		Noted	
PS D-WP 295	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works				Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dr Sharon Abbott	Given the proximity to large areas of SSCI grassland, DWT supports the requirement for a Phase 1 & 2 habitat survey, botanical survey and reptile survey to inform any application on this site.		Noted	

Comment ID	Section of the Waste Plan	Question 3 - Positively Prepared	Do you consider the document is legally compliant?	Do you consider the document is Sound?	Respondent	Full Name	Details of why the document is not legally compliant or unsound?	Details of what changes are considered necessary to make the document legally compliant	DCC Officer Comments	Modifications
PS D-WP 209	Inset 13 - Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works				Maiden Newton Parish Council	Mrs Sally Falkingham	Maiden Newton Parish Council discussed the Draft Plan at their meeting on 4 January. They wished to fully support all the proposals made in the Draft Plan but I was asked to bring the following to your attention:- Inset 13. Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works. Extension to Existing Treatment Works This scheme has already placed before, and welcomed, by our Council. When is it likely to be implemented? On 4 January I was asked to repeat our concerns about the traffic to the existing site, both day and night, by heavy lorries. The access road from the A356 is breaking up and debris is being washed onto the main road whenever there is heavy rain.		See separate report for detailed response to issues raised to site allocations.	