

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 4	1	Introduction	Mr Robin Warner	Crown Estate	Please see document attached to this representation.	
PSD - MSP 156	1	Introduction	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Interactive Map Congratulations on the visualisation of Mineral Sites and associated areas that you have achieved using the overlays in the Dorset Explorer map. This has been better than expected and exceedingly helpful.	
PSD - MSP 290	1	Introduction	Ms Anna Lee	Purbeck District Council	Purbeck District Council considers that the Mineral Sites Plan is sound and legally compliant. In particular, the Council supports the proposed policy MS-3 (Swanworth Quarry Extension), which will facilitate the retention of local jobs.	
PSD - MSP 290	1	Introduction	Ms Anna Lee	Purbeck District Council	Purbeck District Council considers that the Mineral Sites Plan is sound and legally compliant. The Council also welcomes the proposed policy MS-8 (Puddletown Road Area Policy) which aims to achieve a consistent and co-ordinated approach to development in this area.	
PSD - MSP 261	1	Introduction	Dr John Miller			

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 312	1	Introduction	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>Thank you for consulting Dorset Wildlife Trust about the above plan. We have the following comments to make: 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.</p> <p>We assume that all relevant comments to previous versions of the plan, not mentioned here, will be carried forwards unless the issues have already been resolved through amendments to create this version e.g. by the removal of an allocated site.</p> <p>Finally, Dorset Wildlife Trust welcomes the decision not to include the following sites in the Minerals Pre-submission Draft Plan: AS-08 Horton Heath AS-28 Gallows Hill Site A AS-28 Gallows Hill Site B</p> <hr/> <p>Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel</p> <p>3 a. AS-06 Great Plantation DWT retains great concerns about the allocation of this site in the Plan, as we believe it will be very difficult to adequately mitigate the likely impacts of mineral extraction on European Sites and species associated with them including Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Nightjar. However, we recognise that the size of the proposed allocated site has been reduced to remove any area of SAC/SPA from within the minerals development area, and we see from the details within the HRS screening report that a heathland support area has been proposed to mitigate the effects of displacement of recreational activity onto the nearby European Sites, as well as additional heathland within the allocated site. Provided that all of the measures outlined in the HRA screening report are adhered to and that any planning proposal for mineral extraction in this area is shown to have reduced biodiversity impacts on European Sites and their associated species to non-significant levels before planning permission is granted, then we will not retain an objection to its inclusion within the Plan.</p> <hr/> <p>3 b. AS-09 Philliols Farm DWT welcomes the recognition of the need to protect both the Bere Stream SSSI and Philliols Coppice SNCI as well as the Fairy Shrimp in any proposed mineral developments at this site, with mitigation required to be implemented. A buffer to the River Piddle at the southern end of the site should also be maintained. We are also pleased to see that the restoration vision states that restoration to a heathland and semi-natural grassland /scrub mosaic is the key objective to link with existing heathland sites. DWT strongly supports this.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>3 c. AS-13 Roeshot, Christchurch DWT welcomes the requirement for mitigation against direct and indirect impacts on the Southern Damselfly and its habitat along the Mude Stream. It is important that any mitigation measures include wider aspects of mitigation such as measures to prevent changes in flow rates or any run-off which might damage downstream habitats including the Mude Valley SNCI as well as the Southern Damselfly habitat itself. The measures included within the HRA screening report which specifies wide buffer strips down either side of the Mude Stream, and the provision that both sides cannot be worked at once will be very important, and specific habitat improvement work along the river is also supported.</p> <p>3 f. & h. AS-19 Woodsford Quarry Extension, Woodsford and AS-26 Hurst Farm Moreton DWT is pleased to see that the restoration vision for both these sites includes the possibility of a large scale wetland restoration scheme which would help with flood alleviation, contribute towards overall reduction in Phosphate, Nitrogen and sediment downstream on the River Frome and in Poole Harbour and create habitats which would benefit protected species such as otter and water vole as well as wetland birds.</p> <p>Policy MS-2: - Sand and Gravel Area of Search. The map showing the proposed Area of Search for further, unallocated, sites for sand and gravel extraction has been considerably refined, and although it is still difficult to use to check small details of boundaries, DWT is pleased to see that, as far as can be checked, all nature conservation designated sites, including European sites, SSSIs and SNCIs have been removed from the area of search.</p> <p>Provided that other sites such as Local Nature Reserves, ancient woodlands etc. have also been removed, then hopefully this will mean that there will not be significant conflicts of interest with biodiversity issues from the outset of any future sites put forward.</p> <p>Policy MS-3: Swanworth Quarry Extension We have no further comments to add to those already given. It seems likely that the biodiversity issues relating to the nearby SAC/SPA can be overcome and the remaining issues relate to Landscape and the AONB. A restoration vision which includes some nature conservation after use and restoration of areas of semi-natural limestone grassland is supported.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>Policy MS-5: Site for the Provision of Ball Clay The issues raised originally are still of concern with regards to this site. However, the HRA screening report states that discussions have established that adequate mitigation can be provided to ensure that effects on Annex 1 birds which are qualifying species of the European heathlands are reduced to a non-significant level.</p> <p>Provided that all the measures listed in that report are implemented and that adequate mitigation against any adverse impacts on the immediately adjacent SNCI, including an appropriate buffer area, can also be secured, then DWT has no objection to this site going forward. As with other sites, the restoration vision which emphasises the importance of to link with existing heathland sites to create a large and continuous habitat, managed by extensive grazing, is strongly supported.</p>	
					<p>Policy MS-6: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone PK-19 Broadmead Field DWT welcomes the removal of the SNCI from this site allocation, but would like to ensure that a substantial buffer to that site is included in any proposed quarrying of the remainder of the site. For all the allocated Purbeck Stone sites DWT is pleased that the restoration vision includes nature conservation after-use, integrating semi-natural grasslands (as well as native hedgerow and copse retention) as a key element. We would like to have seen the suggestion of some additional pond creation to benefit Great Crested Newts, for which this area is known to be important, stated in the restoration vision too, since assessment for impacts on this species is recognised as a key requirement of any application.</p>	
					<p>Policy MS-7: Sites for the provision of other building stone (excluding Portland and Purbeck stone) BS05 Whithill Quarry, Lillington DWT is pleased to note the recognition that a full ecological assessment of this site will be required to include any adverse impacts on the nearby Honeycombe Wood SNCI.</p>	
					<p>Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the Puddletown Road Area Policy, and would wish to be included in any discussions or meetings which might help to further the aims and ensure a consistent approach to development, restoration and management of the sites within this area to secure the long-term conservation objectives.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 75	1.1	Paragraph	Sylvia Dobie	Gillingham Town Council		

PSD
-
MSP
144

1.1

Paragraph

Mr
John
Wicken
den

The Statement of Consultation (Dec 2017) claims the plan has been developed since 2008. AS25 Station Road, Moreton was introduced into the plan very late (residents found out in July 2015), with virtually no Applicant documentation (as required by DCC's own strategy/policies) and without due consideration of the impact it will have on Moreton Conservation Area, the overall setting, amenity and tranquility of Moreton Estate and its historic village. AS25 has been the subject of the 3rd Consultation and now this final pre-submission consultation.

The Statement of Consultation mentions that 3 petitions were received opposed to AS25, AS26 and AS19. It also states that the majority of 1299 representations were opposed to the Plan but fails to state how many. FRAME (From Residents Against Mineral Extraction) was formed to represent impacted residents just prior to the 3rd Consultation and forced the DCC to postpone the submission date due to a lack of time to assimilate what was being proposed for the Village.

The Statement of Consultation fails to mention FRAME or the fact that objection articles appeared in both national and local newspapers plus radio and TV coverage. Para 6.40 of the Statement explains what the DCC did about the representations. The answer seems to be a resounding "NOTHING". Cynically the paragraph mentions as an example of the DCC refining their plan and waking up to the fact that AS25 borders the Moreton Conservation Area. The weight of benefit is clearly to ignore all opposition and blindly accept sites to satisfy some ill-conceived tonnage requirement which once analysed shows that River Terrace Sand and Gravel is not required during the Plan period. The DCC's process of consultation is unsound due to the lack of substance in the sections "what have the DCC done" in response to the consultation(s).

The DCC need to publish exactly what opposition (or indeed support) there has been for each consultation. The public have put in a huge amount of work to understand the DCC Policies and their Plan.

The DCC owe the public fairness and transparency. The DCC need to explain in an objective manner why certain sites have been dropped and others included when the assessments look identical.

Can the DCC please explain their rationale for their decision making in accord with their own policy/strategy? Appendix 1: Minerals Site Assessment Criteria states that "The preparation of the Mineral Sites Plan will involve a consistent assessment of all known sites to measure the relative impacts and produce a list of preferred sites whose inclusion within the document can be strongly and robustly defended".

Can the DCC please articulate how there plan is strong and robust where there is such a lack of objective assessment?

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 153	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<p>Future Proofing the Plan The Strategy documents what you want to achieve, and takes a long term view. The Plan documents how you will implement the Strategy for the Plan period. Therefore it needs to contain actions which will implement the Plan during the Plan period and actions which will facilitate the implementation after the Plan period. The actions regarding safeguarding and allocation of sites are appropriate to the Plan and has been carried out exhaustively. But actions that further other aspects of the Strategy are missing. Typically, these missing actions involve a mineral type as a whole, or areas containing many adjoining sites.</p> <p>For an example of the former the supply of Ball Clay is required for the foreseeable future. In the absence of a national strategy the Plan acknowledges a shortfall in the predicted supply, even after the allocation of the Trigon Hill Extension. So the plan should have actions a) to encourage the development of a national strategy b) to facilitate the use of mining when the surface resources are depleted. (In general we do not support a predict and provide model.)</p> <p>The Puddletown Road Area Policy is an example of the latter. This model could be applied elsewhere.</p>	
PSD - MSP 161	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Alan Jailler		<p>Not enough consideration has been given to the bordering SSSIs, new primary school, tourist caravan and holiday parks and many residential properties.</p>	
PSD - MSP 152	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<p>Other Area Policies The Puddletown Road Area Policy model can be applied elsewhere. We are not suggesting that the Plan should be specific at this stage but are suggesting that an enabling paragraph is added to the Puddletown Road Area Policy MS-8 to allow the Minerals Planning Authority to allocate policies for other areas. The areas we have in mind are Moreton / Crossways, Purbeck Plateau and Portland which interestingly correspond to inserts A, D and E of the Submission Map.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 357	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Dave Ogborne	Wessex Water	<p>Thank you for the consultation regarding the Draft Minerals and Waste Plans for Bournemouth Dorset & Poole. Please note the comments made below on behalf of Wessex Water acting as the water and sewerage undertaker. Please note that Bournemouth Sembcorp has responsibility for some areas of the Dorset Plan.</p> <p>Mineral Sites Plan The proposals set out the resources required over the plan period with assessment of existing sites and the preferred sites allocated to meet future demand. The site allocations are noted, however we have serious concerns over allocations at PK-08 Quarr Farm and the inclusion of PK-21 Gallows Gore.</p> <p>We have previously advised that Wessex Water has critical infrastructure at this location, which serves local communities with public water supplies. The proposed allocations indicate areas immediately adjacent existing Wessex Water site boundaries with storage reservoir and trunk mains directly affected from quarry operations. The addition of the new allocation at Gallows Gore introduces the prospect of stranded assets with quarry activity providing no local routes for existing trunk mains.</p> <p>Wessex Water has a statutory duty to maintain and repair these assets and we believe that our statutory obligations and operations will be injuriously affected by this development. In the circumstances we believe that this matter represents a material consideration and we lodge a formal objection to both of these site allocations.</p> <p>If these sites are to proceed we request that further detailed information with robust assessments are provided that will satisfy the concerns of the water undertaker. Insufficient information is available to provide any detailed comment at this stage.</p> <p>We request further discussion with the minerals planning authority to review these proposals and clarify our position. We will be seeking assurances that our assets can be safeguarded with any appropriate measures before the planning authority proceeds with these particular allocations.</p>	

PSD - MSP 308	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Dave Ogbor ne	Wessex Water	<p>We note the plan functions in para 1.4 and the need to allocate sites, secure future provision of aggregates and safeguarding resources.</p> <p>Allocations Policy We request that any proposals coming forward should identify any utility apparatus within the site. Where proposals affect existing plant and apparatus there should be supporting evidence to indicate that any impact can be mitigated. This may allow for diverting or relocating existing infrastructure either permanently or a temporary basis. Furthermore this arrangement should be agreed with the undertaker to ensure that satisfactory arrangements can be executed.</p> <p>Allocations will remain the primary source and windfall sites will be accepted subject to shortfalls from proposed allocations and delivery failure. We understand that the allocations remain subject to the grant of planning permission as detailed in para 2.6 and will need to satisfy the development guidelines associated with each site allocation.</p> <p>Para 2.6 The specific allocations do not equate to the grant of planning permission and any proposal for the development of an allocated site will still need to secure planning consent</p> <p>Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search No comments</p> <p>Policy MS-3: Swanworth Quarry Extension No comments</p> <p>Policy MS-4: Site for the provision of recycled aggregate No comments</p> <p>Policy MS-5: Site for the provision of Ball Clay No comments</p> <p>Policy MS-6: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone</p> <p>Broadmead Field, Langton Matravers (PK-19 - see Submission Policies Map - Inset 14) There are existing water mains and abandoned water tanks at the south of the site - these should be retained and relevant provisions provided in the development guidelines.</p> <p>Gallows Gore, Harmans Cross (PK-21 - see Submission Policies Map - Inset 13) We have previously objected to this allocation owing to the location of critical infrastructure including reservoirs and trunk mains and the impact of quarry workings and extractions. There are also distribution mains located within the access highway, which may require protecting from any construction loadings and temporary works. If the site remains allocated and seeks planning consent, Wessex Water acting as the sewerage undertaker will require specific and robust assessments to be completed. The criteria will need to be specified and will be developed from the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed pre-assessment of risks demonstrating that there will be no impact on Wessex Waters critical assets • provision of in-depth details of proposals • working method statements identifying required protection measures and buffer/no-work areas • vibration monitoring indemnity provisions • In default of the information being provided at the application stage we will insist upon a minimum clearance/stand-off distance of 30 metres from site boundary to quarry excavations. <p>Policy MS-7: Sites for the provision of other building stone (excluding Portland and Purbeck stone) No comments Policy</p> <p>MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy No comments</p> <p>Policy MS-9: Preventing Land-Use Conflict The provision of a 250 metre consultation zone is accepted.</p>
PSD - MSP 300	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Rohan Torkild sen	Historic England	<p>Thank you for sharing the Pre Submission version of this important planning document.</p> <p>Our assessment and observations are mindful of the Governments expectation, and a key test of Soundness, that the Minerals Plan contributes to the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning</p>

Policy Framework (NPPF) [1] ; one of the core dimensions being the protection and enhancement of the historic environment [2] . We refer to the following statutory and policy tests.

1. Plans should meet objectively assessed needs (though, for example the allocation of sites for development), unless specific NPPF policy relating to e.g. designated heritage assets, indicate development should be restricted (NPPF Paragraph 14).
2. Great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets (NPPF Paragraph 132);
3. Special regard must be given to desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building and special attention must be given to desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area in the exercise of planning functions (S66 & S72, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990);
4. Development will be expected to avoid or minimise conflict between any heritage assets conservation and any aspect of the proposal (NPPF Paragraph 129); Harm (significant adverse impacts) should be avoided. Only where this is not possible should mitigation be considered (NPPF Paragraph 152).
5. Any harm and mitigation proposals need to be fully justified and evidenced to ensure they will be successful in reducing harm.
6. Evidence as to whether the historic environment has been appropriately considered will help determine whether the Plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

It will be important for you as the local authority to be satisfied that sufficient evidence has been gathered to show that there is a clear understanding of how the historic environment and heritage assets may be affected and to what extent (the degree of harm the significance of the asset).

It will then be important for you to clearly indicate that a positive approach to the historic environment has adopted and how the key statutory and national policy obligations have been applied.

Purbeck District Council Conservation Officer Assessment June 2017 We note Purbeck DCs Conservation Officers robust assessment of the impact of the proposed allocations on the significance of affected heritage assets and helpful suggestions to mitigate or minimise harm. As the evidence applies the appropriate legislation and national policy we consider it to be reasonable for the local authority to consider and respond to its conclusions and illustrated recommendations. Your response will help to demonstrate how you have paid sufficient regard to the need to conserve the historic environment.

We note, and appreciate, the Conservation Officers particular concern regarding Philliol's Farm (AS-12), Woodsford Quarry (AS-19), Station Road, Moreton (AS-25), and Hurst Farm, Moreton (AS-26). Has the local authority considered small plot phased extraction within these very large sites to reduce the impact on the landscape, and allow a more sensitive, responsive managed release of sites that can enable the conservation of, for example, ancient trees and hedgerows, important features within the historic landscape? Historic England would welcome the opportunity to discuss such potential measures, and others to reduce the level of harm to the significance of the historic environment. [1] NPPF paragraphs 151 and 182 [2] NPPF paragraph 7

In addition, Historic England has the following comments. Policy MS-1: Production of Sand & Gravel - Great Plantation, Bere Regis The proposed quarry would have a major impact on the settings and significance of three scheduled monuments: a Bronze Age round barrow and two sections of the Battery Bank linear earthwork. These three heritage assets are landscape monuments intended by their builders to have a distinctive topographical and visual presence in the landscape. The landscape setting of the monuments is of key importance to an

understanding and appreciation of these heritage assets and is a fundamental and significant component of their heritage significance and public value. The present proposals, both in the position and extent of the quarry and also in the landform created in the post-extraction restoration scheme, would bring permanent major adverse changes to the landform and landscape which provides the primary context and setting of the monuments. We consider that these proposals would result in substantial harm to the significance of these designated heritage assets.

We consider that there may be scope for extraction in the area to the north of the Battery Bank and east of the barrow, but the proposals would need significant modification in order to reduce the level of harm to the affected heritage assets to a level where it would be acceptable. The area of extraction would need to be significantly smaller than that currently proposed, and designed so as to retain sufficient historic landform around and between the monuments to maintain the integrity of their landscape setting. Similarly, the present quarry restoration scheme would need to be significantly modified so that it would reinstate ground surfaces at, or close to, the existing historic ground levels within the primary settings of the monuments in order to restore as far as possible their visual landscape settings. We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss this matter with you.

Policy MS-5: Site for the provision of Ball Clay - Trigon Hill Extension, Wareham The proposed quarry would have a major impact on the settings and significance of the scheduled Bronze Age round barrow monument on Trigon Hill. This designated heritage asset is a landscape monument intended by its builders to have a distinctive topographical and visual presence in the landscape. The landscape setting of the monument is of key importance to an understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets and is a fundamental and significant component of its heritage significance and public value. The present proposals, both in the position and extent of the quarry and also in the landform created in the post-extraction restoration scheme, would bring permanent major adverse changes to the landform and landscape which provides the primary context and setting of the monument. We consider that these proposals would result in substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. We consider that there may be scope for extraction in part of the remaining natural landscape around the barrow, but the proposals would need significant modification in order to reduce the level of harm. We would strongly suggest that the area of extraction would need to be significantly smaller than that currently proposed, and designed so as to retain sufficient historic landform around the monument to maintain the integrity of its landscape setting. Similarly, the present quarry restoration scheme would need to be significantly modified so that it would reinstate ground surfaces at, or close to, the existing historic ground levels within the primary settings of the monuments in order to restore as far as possible its visual landscape setting. We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss this matter with you.

Policy MS-3: Swanworth Quarry Extension Historic England (Keith Miller) in recent dialogue with the prospective applicant and their agent, have discussed, and as we understand, agreed a scheme to minimise the level of harm to the settings of two scheduled round barrows. If such arrangements/conditions are reflected in the Plan Historic England considers the allocation would be soundly based.

Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy It would be helpful if the local authority were to confirm why this Policy only appears to address potential issues relating to the natural environment.

We hope our comments will assist you in the preparation of a sound and robust plan and would welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments further. NB above comments also logged against the relevant sections in the plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 222	1.1	Paragraph	Mrs Sally Falkingham	Maiden Newton Parish Council	<p>Maiden Newton Parish Council have carefully read the 2017 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Minerals Site Plan and are relieved to find that the Parish has no interest in any of the sites under discussion. (No mention of extraction of chalk from White Sheet Hill Quarry).</p> <p>At their meeting on 4 January 2018, I was asked to write to you expressing our support for the Plan, as published. Sally Falkingham Councillor Maiden Newton Parish Council</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 226	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Paul Knight	Bournemouth Airport	<p>Pre-Submission Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2017 With reference to the consultation on the above plan, Bournemouth Airport has the following comments to make with regard to Aerodrome Safeguarding as a statutory consultee.</p> <p>Bournemouth Airport recognises the importance of local mineral 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Strike Risk The extraction of minerals and associated restoration plans will create habitats that will encourage hazardous species of wildlife to the site 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 recognized 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. <p>The above outlines the four key criteria that should be examined 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.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
331

1.1

Paragraph

Ms
Helen
Patton

New
Forest
National
Park
Authorit
y

Pre-Submission Draft Minerals Sites Plan As you are aware our previous comments related to the sites at Roeshot (AS13) and Hurn Court Farm Quarry (AS09). Comments on the current consultation document are also made in relation to these two sites and are as follows.

AS13 Roeshot The Authority previously raised concerns that the following impacts had been omitted from the Plan;

- Impacts on nearby internationally designated sites located within the National Park.
- Traffic impacts on the National Park, in particular impacts on Lyndhurst which is identified as an Air Quality Management Area.
- Impacts on the biodiversity of the National Park, in particular impacts on nearby Burton Common SSSI, the New Forest Special Protection Area, New Forest Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar Sites.
- Impact on the special quality of the landscape of the National Park.

The Authority is concerned and disappointed to note that our previous comments in relation to the requirement for an assessment of the impacts on the biodiversity of the nearby internationally and nationally designated sites has not been taken on board. The Pre-Submission document still only refers to an assessment being required for the designated sites within Dorset only. The Authority considers this to be a serious omission as it fails to reflect the Councils Duty to Co-operate and also the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and one which requires amendment in the final Submission document.

While the Authority is pleased to note that traffic impacts will be assessed through a Transport Assessment, it seems to suggest in the Pre-Submission draft document (page 120) that a Transport Assessment would only consider the more localised traffic in combination with proposed nearby housing development rather than an assessment of the more wider traffic impacts extending through the National Park and in particular through Lyndhurst. The Authority therefore requests that this should be amended in the final Submission document.

The following is for your information regarding the access. The accompanying site assessment for Roeshot incorrectly states that Hampshire County Council will be determining the access for the Hampshire site " the access is actually located within the National Park and planning permission (planning application reference 16/00277) was granted by the Authority on 31 August 2016.

The Authority is pleased to note that potential impacts on the special quality of the landscape and the setting of the National Park have been included in this document in line with our previous request.

On a general point, in relation to the comments made on the potential impacts on the National Park as set out above, the Authority is concerned to note that an assessment of these potential impacts will be delayed and considered as part of any planning application subsequently submitted for the site. It is assumed that leaving the potential impacts to be assessed as part of the planning application stage as opposed to the plan making stage, Dorset County Council and partner authorities are confident that the potential impacts can be addressed and overcome, as failure to overcome any significant constraints will obviously mean that the site will be undeliverable within the Plan period.

The following comment is made in relation to the proposed Suitable Area of Natural Greenspace (SANG) for the housing to be built south of the railway. As stated previously, the Authority considers it essential that the working of the minerals for this proposed site mirror those of the eastern part of the site contained within the adopted Hampshire Mineral Plan, whereby SANG provision is co-ordinated with the operational working of the

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>mineral. The Authority would like to take this opportunity to reiterate that cross-boundary liaison between the planning authorities concerned is clearly essential if the SANG is indeed going to provide attractive, useable greenspace to address the recreational needs of the urban extension, and the National Park Authority would be wish to be involved in any future discussions regarding mineral development of this site.</p> <p>AS09 Hurn Court Farm Quarry As you are aware, as with the proposed Roeshot site, the Authority considers that reducing the impact of mineral traffic on the roads running through the National Park should be considered as apriority. Again, the Authority is concerned to note that while a Transport Assessment will be required, it seems to suggest in the document that the assessment will only focus on Parley Lane and other roads in the local vicinity, rather than an assessment of the wider traffic impacts extending through the National Park. The Authority therefore requests that this should be addressed in the final Submission document.</p>	
PSD - MSP 545	1.1	Paragraph	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	See letter submitted for details.	
PSD - MSP 539	1.1	Paragraph	Mr. R Khanna	Worth Matravers Parish Council	Please see attached letter for full representation. This representation has also been attached to Appendix A at Figure 18 (PK16 Swanworth), and at Figure 27 (PK21 Gallows Gore).	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 335	1.1	Paragraph	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	<p>Representations from West Parley Parish Council on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole pre submission Waste Plan (Regulation 19) December 2017.</p> <p>Further representations on the Minerals Extraction Proposals Although not within the geographical Parish of West Parley, the proposed extension to Hurn Court Farm Quarry, is estimated to provide a further 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel and the Roeshot Extension 3.5 million tonnes. However, even without the proposed extensions, there is a current surplus in supply for the Plan period from elsewhere in Dorset.</p> <p>The value of the mineral deposits will not diminish and it therefore appears totally unnecessary to allocate both sites for expansion at this juncture. We re-iterate our point that the roads infrastructure -even with the modifications currently being proposed to alleviate some problems on the B3073 corridor- cannot cope with what is currently proposed under the Core Strategy for housing and employment, let alone the significant proposals for the Eco and Hurn Court Farm sites.</p> <p>Therefore, in conclusion the Parish Council is of the view the proposed strategy is not sound nor justified. Other sites in Dorset do not have the site constraints as these two, but can provide sand and gravel deposits locally over the Plan period without the allocation of both identified Christchurch Sites.</p>	
PSD - MSP 585	1.1	Paragraph	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England	Please see attached representation.	
PSD - MSP 342	1.1	Paragraph	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	Please see attached representation.	
PSD - MSP 580	1.1	Paragraph	Mr George Whalley	Christchurch Borough Council	Please see attached document for full representation.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 6	1.9	Paragraph	Mr A P Read		<p>Criterion C10 " Impact on historic buildings. Is not factually correct and states; Station Road is lined on both sides with an informal avenue of trees and shrubs. The two closest listed buildings are sited to face along the road rather than across it at the site therefore provided that the avenue of trees is retained there will be no significant impact on these buildings or their settings.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Moreton Conservation Area. In fact the two closest properties within the conservation area lie less than 100mtrs from the proposed development and face the development across the Road with hardly any natural screening as the majority of trees are immature and of less than 20cm dia. Thus the development will not only have a significant impact on health and quality of life, but also total loss of day to day visual amenity.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the original historical report submitted, section 3.3.3 stating; It is a long-standing maxim in Planning law that there is no right to a view. However, just as loss of residential amenity (for individuals) is material in Planning, interference with an individual residents ability to appreciate heritage-significance in views is now taken as contrary to the general public interest. This is clear in recent Planning Inspectors reports, for instance 19:287. [1] a Grade II mid 18th century stone farmhouse [2] The setting of the listed building would be substantially altered for the occupants who would experience the impact every day going about their day to day activities [3]. 293. The heritage implications for those who live in a listed property or a CA [Conservation Area] who also have a view of the proposed [4 development] is a material consideration. Frequently, those who choose to live in a heritage asset such as a CA or a listed building do so because they appreciate the particular qualities of their surroundings and the materials and workmanship of a previous age. If the development not only has a serious impact on the setting of their house but also imposes on the day to day visual amenity of the occupants because of orientation [5] or distance, going about their daily lives, there is every reason to suppose that they would find the effect on significance reinforced and amplified. [6]</p> <p>3.3.4 Since, in Planning terms, the current proposals at AS19, AS25 and AS26 are far from short-term temporary, it is appropriate for certain relevant viewing points that are currently inaccessible to the general public also to be included in the present appraisal, in particular, those involving potentially affected views outwards from heritage assets.</p>	<p>A full visual survey giving thought to ground plane sight of view, from standing and horse back, from all areas surrounding the proposed development should be undertaken including views from the nearby Fir Hill and Moreton Obelisk (currently on Historic Englands at risk register).</p>
PSD - MSP 8	1.9	Paragraph	Mr Barry Barry Cullimore		<p>WE did not receive any notification of the possibility of quarrying in the field at the bottom of our garden until our neighbour found out about the proposal when their house sale fell through.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 42	1.9	Paragraph	Mr Oliver Vass		No. The sustainability reports by tourism officials has been ignored. There is poor and misleading information in the consultation and the full impact hasn't been explained to all the stakeholders.	<p>The local infrastructure cannot support the increase in traffic.</p> <p>The heavy lorries will be a danger to horse riders and cyclists as negotiate narrow roads with few passing places.</p> <p>Health of children at the school in Corfe Castle will be impacted by increased diesel emissions from lorries.</p> <p>There are alternative sites which are not overlooked by SSSIs or along the Jurassic Coast, which is a World Heritage Site</p> <p>It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle, endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism, fails to conserve or enhance the natural and historic environment and is an unsustainable use of minerals.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
59

1.9

Paragraph

Dr and
Mr
Alexan
dra
and
Frank
Chesw
orth

I wish to highlight the unjustified policy of setting out potential development sites for Purbeck stone working which will add a further rate of development of 15,000 tonnes per annum. This rate of potential development is more than the present rate of extraction. The reserves of Purbeck stone will be in excess of 350,000 tonnes giving well over twenty five years of exploitation in a market that on sane projections is likely to decrease hence lengthening the reserves life. This means that too many sites are being classified for development whereas even less would over-satisfy the market.

I appreciate that there is not enough information to prioritise choices of sites on technical or commercial grounds and that it is not the County's responsibility. However, it is the County's responsibility and within their power to reduce the number of mineral sites to improve the blight and problems any approval gives to their constituents and residents near these sites.

A typical example is the Gore Gallows site (PK-21) where there are approximately ten dwellings near the perimeter of the site and the access is down the narrow Haycroft Lane. If the present proposals are accepted, these houses would be blighted for maybe fifty years and by a draft Minerals Plan that is based on an exaggerated proposition of market size. We urge that this draft Mineral plan review remove some excess potential production capacity of Purbeck stone and that the decision on which to remove be based on the benefit to residents who are in many cases now unable to sell their homes. Dr A J Chesworth and Mr F A Chesworth

There is a reliance on individuals to follow the very long progress of this major review and decision-making process which in many cases is beyond their patience and ability. There are some comments from individuals but there seems little cognizance from the authorities as to the effect of these upcoming decisions on these property owners and their lives.

Few individuals make representation whereas the voices of commercial interests are loud. Much of the information in the report has been collected directly from the commercial interests and there is little geometric drilling and core taking to prove the reserves.

Formal effort should be made by officials to collect the views and potential effects on individuals and to consider the human side of the development decisions particularly on people's lives with respect to their main asset - their house.

Officials need to apply imagination to the plight of a person whose house becomes unsaleable. Strong consideration needs to be given to not giving a development green light to sites where there are adjacent houses. There are plenty of

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
						stone reserves to make this possible.

PSD
-
MSP
259

1.9

Paragraph

Ms
Honor
Stacey

I believe the minerals document is not legally compliant and is unsound. There has been a dreadful lack of information given to residents of Purbeck about this application for a massive quarry of 35 acres on rolling hills in "An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty" which is overlooking the Jurassic coastline and is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. It cannot be argued that there are exceptional circumstances for:

1 This Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with World Heritage status to be destroyed. The exposed windy nature of the Purbeck Hill will make it impossible to disguise the quarry which would be on rising ground and would come within 200 m of the B3069 - a road from where there are the most spectacular views across the valley to Corfe Castle and Poole Harbour in one direction and at present views of rolling hills stretching out all the way to the Jurassic Coastline on the side of the proposed quarry.

2. For the Purbeck Way " a beautiful walk within the AONB linking Corfe Castle to the South West Coastal Path to be bridged to enable quarry lorries to traverse from one part of the quarry to another.

3. For the narrow roads through Purbeck to be subjected to fast travelling heavy lorries which endanger walkers, cyclists and local residents. (On Friday 26 th January 2018 there was a particular incident in which two heavy lorries with equipment for Swanworth quarry stopped all traffic on Kingston Hill for about 20 minutes as they were so big they could not pass each other. In trying to remove the blockage the lorries dislodged mud from the bank which posed a danger to all traffic. I have photographs available of this incident. This proposed quarry is just not in keeping with the small traditional stone quarries which have been part of the area for centuries.

4 The risk of the water supply of the village of Kingston being contaminated. This is the only mains water supply for villagers

Adequate supplies of stone are available in other areas of Dorset and could alternatively be brought by train into places like Hamworthy from where it could be more effectively distributed.

The effect on employment and tourism in Purbeck. As someone running a holiday cottage agency based in Purbeck I would particularly like to raise the importance of Tourism to the Isle of Purbeck and the risk of this quarry endangering its continued success as a major source of employment We are one of at least 5 local holiday cottage agencies with cottages in Purbeck. We have 40 cottages here. The other agencies have many more. There are also many camp sites, bed and breakfast rooms and hotels. We survive by encouraging holiday visitors to come to the area mainly because of its beautiful landscape. These agencies not only employ full and part time office staff. There are associated jobs with bringing work for housekeepers, builders, electricians and plumbers. I have obtained the figures on the attached sheet from the Visit Dorset web site which is run by the council. They show that in 2015 (the latest figures available) Holiday visitors stayed in Purbeck for two million one hundred and fifty four thousand nights Three million six hundred and forty six thousand visitors came on day visits. The total visitor spend was two hundred and twenty five million, eight hundred and forty two thousand pounds in 2015 This report states that tourist related jobs make up 19% of all employment in Purbeck Estimated actual employment related to tourism in Purbeck was 4,230 And of these £3052 were in full time employment

I have spoken to many people about this extension. It has not always been easy to get people to write mainly because they feel there is no need as the quarry could not possibly be considered in such an area of outstanding natural beauty; an area which is part of a world heritage site; an area visited by hundreds of thousands of people each year. I agree it should not be possible that this application is even being even considered. Very similar proposal were turned down in 1968 and 1988. The information given to residents has been poorly explained and the very on line consultative document we are being asked to complete gives the appearance of being an attempt

I do believe that the proposed Swanworth Quarry application could be changed to make it legally compliant or sound. This type of application should never be considered suitable for An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is dependent on the beauty of the area to provide employment for thousands of people.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					to be confusing. We are being asked to give a yes or no answer to the following questions: Do you consider this section of the document is sound/unsound because it is/is not: (please select either Yes or No) Positively prepared Justified Effective Consistent with National policy	
PSD - MSP 155	2.1	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Finances Have not identified any discussion of finances in connection with implementing the Plan. This suggests that the thinking is that the only monies involved will be the operational monies of the site operators. Is this realistic? Surely there will be expenditure required for co-ordination, monitoring, enforcement, etc. Some indication of the budget required and how it will be funded would help to make a desirable Plan into a reality.	
PSD - MSP 269	2.3	Paragraph	Mrs Jennifer Meade		Poole Formation Sand and River Terrace Gravel have been lumped together as aggregates. This ignores the fact that there is a surplus of River Terrace Gravel (nearly 13 years) and a shortage of Poole Formation Sand. This split was made in the Local Aggregate Assessment and the Mineral Strategy, but is not made anywhere in the Mineral Plan.	Need to split between River Terrace Gravel and Poole Formation Sand and assess the sites accordingly. Some of the sites are only suitable to River Terrace Gravel extraction and so should not be included in the plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 264	2.3	Paragraph	Mr Tony Meader	Knightsford parish council	<p>The Draft Mineral Plan does not comply with the NPPF or the 2014 Mineral Strategy in a number of areas. For Example;</p> <p>Strategy para 1.12 Mineral Sites Plan . Requires sites to be fully assessed. The Draft Mineral Plan has not done this.</p> <p>Strategy para 1.16 Sustainability Appraisal. The Draft Site Plans Sustainability Assessments Sustainability Objectives grading are not accurate or comprehensive.</p> <p>Strategy para 1.19 Conservation Regulation Assessments. The Draft Site Plans HRA screening document describes how potential Significant Impacts on the River Frome SSSI were changed without going through an Appropriate Assessment process.</p> <p>Strategy para 2.19 Community Strategies. The Draft Site Plan fails to meet nearly all the Strategy objectives eg. Conserve landscape character, Promote and support tourism.</p> <p>Strategy para 7.28 Sand & Gravel " the Current Picture. The Draft Mineral Plan risks specific shortages of particular types of material being hidden within an overall total figure. It hides sand and gravel in one tonnage figure.</p> <p>Strategy para 7.44 Sand & Gravel - Spatial Characteristics. The Draft Site Plan fails to provide detailed assessment of the ecological and hydrological implications of sand and gravel working in the resource blocks close to European or international sites (i.e. The River Frome SSSI) to support sites to be taken forward into the Mineral Sites Plan.</p> <p>Policy AS2 & Strategy para 7.51 Sand & Gravel - Monitoring and maintaining separate landbanks. The Mineral site plan does not identify which sites are Poole formation sand & which are River Terrace gravel landbanks so fails to calculate and maintain separate equivalent to at least 7 years' supply in each case as required by the NPPF and Minerals policy. Adopting the sites nominated will result in a sand supply of barely 7 years and a gravel landbank of 28 years.</p> <p>Cultural Heritage impacts have not been properly assessed to a professional standard. For AS19 there has been no input from the West Dorset District Council conservation officer. It is particularly disturbing that comments made by the Purbeck DC Conservation Officer in 2015 were withheld from the consultation site and only posted, with a disclaimer, in the last week of the consultation.</p> <p>The plan does not mention the impact of/on the planned Dorset National Park per NPPF paras 115 & 116. These are covered in more detail in Knightsford Parish Councils comments on Section 3.1 " Tonnage ,and comments on the proposed Site AS19 " NE Woodsford Extension.</p>	<p>Appropriate Assessments, including site visits, should be conducted on sites potentially impacting SSSIs, protected species, SNCIs & other features important to wildlife, Cultural heritage, etc. The Site Assessment Criteria and Sustainability objective effects should be revised to reflect appropriate assessments. The plan should differentiate between proposed site allocations for Poole Formation Sand and River Terrace Gravel to enable separate landbanks to be calculated and maintained.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 177	2.5	Paragraph	Mr John Wicken den		<p>The following paragraphs and sections refer to the Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Minerals Strategy 2014 where the DCC have failed to comply with their own strategy & policies with reference to AS19, AS25 and AS26. For the sake of avoiding duplication please refer to this section in FRAMEs's response for the detail.</p> <p>Minerals Sites Plan, Para 1.12, Sustainability Appraisal 1.16, Conservation Regulations Assessment, Para 1.19 Background Para 2.4: mentions recycled aggregate but DCC has completely ignored the tonnage derived in this way,</p> <p>Community Strategies Table 1 Objectives, Spatial Portrait Para 3.1, Benefits of Mineral Extraction Para 3.18: Vision & Objectives (objective 5 claims to minimise impacts on local communities, business and tourism), Climate Change Policy CC1 Preparation of Climate Change Assessment, Policy AS1 Sustainable Minerals Development Para 16.2, Policy DM1 (items a, b, c, d, e, i, j, k), Policy DM2 (The DCC have completely ignored the impact of quarries on the concept of tranquillity),</p> <p>DM3 Managing Ground Water Para 16.13 states that applicants will be required to assess the impacts upon the water environment (not done),</p> <p>Policy DM4 (states each proposal should be accompanied by an objective assessment of any impacts upon the local landscape character and its setting including historic landscape character -not done),</p> <p>Policy DM5 (Para 16.25 states that an appropriate assessment has to be completed to comply with the Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, no substance),</p> <p>Historic Environment DM7 (assessment and evaluation of heritage assets and their settings has not been demonstrated, Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act of 1990 has not been applied).</p> <p>Transport & Minerals Development DM8 (flawed assessment of traffic flows and nature of rural roads). Policy SS1 states: "Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with polices in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved without delay , unless material considerations indicate otherwise."</p> <p>The DCC have backloaded much of the assessments in the Plan to post-submission planning but by then it is too late to fully understand the true impact on the community and environment and according to SS1 the plans will be approved without delay. This tactic by the DCC is not acceptable.</p> <p>The following sections of the Minerals Strategy 2014 refer to The Applicants duty and DCCs obligation for them to provide information:- Restoration 15.14, Sustainable Minerals Development 16.2 , Managing the impacts of minerals development on amenity 16.5 , 16.13 Impacts upon the water environment, 16.36 Impact on biodiversity/geodiversity. There is no evidence that the Applicant has does any of this for AS25 & AS26 , in fact the burden has fallen to the Dorset tax payer to commission studies to support a private application.</p>	<p>The fact that there are so many shortcomings in the application of policy and strategy by the DCC makes the plan invalid for AS19, AS25 and AS26 and therefore these sites need to be withdrawn from the Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 281	2.5	Paragraph	Mr Tony Meade	Knightsford parish council	<p>Compliance of DCC Minerals Plan (Dec 2017) with DCC Minerals Strategy May 2014 The Draft Mineral Plan does not comply with the NPPF or the 2014 Mineral Strategy in a number of areas. For Example;</p> <p>Strategy para 1.12 Mineral Sites Plan. Requires sites to be fully assessed. The Draft Mineral Plan has not done this.</p> <p>Strategy para 1.16 Sustainability Appraisal. The Draft Site Plans Sustainability Assessments Sustainability Objectives grading are not accurate or comprehensive.</p> <p>Strategy para 1.19 Conservation Regulation Assessments. The Draft Site Plans HRA screening document describes how potential Significant Impacts on the River Frome SSSI were changed without going through an Appropriate Assessment process.</p> <p>Strategy para 2.19 Community Strategies. The Draft Site Plan fails to meet nearly all the Strategy objectives eg. Conserve landscape character, Promote and support tourism.</p> <p>Strategy para 7.28 Sand & Gravel " the Current Picture. The Draft Mineral Plan does not avoid the risk of specific shortages of particular types of material being hidden within an overall total figure.</p> <p>Strategy para 7.44 Sand & Gravel - Spatial Characteristics. The Draft Site Plan fails to provide detailed assessment of the ecological and hydrological implications of sand and gravel working in the resource blocks close to European or international sites (ie. The River Frome SSSI) to support sites to be taken forward into the Mineral Sites Plan.</p> <p>Policy AS2 & Strategy para 7.51 Sand & Gravel - Monitoring and maintaining separate landbanks. The Mineral site plan does not identify which sites are Poole formation sand & which are River Terrace gravel landbanks so fails to calculate and maintain separate equivalent to at least 7 years' supply in each case as required by the NPPF and Minerals policy.</p> <p>Cultural Heritage impacts have not been properly assessed to a professional standard. For AS19 there has been no input from the West Dorset District Council conservation officer. Comments made by the Purbeck DC Conservation Officer in 2015 on adjacent sites AS25&26 were withheld from the mineral plan web site and were only made available, with a disclaimer, in the final week of the consultation</p> <p>The plan does not mention the impact of/on the planned Dorset National Park paras 115&116. These are covered in more detail in Knightsford Parish Councils comments on Section 2.16, 3.1,and on the proposed Site AS19 " NE Woodsford Extension.</p>	<p>Appropriate Assessments, including site visits, should be conducted on sites potentially impacting SSSIs, protected species, SNClS & other features important to wildlife, Cultural heritage, etc.</p> <p>The Site Assessment Criteria and Sustainability objective effects should be revised to reflect appropriate assessments. The plan should differentiate between proposed site allocations for Poole Formation Sand and River Terrace Gravel to enable separate landbanks to be calculated and maintained.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 378	2.5	Paragraph	Mrs Clarice Wicken	FRAME (Frome Residents Against Mineral Extraction)	Please see report attached to this representation.	
PSD - MSP 84	2.9	Paragraph	Mr John Evans		<p>The Minerals Strategy was adopted in 2014, and runs to 2028. If the Mineral Sites Plan is adopted in 2018, a 15 year plan period would end in 2033.' So the planning period is until the latest 2033. Estimates of demand are up to this time; and presumably The Minerals Sites Plan is determined in order to meet those demand estimates; and yet sites that would, in DCC's own plan only come on stream around 2036, are included.</p> <p>The Plan states that AS25 (Station Rd Moreton) would not operate concurrently with AS26 (Hurst Farm). Even if AS26 survives into the Adopted Plan (despite the many objections to it and after detailed Planning assessment) it is unlikely to begin operation until at least 2020. With a stated lifetime of 16 years it would be exhausted in the mid 2030s. Therefore there is no need to include AS25 in the Plan; it's potential output is not required within the lifetime of the strategy and Minerals Sites Plan.</p> <p>Alternatively, AS26 is not required if AS25 is included in the Sites Plan</p>	Remove AS25 from the Plan; it is patently not required in the planning horizon. At best the site should be safeguarded.
PSD - MSP 279	2.13	Paragraph	Mr Tony Meade	Knightsford parish council	Please refer to comments made by KPC in the AS19 site assessment.	
PSD - MSP 270	2.16	Paragraph	Mrs Jennifer Meade		AS19 and AS26 are both very close to the River Frome, which is a SSSI. The potential impact on the SSSI has not been properly assessed.	An appropriate assessment of the impact needs to be carried out.

PSD
-
MSP
132

2.16

Paragraph

Mr
John
Evans

The Planning Inspectorate's Guidance states (my bold emphasis): Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, an Appropriate Assessment is required where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect upon a European site, either individually or in combination with other projects. "Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the sites conservation objectives" Article 6(3)

This Article has been interpreted as meaning that any project is to be subject to an appropriate assessment if it cannot be proven, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no significant effect on that site (a precautionary approach) , either alone or in combination with other plans or projects" Thus Dorset Mineral Strategy states (my bold emphasis): ' 7.44 - No sites will be brought forward for sand and gravel which fall within and/or are likely to affect European or internationally designated nature conservation sites. Nationally designated SSSIs are also afforded statutory protection. Detailed assessment of the ecological and hydrological implications of sand and gravel working in the resource blocks close to European or international sites will be necessary to support sites to be taken forward into the Mineral Sites Plan.

Where significant doubts remain over possible effects on European sites, a precautionary approach to avoid inclusion of such sites will be taken' But the real test is not 'where significant doubts remain over possible effects', but 'where it cannot be proven, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no significant effect' This is a stronger test than that which DCC has applied to sites AS19 (Woodsford Extension) and AS26 (Hurst Farm) and possibly AS25 (Station Rd Moreton). The HRA Assessment states: 7.4 Sites previously assessed as having likely significant effects Four sites were previously assessed as having the potential to cause likely significant effects. However site visits, provision of further information and discussions with Natural England resulted in the conclusion that allocation of the sites would not lead to likely significant effect on the relevant European sites, a conclusion reflected in earlier iterations of this HRA. The text below provides information on how this conclusion was reached.

7.4.1 AS-19 Woodsford Quarry Extension, Woodsford and AS-26 Hurst Farm, Moreton These allocations lie adjacent to and south of the river Frome. The proximity of the sites to a river which flows into the Poole Harbour SPA and RAMSAR sites led to concerns that pollutants (silt and disturbed nutrients such as nitrate and phosphates) from activities associated with the mineral permissions would affect the European sites. However, discussions with Natural England resulted in the agreement that standard pollution controls, required via environmental permitting and the conditions of the mineral permission should ensure that these impacts never rise above the threshold of significance. A safeguard was put in place by including wording in the relevant policy (MS-1) stating that development must not adversely affect the integrity of the European sites (see Sect 8 below). In addition, the development guidelines for these sites refer to the potential for restoration to large scale wetlands once mineral extraction is complete. This would contribute towards overall reduction in phosphate, nitrate and sediment load in the river, and would therefore have a positive impact on the Poole Harbour SPA and RAMSAR. It was England Nature which originally raised the prospect of these sites having the potential to cause likely significant effects. Subsequent 'Discussions' with England Nature do not constitute an 'Appropriate Assessment liable to prove 'beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no significant effect' In event event restoration involving wetlands (by no means certain given the poor standards of restoration elsewhere and not in any event the originally proposed restoration for AS26, which was to be to farmland) will not make up for over 20 years of significant effect (the combined duration of working AS26 and AS19)

An 'Appropriated Assessment' should be made before including AS19 and AS26 in the plan; this should not wait until a later stage in the Planning Process

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 280	2.16	Paragraph	Mr Tony Meade r	Knightsford parish council		
PSD - MSP 255	2.16	Paragraph	Mrs Joanna Foote		<p>Why is AS25 site not included in this list of sites with potential effects on RAMSAR and protected sites? If AS25 goes ahead it will destroy some 2km of ancient hedgerows and trees that traverse the site, providing important habitat corridors to woodland on the southern and western boundaries.</p> <p>Moreford Hall (formerly called Frampton Woods House and then the New House) has a long recorded (1988-present) bat roost of Serotine, Long eared and Pipistrelle bats. These are European protected species, sensitive to disturbance and protected under UK and European legislation. "Making planning decisions without the due consideration of priority species is contrary to the National Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006". S.40 states, "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity." Under s.41 bats are listed by Defra as a priority species for the conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>AS25 is also situated within 750m of an EU designated heath, there has been no Habitat Regulations assessment. The site Assessment document for AS25 considers there to be a level D No significant impact on Biodiversity. Therefore the current assessment is neither sound nor legal. Furthermore the plan does not take into consideration the effects of mineral extraction on the River Frome SSSI less than 1 km from the site, which will be subject to direct water run off from the site due to the location of both a tributary of the river and land drainage systems that traverse the site. (EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora)</p>	<p>A full HRA according to EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on conservation of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna needs to be carried out in regards to AS25 site.</p> <p>Legally assess proximity of River Frome SSSI and Poole harbour Ramsar. A full and detailed bat survey of the site to reflect the accurate proximity to established and protected roosts.</p>
PSD - MSP 266	2.16	Paragraph	Mr Tony Meade r	Knightsford parish council	An Appropriate Assessment has not been carried out to determine impact on designated areas. E.g. for AS19 an Appropriate assessment has not been carried out for the impact on the River Frome SSSI. The plan contravenes the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC), it is unsound and illegal.	Carry out Appropriate Assessment on sites where there is a potential impact on designated sites.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 344	2.16	Paragraph	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	<p>The RSPB support the preparation and publication of an Habitats Regulations Assessment (November 2017) to support the draft Mineral Sites Plan. We support the conclusions drawn over possible risks of likely significant effects from the proposed allocations Great Plantation (AS-06), Philliols Farm (AS-12), Roeshot (AS-13) and Trigon Hill (BC-04). Addressing these potential effects is carried forward by additional text to relevant policies for these sites (via Policies MS-1 and MS-5).</p> <p>We support the addition of the detailed text to safeguard European and internationally important wildlife habitats and species within Policies MS-1 and MS-5. Specifically: Policy MS-1. Any proposal for the development of any of these allocations must address the development considerations set out for each site in Appendix A, as well as any other matters relevant to the development of each proposed allocation, and demonstrate that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority. Proposals for the development of these allocations will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Appraisal screening indicates that development at AS-06 Great Plantation may have significant effects on species, proximity and displacement of recreation in particular; development at AS-12 Philliols Farm may have significant effects on displacement of recreation and species in particular and development at AS-13 Roeshot Quarry Extension may have significant effects on species in particular. In each of these cases development proposals must either mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place.</p> <p>Policy MS-5 Any proposals for the development of this allocation must address the development considerations set out in Appendix A, as well as any other matters relevant its development, and demonstrate that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority. Sites will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</p> <p>Habitats Regulation Assessment screening indicates that development at BC-04 Trigon Hill Extension may have significant effects on species in particular. Development proposals must mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 288	3	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	Mr Anthony Smale	Railfuture, Wessex Branch	<p>Section 3 & Appx A fail to place any obligation on site developers to consider trans-shipment by rail (or sea). We consider rail transport to be mandatory for long distance trans-shipment from the Frome and Piddle Valley areas.</p> <p>Section 5 & Appx B fail to list all railheads in the County and those in neighbouring counties, and fail to encourage the development of new railheads.</p> <p>Lack of any policy statement about trans-shipment by sustainable modes</p>	<p>Section 3 Mineral Sites It is our strongly-held view that any permission for the further extraction of large quantities of sand and gravel from the Frome and Piddle Valley areas should be granted only on condition that materials destined for use outside the local area will be transported by rail, with sea transport as an alternative.</p> <p>The Plan documents state that one impact of sand and gravel extraction is an increase in road traffic of 81.3% in one case " clearly rail has the potential to substantially reduce this figure. Nor is rail transport limited only to long-distance haulage: we would draw your attention to planning conditions for the extraction of minerals in Lavant (Sussex), which resulted in successful trans-shipment of sand and gravel by rail just 5 miles to Chichester over a period of several years.</p> <p>There are obvious benefits to the County from actively encouraging trans-shipment 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.</p>
PSD - MSP 25	3.1	Sand and Gravel	Hannah Lorna Bevins	Amec Foster Wheeler E&I UK	PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LETTER	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 298	3.1	Sand and Gravel	Mr Simon Munnings	Wessex Surveyors	See submitted letter	See submitted letter

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 328	3.1	Sand and Gravel	Mr Mike Whittin gton		<p>This e-mail is not an objection to the mineral site plan as new gravel and sand extraction sites off the Puddletown Road are needed in Dorset as existing sites are worked out. I would like the Planning Department and the follow up inspection process to be aware of the current high lorry flows on the Bere Regis to Wool Road .</p> <p>We were promised a Southern By-Pass to Bere Regis 25 years ago to take the planned lorry traffic round the village but this has not been implemented and the lorry traffic has probably increased tenfold in the last 25 years.</p> <p>The current C road is not fit for purpose and not maintained to the standard required for the volume of heavy traffic using it. In Bere Regis the re-siting of the School on Rye Hill was excellent as this improved the safety aspects for parents dropping off/collecting young children and also removed the traffic bottleneck on the hill outside of the old school.</p> <p>However although not finalised into the Purbeck plan there is a lot of new housing proposed off Rye Hill in Bere Regis. I live at the top of Rye Hill opposite the junction of Yearlings Drove and the turning circle to the caravan park. This junction is not easy to exit from with the volume and speed of the traffic on the main road. The current 30mph limit needs to be extended to where the current 40mph limit is positioned at the moment and the 40mph limit repositioned past the junction of the minor road to Bere Heath and Hyde. The exit from my drive to the main road is even more difficult as it is very hard to see the speeding traffic from both directions on a slight bend and hill and is an accident waiting to happen and would benefit from a change in the speed limits.</p> <p>Last year the Water Board were allowed to install 2 large pipelines across the main road close to my drive as part of the Dorset Water Distribution system with a large Water Monitoring Station accessed from the top of Yearlings Drove. They have been allowed to put access chambers in the main road with the grids in line with the traffic tyres. They have also been allowed to patch the road without being made to re-surface a larger section of the road surface as I requested Dorset Highways to make sure was carried out.</p> <p>As a result the large volume of empty lorries returning to the quarry's bounce on the uneven surface patches and the grids and cause a very unwelcome source of noise pollution which is not acceptable for a road carrying this amount of heavy traffic. I would like the above points considered by the Planning Department and the Planning Inspector when the Gravel Site Plan is under review to see if any improvements can be made to the Bere Regis to Wool Road and possibly recommend a Southern By-Pass to Bere Regis.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 83	3.1	Paragraph	mr Vesey Brook-Fox		<p>As the wife of Lt Col Brook-Fox I wish to comment. I have made the assumption that his original comments made in 2016 and earlier this month will be considered so I wish to add some supporting comments on reflection.</p> <p>i have had to assume that the document is legally compliant but i believe it is unsound and ineffective. It is clear from reading the Inspectors report from 1996 which deleted Philliols Farm from the Plan that he believed the damage to the 'intimate landscape' of the local countryside could not be mitigated which was unacceptable.</p> <p>It is also clear that it would not be possible to restore the land to its previous farming condition because by removing the gravel this area would become more susceptible to flooding as it is so close to the water table and would become a wetland area instead.</p> <p>It is clear, whatever the mitigation that the local economy would suffer greatly both from the direct impact of the extraction as well as the transportation of the gravel- on the farmer who would lose his livelihood, on adjacent holiday cottages and local caravan sites and on recreational use of the heathland which is used by large numbers of tourists who would wish to go elsewhere.</p> <p>Whilst some would argue that little has changed since the last inspectors report I would disagree! It is of interest that the site was excluded from the draft plan in 2015 and most of the risks identified then (and now) have not been mitigated; that the danger of flooding has increased, not diminished and still no Hydrological Survey has taken place; that BREXIT is underway when productive farms should be maintained, not destroyed, and where the needs of the environment are of greater importance than ever under the Minister.</p> <p>Finally it is not clear that there is the quantity of Gravel purported to exist (is it 1.5m tons or 0.7m tons?) and it would seem sensible to concentrate on other nearby areas with proven deposits in the plan such as Great Plantation (AS06) Station Road (AS25) and Hurst Farm (AS28) which may not have the problem of 2 separate owners.</p>	<p>I believe it is not possible to mitigate the destruction of Philliols Farm, or the impact on the local countryside both in the short and long term.</p> <p>But there remain so many other impacts in the risk register which must be properly reconsidered before Philliols farm is included in the Minerals Extraction Plan</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 85	3.1	Paragraph	Mr John Evans		<p>Calculations of new sand and gravel requirement through to 2033 is 11.87mt; yet the 8 new sites within the plan have reserves estimated to be 16.43 mt, an unnecessary and unjustified over-provision of 4.56 mt.;</p> <p>and this 'oversupply' does not seem to allow for supply from recycled aggregate, which is not insignificant. British Standards permit the inclusion of recycled aggregate in new concrete construction and it is likely that recycling will form an increasing proportion of the aggregate content (currently at 17%), possibly up to 25%.</p> <p>A sensible waste strategy, reflected in DCC's own, is: 1. Lower the sources of waste 2. Re-use 3. Recycle 4. Generate energy from waste 5. Dispose as a last resort DCC already have inert-waste recycling plants as part of their Waste Sites Plan so it not sound to exclude recycling from the supply estimates and it is contrary to National and DCC policy.</p> <p>If realistic tonnage from recycling was included, less supply from new quarries would be required.</p>	<p>Estimates of demand from new sites should be lowered to account for recycled aggregate. The number of sites in the plan should be reduced so that additional reserves are closer to that lower demand estimate i.e remove two or more sites from the plan</p>

PSD
-
MSP
134

3.1

Paragraph

Miss
Elizabeth
Maidment

East
Stoke
Parish
Council

Policy No AS1 - Site Allocation AS06 The site is The Great Plantation, Hethfelton Wood, in the Parish of East Stoke. Public access is from the A352 at East Stoke. Two supporting documents - the Mineral Sites Plan pre-submission draft: Assessment under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 of November 2017, and the Proposed Dorset Mineral Sites - Great Plantation (AS06) Heritage Assessment of November 2017 identify the site as being in the Parish of Bere Regis. The Heritage Assessment identifies it as being "near Bovington". The site is not in the Parish of Bere Regis, it is in the Parish of East Stoke. It may be near Bovington, as it is near Wool and near Wareham but this is not how local people would identify it. Access is through Hethfelton Wood and is gained from entrances off the A352 at East Stoke. These errors may cause confusion and difficulty in gaining information to anyone researching the proposal without local knowledge.

DUTY TO CO-OPERATE There is no evidence that the Parishes of Bere Regis and Arne have been consulted. These Parishes will potentially be affected by traffic movements " Bere Regis along the Puddletown Road and on the A35 at the village of Bere Regis and Arne at the junction of Puddletown Road and A352 at Worgret (see topic SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS, Criterion C19, Impact on Existing Settlements).

The Parish of East Stoke has been kept informed by registering for information and by raising questions at various times since 2013. Site AS06 has been so considerably modified since the 2015 and 2016 proposals that it is effectively a new proposal. This is only available for public response from 1 st December 2017 to 31 st January 2018, with no opportunity to comment on any further assessment or modification. The time available for informed response is not sufficient. Furthermore, only those with specialized professional knowledge such as lawyers and planners will be able to comment on the legality and soundness of this proposal with confidence. A lack of response from the general public should be seen in this context.

WHY IS THE DOCUMENT UNSOUND? In the first instance the document is unsound due to the errors in the supporting documents "Assessment under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations November 2017, and Heritage Assessment November 2017, which place site AS06 in the Parish of Bere Regis, when it lies in the Parish of East Stoke. These errors provide misleading information to those researching the documents. By going to Dorset Minerals Plan on the website, choosing the link to Mineral Sites Plan Pre-submission Draft available for public consultation 1.12.17 to 31.1.18, then proceeding to "Site Appraisals for draft mineral sites plan" you are led to a page last updated 12.2.16. The list of sites on this page is no longer accurate and the appraisal for site AS06 relates to the original proposal with map" significantly different to the modified one issued in 2017. There is no indication of how to proceed to the updated and modified proposal.

To make the plan legally compliant, the supporting documents " Assessment Under Conservation, Habitats and Species Regulations and Heritage Assessment will need to be corrected, putting site AS06 in the Parish of East Stoke and removing it from the Parish of Bere Regis. It would also be desirable to improve on the geographical description of the site being "near Bovington"- it is accessed from East Stoke. However, any such amendment will be too late for those who have already relied upon the incorrect information published. It does not seem possible at this late stage to see any way in which the plan could be made sound in the time available before the consultation period closes on 31 st January 2018.

The comments made in Section 4, when summarised, demonstrate how much information is missing from the proposal for site AS06. A number of formal assessments is required and information on proposed mitigation (particularly in relation to public access) needs to be provided.

East Stoke Parish Council believes that there are too many unknown factors within the proposal, with no opportunity for clarification before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State, and no opportunity for consultation or response when this information does become available.

It seems quite possible that the site could be rejected at the next level, having incurred escalated costs. It is the view of East Stoke Parish Council that the proposal for site AS06, the Great Plantation, should be removed from the plan before submission.

Should the plan indeed go forward, then the question of mitigation of public access availability will be of considerable interest. East Stoke Parish Council would expect an equal distance of accessible paths, with a similar level of interesting terrain to that at present available in Hethfelton Wood. A new route northwards passing to the west of the present quarrying and on towards the Puddletown Road, with possible access from the Puddletown Road in addition to the present East Stoke access, might meet with some enthusiasm. A new circuit of paths within Hethfelton Wood would be the very least expected, and any exchange land beyond reasonable walking distance and away from the site would be unacceptable.

IS THE PROPOSAL FOR SITE AS06 JUSTIFIED? No, Site AS06 contains similar features and constraints to other sites which have now been removed from the draft plan. Site AS08 (Horton Heath) would have been expected to produce 125,000 tons per annum for an unspecified number of years. Site AS12 (Moreton Plantation) would have been expected to produce 500,000 tpa over 14 years. The modified Site AS06 is only expected to produce 200,000 tpa over 10 years. This reduced output does not appear to justify the anticipated adverse effects on biodiversity, heritage and public amenity, where necessary assessments and mitigation are required. See also Pre-Submission Background Addendum Sheet of 11.12.17 referring to Heritage Assessment Phase 2. The government is promoting the availability of open access land, to the extent of proposing payment to landowners to create such access to their land. In site AS06 we have existing and much appreciated open access land; why would the loss of this access be justified? The justification for site AS06 remaining as a proposal in the Draft Plan is unclear.

IS THE PROPOSAL FOR SITE AS06 EFFECTIVE? The site assessment for site AS06 prepared by Dorset County Council, along with the supporting documents aforementioned, highlight concerns remaining over the suitability of the site for any excavation. Namely:

BIODIVERSITY: The impact on International, European and National designations covering habitats, protected species (birds, reptiles, invertebrates) as well as possible adverse implications to the adjacent SSSI/SNCl sites. Under the Habitat Regulations the integrity of the European Ramsar sites may be compromised. It appears that Natural England are not yet completely satisfied with the modified proposal. Further assessments of the effects on all these categories are required, along with proposed mitigation arrangements.

WE DO NOT KNOW WHAT THE FINDINGS WILL BE NOR WHAT MITIGATION ARRANGEMENTS WILL BE PROPOSED. Note Paragraph 1 item 3(exceptional circumstances) of the supporting document "Habitat Regulations Assessment non-technical summary"; "if it is not possible to conclude that there are no adverse effects and it is not possible to change the plan during the course of Appropriate Assessment that the Council (as the plan making body) may only proceed to adopt the plan in closely defined circumstances. The County Council must be satisfied that, if there are no alternative solutions, the plan must be carried out for imperative reasons of over-riding public interest. The County Council may write to the Secretary of State for his opinion, and he may give direction prohibiting agreement with the plan" East Stoke Parish council submits there are no over-riding reasons of public interest for this proposal to proceed.

HERITAGE: Although now excluding the documented ancient monuments (barrows and Battery Bank), the boundaries of the nominated site come very close to these monuments. The possible impact on these and any associated areas of archaeological interest is of concern. The impact on landscape requires further consideration. It is noted that a full Heritage Assessment will be required and no

mitigation arrangement is suggested. WE DO NOT KNOW WHAT THE FINDINGS WILL BE. WATER: It is noted that a full hydrogeological assessment with mitigation proposal is required. WE DO NOT KNOW WHAT THE RESULT OF THIS ASSESSMENT WILL BE. SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS -Human Health and Amenity -To enable safe access to countryside and open spaces -Vehicular Access Site AS06 is currently reached by the public from two access points on the A352 at East Stoke where there are small entry points with parking space, and then on foot through Hethfelton Wood. This is Open Access land owned by the Forestry Commission and is much valued by visitors from both within and outside the Parish of East Stoke. These may be leisure walkers, runners, sometimes riders, or those with a specific interest in the biodiversity and heritage. With significant new housing developments projected with a three mile radius, Hethfelton Wood, including the Great Planation, affords one of a decreasing number of local opportunities for the enjoyment of fresh air, exercise, nature and history. It seems unlikely that there will be numerous responses to the proposal from the public " partly due to the fact that signs at the entrances to Hethfelton Wood are not eye-catching and take some effort to read. However, visitors, when directed to the content of the notices, generally express dismay. The website accessed through Dorset For You is daunting and the response form even more so. Both the Site Assessment and Appendix A to Site Allocations state that "the site is open access, and any loss of access " even if only temporary " must be replaced with other opportunities for public access". East Stoke Parish Council submits that such access should be commensurate and contiguous with what is currently available, and free from noise and dust. The UK Forestry Standard (2011) issued by the Forestry Commission, which sets out guidelines and legal obligations on forest management, contains several references to the commitment to and importance of, public benefit. NO PROPOSALS FOR SUCH MITIGATING ARRANGEMENTS ARE PROVIDED.

VEHICULAR ACCESS The site assessment states that it is EXPECTED that existing access through adjoining works to the north will be used, but allows for the possibility of new access being provided. It is not certain that the works would follow cessation of other work on neighbouring sites. If they should take place in parallel there would be an increased impact from traffic movement. Detailed traffic information/a Transport Assessment will be required, identifying possible impacts and appropriate mitigation. IT IS NOT CLEAR HOW THE SITE WOULD BE WORKED AND WHAT THE IMPACT OF WORKS TRAFFIC WOULD BE, It is of note that access to the site would be MAINLY via A35/A31. MAINLY is not ENTIRELY. Access via the A352 would be unsuitable and strongly contested at the planning stage. The possibility of heavy vehicles using the forest rides in Hethfelton Wood outside the nominated site, and those rides being modified to accommodate this, would be unacceptable. THERE IS NO REASSURANCE THAT THE REMAINDER OF HETHFELTON WOOD WOULD NOT BE DRAWN IN TO THE PROPOSED OPERATION. MITIGATION: The map of the revised proposed site AS06 show a "Mitigation Corridor" within the nominated site but there is no information as to how this will

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>be used or what mitigation would be taking place, nor whether there would be any public exclusion zones in Hethfelton Wood outside the nominated site. REINSTATEMENT: No reinstatement has yet taken place of the existing works to the north, and it is conceded that such deep excavation can never be brought back to its original levels. It seems clear that this would also be the situation applied to Site AS06.</p>	
PSD - MSP 272	3.1	Paragraph	Mrs Jennifer Meade		<p>This plan does not differentiate between Poole Formation Sand and River Terrace Gravel. There is currently nearly 13 years worth of River Terrace Gravel available from existing quarries but less than 7 years worth of Poole Formation Sand.</p>	<p>The plan needs to split out the requirements for River Terrace Gravel and Poole Formation Sand.</p>
PSD - MSP 202	3.1	Paragraph	Mr David Payne	Mineral Products Association	<p>We support the level of provision being made through the allocated sites. National policy requires maintenance of a landbank of permitted reserves equivalent to at least 7 years' worth of supply (7x 1.58mt = 11.06mt; or if the latest LAA figure of 1.55mt is used this would be 10.85mt) throughout the Plan period, including at its end.</p> <p>While the level of proposed provision does not provide for this amount, we acknowledge that the Plan will be reviewed before 2033, and it does provide flexibility and headroom for reserves to be permitted above the amount calculated as needed by 2033 and so goes some way to meeting national policy requirements.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 187	3.1	Paragraph	Mr Rob Westell		<p>The 10 year period used to calculate average output includes all those years when the country was in recession. Mineral output in the UK dropped by 40% at the start of the recession (2008) and has slowly been recovering since. To adopt the average of 1.51mtpa would significantly underestimate the level of future extraction.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Warmwell Quarry (the largest in Dorset) ceased production during 2017 and will not have contributed to output for part of 2017 and the whole of 2018. The gap left by Warmwell Quarry has seen imports of sand from as far afield as Tiverton, Devon, a wholly unsustainable situation, given the distances involved.</p> <p>Dorset has very recently become more dependent on aggregate contributions from neighbouring counties, a situation which must be rectified.</p>	<p>Add a reasonable amount to the landbank calculation to cater for future increases in output, after all the landbank is simply a target, not a maximum. The consequences of not having an appropriate landbank are already becoming apparent.</p>
PSD - MSP 199	3.1	Paragraph	Mr David Payne	Mineral Products Association	<p>We support the provision of potentially c.16.5mt through the site allocations. National policy requires the maintenance of a landbank of reserves equivalent to at least 7 years' supply (7 x 1.58 = 11.06mt) throughout the Plan period, including at its end.</p> <p>Providing for an amount that is potentially above the simple calculation of the plan period x annual supply doesn't entirely account for the need to maintain a minimum of a 7 year landbank at the end of the Plan period, as it is likely the Plan will be reviewed before then, but does provide some flexibility for additional reserves to be permitted at allocated sites.</p> <p>This is also important as demand is likely to rise and annual provision will need to rise to meet this demand.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
265

3.1

Paragraph

Mr
Tony
Meade
r

Knightsf
ord
parish
council

The Draft Mineral Site Plan fails to calculate and maintain separate landbanks of Poole Formation Sand and River Terrace Gravel.

It puts forward sites that will result in a serious under supply of Poole Formation Sand (less than 3 years worth) and a ridiculous over supply of River Terrace Gravel (28 years worth). It fails to meet the requirement of NPPF 145 and the 2014 Mineral Strategy. The plan is unsound and illegal.

Additional information, supporting references and arguments NPPF 13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals ,Paragraph 145 states; "Mineral planning authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by; calculating and maintaining separate landbanks for any aggregate materials of a specific type or quality which have a distinct and separate market. This is recognised in the 2014 Minerals Strategy; " Key Issue 2 - Planning for an appropriate, robust and flexible level of aggregates provision having regard to demand. " " Policy AS2 " Landbank Provision - The Mineral Planning Authorities will maintain separate landbank for both Poole Formation and River Terrace aggregate equivalent to at least 7 years' supply in each case." There are also numerous sections in the 2014 Mineral Strategy and the Local Aggregate Assessment where the permitted reserves, annual demand and landbanks of River Terrace gravel and Poole Formation sand are differentiated and quoted. For example - the 2014 Mineral Strategy paragraphs covering The Current Picture & Monitoring and maintaining separate landbanks; "7.28 Following discussions with companies and their agents, sales and reserves figures have been divided by source (either Poole Formation or river terrace gravel) where commercial confidentiality restrictions allow. This enables a useful assessment of supply and will avoid the risk of specific shortages of particular types of material being hidden within an overall total figure. 7.51 Poole Formation sand and river terrace/plateau sand and gravels are geologically different and it is considered appropriate to monitor their supply separately. This will ensure that, should there be a decline in either type of aggregate, this will not be masked by overall production and the level of the combined landbank. The Mineral Planning Authority would then be able to take appropriate action to address a decline. Further analysis based on production from quarries within the different geological deposits makes it possible to identify separate landbanks. 7.52 At the end of 2011, the average of the previous ten years of production was 1.58 mtpa. This comprised 1.01 mtpa or 64% of Poole Formation and 0.57 mtpa or 36% of River Terrace sand/gravel. The figures of 36% for River Terrace and 64% for Poole Formation represent relative levels of production of the different types of aggregate. They are not intended to comprise a cap on future production levels. As the ten year rolling average varies year by year relative production levels may also vary. 7.53 Applying these relative proportions to the estimated reserves (9) (at the end of 2011) of River Terrace (approximately 7.6 mt) and Poole Formation (approximately 9.9 mt) aggregate gives indicative landbanks of 13.3 years for River Terrace/plateau sand and gravel and almost 10 years for Poole Formation sand. River Terrace: $7.6\text{mt}/0.57\text{mtpa} = 13.3$ years Poole Formation: $9.9\text{mt}/1.01\text{mtpa} = 9.8$ years 7.54 This exercise will be repeated annually to identify possible shortfalls in provision. Policy AS2 commits to the maintenance of at least a 7 year landbank for each type of sand/sand and gravel."

And, for example - the paragraphs in the latest full Local Aggregate Assessment 2006-2015 (May 2017) covering Monitoring Separate Sand and Gravel Landbanks ; "1.41 . Although the two types of land-won aggregate are to some extent interchangeable, as required by Policy AS2 of the 2014 Minerals Strategy the Mineral Planning Authority seeks to maintain and monitor separate landbanks for Poole Formation and River Terrace. This is done through monitoring sales from quarries which produce primarily one type of aggregate or the other. 1.42. At the end of 2015, reserves of Poole Formation were 7.1 mt and River Terrace was 6.7 mt. However, the levels of sales are different, with approximately 0.92 mt of Poole Formation (61%) sold compared with approximately 0.58 mt of River Terrace (39%) in 2015. 1.43. The ten year average sales figures from 2006 to 2015 are 1.03 mtpa for Poole Formation and 0.52 mtpa for River Terrace. If these sales figures are applied to the reserves figures, they indicate

Tonnage and landbank estimates for Poole Formation sand and River Terrace gravel should be clearly identified in the plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>that the separate landbanks are around: Poole Formation: 7.11 mt (reserves) / 1.03 mt (10 year average to 2015) = 6.9 years River Terrace: 6.72 mt (reserves) / 0.52 mt (10 year average to 2015) = 12.9 years 1.44 . The Poole Formation landbank is just under 7 years and the River Terrace landbank almost 13 years. The Poole Formation will be closely monitored to see if the decline continues, or increases in subsequent years. It is not considered that any specific action is required now. There will be an increased need to maintain the Poole Formation landbank, for example through the emerging Mineral Sites Plan or new permissions, to demonstrate compliance with the Minerals Strategy. This is all the more relevant as one of the main producers of Poole Formation sand, Warmwell Quarry, is due to close within a year or less."</p> <p>A simple review of the proposed sites locations on the British Geological Society maps of Dorset, the estimated Tonnage per Hectare (a good indicator of whether aggregate is deep quarried Poole Formation sand or really extensive shallow River Terrace gravel), and their elevation shows the proposed sites are split as follows;</p> <p>Poole Formation sand sites; AS06 Great Plantation " 2mt (136,000t/Ha) AS15 Tatchells Quarry Extension " 0.33mt (152,000t/Ha) Total approx. 2.33mt " approximately 2.5 years supply of sand.</p> <p>River Terrace gravel sites; AS09 Hurn Court Farm Quarry Extension - 0.6mt (42,000t/Ha) AS12 Philliol's - 1.5mt (22,000t/Ha) AS13 Roeshot Quarry Extension " 3.5mt (7,000t/Ha) AS19 Woodsford Quarry Extension " 2.1mt (33,000t/Ha) AS25 Station Road, Moreton " 3.1mt (52,000t/Ha) AS26 Hurst Farm, Moreton " 3.3mt (42,000t/Ha) Total approx. 14.1mt " approximately 28 years supply of gravel.</p> <p>The landbank for sand and gravel can then be calculated as follows; Poole Formation sand landbank 7.1mt (end of 2015) " 3mt (3 years decline to end of 2018) +2.3mt (New allocation) = 6.4mt equivalent to a 6.5 year landbank which does not meet NPPF or local policy.</p> <p>River Terrace gravel landbank 6.7mt (end of 2015) " 1.5mt (3 years decline to end of 2018) + 14mt (New allocation) = 19.2mt, equivalent to a 38 year landbank which far exceeds the 7 year landbank required by the NPPF.</p> <p>The Draft Mineral Site Plan fails to "calculate and maintain separate landbanks for the specific materials", as required by NPPF. It puts forward sites that will result in a serious under supply of Poole Formation Sand (less than 3 years) and a ridiculous over supply of River Terrace Gravel (28 years). It fails to meet the requirement of NPPF 145 and the 2014 Mineral Strategy. The plan is illegal and unsound.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 365	3.1	Paragraph	Mrs Joanne Baker	Aggregate Industries UK Limited	Please see attached report.	Final paragraph of section 3.4 is amended with italicised text as follows: "This amount, along with the Area of Search (AOS) designated in Policy MS-2 and windfall sites outside the AOS required to meet specialist markets is considered to adequately meet the need for sand and gravel over the life of the Plan and will meet the requirement for a steady and adequate supply of sand and gravel in accordance with Policy AS-1 of the Minerals Strategy.
PSD - MSP 367	3.1	Paragraph	Mrs Joanne Baker	Aggregate Industries UK Limited	Please see report attached to representation number PSD-MSP 365.	It is requested that an additional paragraph is added to Policy MS-2 which states that ' applications in the AONB for the development of non-allocated sites must meet the exceptional circumstances set out in Paragraph 116 of the NPPF .'
PSD - MSP 278	3.6	Paragraph	Mr Tony Meade	Knightford parish council	As commented in para 2.16 - the plan does not differentiate between river terrace gravel and poole formation sand as required by NPPF and the county mineral strategy. This results in the nominated sites providing too little sand and too much gravel.	Declare how much of each type of aggregate the sites listed are reasonably expected to provide for the plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 544	3.6	Paragraph	Paul Wyatt	Woodsford Farms Ltd	<p>Policy MS-1 identifies allocated sites to meet the provision set out at paragraph 3.4, and the principle of 'over' provision is supported as this builds in flexibility.</p> <p>The potential yield from sites AS25 and AS26 is questioned, as the coverable thickness of the mineral is TWICE the average thickness found at Woodsford Quarry, as well as that for the 'Resource Block C' of the MAU Report 103 'Dorchester and Wareham'.</p> <p>If a more realistic reserve figure of 1.3 million tonnes for AS25, and 1.7 million tonnes for AS26, then the contribution from these two sites would be 3.0 million tonnes, some 3.4 million tonnes below that put forward. Whilst this reduction will still provide (with the permitted reserves) 23.88 million tonnes, which is above the provision in paragraph 3.4, it demonstrates a much less flexible approach (see site comment).</p> <p>The sites in MS-1 are supported subject to clarity on the recoverable reserves.</p>	<p>Subject to the above revised mineral assessments being found to be correct, the revised yields for sites AS25 and AS26 need to amend the calculation of the provision in paragraph 3.4 as well as the reserve figures used in Policy MS-1.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 20	3.8	Paragraph	Mr Vesey Brook-Fox		<p>I am assuming the large number of previous comments made will be carefully reconsidered because none of the serious issues raised appear to have been addressed and the impression gained is that they will be deferred until after a decision is made which ineffective.</p> <p>The proposal to include Philliols Farm as an allocated site is unsound and ineffective. It is difficult to understand how with BREXIT underway that a productive working farm can now become an allocated site when it was turned down by the Independent Planning Inspector in 1996 and again, as a result of a large number of responses to the original proposed minerals site plan of 2013/14, was turned down in 2015 when nothing has changed.</p> <p>There are so many areas within the risk assessment that need further assessment or mitigation relating to environmental impact, impacts on local transport, dwellings, economy and recreational activities that it is ineffective to take this proposal forward before they are addressed. In particular the fact that much of the land will not be able to be returned to agricultural use and is more likely to flood, that there is, as yet, no contractor wishing to take on the extraction, that the current tenants are unlikely to be able to object for fear of losing their employment (and if the project goes ahead are unlikely to be able to continue farming Philliols) and there seems to be great uncertainty anyway over the quantity of gravel available (the assessment has risen from .7m tons to 1.5m without further research) makes the decision unsound.</p>	<p>Much more prior investigation and analysis of the impacts highlighted in the risk assessment should have been carried out and needs to be carried out before Philliols Farm could be included in the Minerals Sites Plan. Therefore the current proposed plan is unsound.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 10	3.8	Paragraph	Mr Terry Sneller	West Dorset District Council	<p>The main issue of concern for West Dorset is the extents of the proposals for aggregates (i.e. sand and gravel) extraction in the Woodsford / Crossways / Moreton area.</p> <p>Three large site allocations are proposed: an extension to the north of the existing Woodsford Quarry (AS-19); a new site south of Station Road west of Moreton (AS-25); and a new site at Hurst Farm, north of the B3390 (AS-26) Although some of the impacts highlighted will be mitigated in part by other policies in the Minerals Strategy and Minerals Sites Plan the key concerns raised in the councils response to the 2016 draft plan consultation are considered to still be valid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent of the proposed minerals workings around the villages especially in relation to the length of time that the area will be worked for minerals; • The volume of traffic and the HGV movements that will result from the quarry workings on top of the growth from proposed housing development; • The potential for impact on the local economy especially the local tourist economy (including Silverlake and Sculpture by the Lakes, Tincleton); • The impact of all of this development on the amenity of the residents of Crossways; and • The impact on the local landscape resulting from the quarry development. <p>It is however acknowledged that the minerals sites around Woodsford / Crossways / Moreton are proposed to be worked sequentially and reflect the demand for sand and gravel. This approach is supported by West Dorset District Council to ensure that traffic movements associated with the developments are not dissimilar to the current situation. However, the construction of the link between the West Stafford Bypass and Highgate Lane south of the railway line should be considered as a mechanism to mitigate the impacts of future growth in minerals related and non-minerals related traffic in the area.</p> <p>It is also recognised that the extraction of minerals contributes to the local economy and that restoration of worked out quarries can offer opportunities for wildlife enhancement and for tourism. These issues will need to be given detailed consideration when decisions are made on planning applications for the proposed sites.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 14	3.8	Paragraph	Mr Ben Wallbridge		Consideration as to the effects on Rights of Way should be taken and appropriate mitigation such as buffer zones/margins/screening/diversions should be included by any planning proposals.	Where new proposed mineral sites are crossed by Rights of Way it may be useful to consult closely with the relevant person responsible for maintaining or diverting it (DCC Senior Rangers/Definitive RoW Officers) to ensure any future planning applications won't be objected to on these grounds.
PSD - MSP 43	3.8	Paragraph	Ms Debbie Weller	Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Philliol's Farm should not be included as a site for consideration as it is a working farm, has been refused at varying levels including the Planning Inspector, will impact severely on the local rural roads that are not built for this traffic and will adversely affect residents in Cold Harbour and Trigon with HGVs damaging the roads, dust, noise, contamination and making an unlit, fast rural road unsafe for tourists and residents. There is no pavement along this road so pedestrians trying to access the pub or forest are buffeted by the wind of passing HGVs; cyclists and horse riders are also at risk. This is a tourist area and the extra traffic could impact on local businesses.	Remove this site from the plan. If this is not accepted then ensure the traffic turns left to access the A35 and does not go through Cold Harbour and Trigon.

PSD
-
MSP
176

3.8

Paragraph

Mr
Richard
Smith

INTRODUCTION My response refers to site AS12 Philliols Farm as a new allocation site under Policy MS-1. I have made responses to previous consultations on the Mineral Sites Plan in 2014 and 2016 concerning this site, and the points now being made are largely due to the lack of answers being given by the Mineral Planning Authority.

I consider that inclusion of this site is unsound both because the evidence in the site assessment is not robust or credible in many important respects ('justified'), and also because there are serious constraints on the site being able to deliver what is shown ('effective'). I feel that the site is not included as a result of a 'comprehensive process of site assessment and selection', which paragraph 1.4 of the Introduction to the Pre-Submission Draft claims to be one of the necessary functions of the Mineral Sites Plan.

REASONS FOR LACK OF SOUNDNESS This inclusion of the site is unsound in four main areas :

a) Misrepresentation of the true nature of the site The site is included as a 'Heath/Forest mosaic' landscape type which, according to the Landscape Management Guidelines issued in December 2017, is based on 'limited desk study evidence'. In reality the site for extraction is river valley located and at or near river level, fully given over to agriculture and subject to prominent views from surrounding higher areas, mainly from the east round to the south west. Only by emphasising these features, can the true landscape sensitivity and intimate landscape character be properly taken into account, as it was at the time of the public enquiry into this site for the previous planning cycle in 1996.

b) Vital assessment work is not being undertaken Being low lying river valley land, the topic of water is crucial. Despite the site assessment criterion C12 (hydrogeology) and C13 (surface water) being at the highest level of sensitivity ('A'), a full hydrogeological assessment will not be undertaken until the planning application stage (i.e. after inclusion within the Plan) and not as part of the site allocation process as the Environment Agency require in their responses in 2014 and 2016. This site is not just subject to a 'theoretical risk of surface water flooding' as the Lead Local Flood Authority say in their response ; it is an increasingly regular reality with the higher water table in ever wetter winter periods. In their response in 2016, Natural England also say that the hydrological impacts on both an adjoining SSSI and SNCI have not been sufficiently well identified. The criteria concerning Biodiversity (C1 to C5) also acknowledge the 'A' sensitivity designation but propose no detailed analysis until the planning application stage. It is very unsound and complacent to constantly defer assessments, as they have now been over many years, beyond the point where the site is formally allocated.

c) References to mitigation of likely impacts The site assessment makes constant reference to mitigation in many criteria, frequently without specifying any details about how this is to be achieved and sometimes, in cases such as landscape character and sensitivity, where the idea of mitigation is intrinsically unsound. In addition, Natural England note that the displacement of recreation as a result of an access road to the site being built through the adjoining heathland of Wareham Forest could be the most difficult to overcome.

d) Constraints of the Site The question of the level of gravel reserve has been raised at all stages of consultation without any appropriate response being given. The figure for the reserve apparently results from survey work on the amount of gravel undertaken by the extraction firm then interested in developing the site, in around 2008. That firm has since withdrawn its interest in extraction from the site on commercial grounds. Also, the reserve now stated conflicts fundamentally with the figure used in the previous cycle, now being over double the amount then reported upon. This is despite the fact that the deepest amounts of gravel are known to be in the area adjoining the south east of the site which is no longer included for extraction, and the owner of that land has provided details in consultation responses, especially in 2016. These unexplained variations in gravel volumes are all the more surprising because these are river gravel deposits and therefore of even, if varying thickness. The response of the

I consider that the inclusion of site AS12 in the Pre-Submission draft plan is highly unsound on many counts, and that it should be deleted from the allocated sites making up paragraph 3.8 of the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>Mineral Planning Authority to past consultations has been nothing more than to reiterate the need for adequate reserves across the county, and not to answer the point that this casts severe doubt on the viability of the site and therefore the soundness of its inclusion in this plan.</p> <p>CONCLUSION It is unsound that the lengthy planning process, which in the case of the Mineral Sites Plan, has now been going on for nearly a decade, seems to involve little more than selecting sites for potential allocation, while much crucial assessment is deferred until after a site is selected and when any planning permission is sought. This is particularly applicable as regards the Philliols Farm site which has been rejected after the most recent independent examination, and which involves severe damage to this sensitive rural area, and for which there are severe constraints on the ability to produce what is claimed. I feel that the potential damage to the area and its residents and businesses, involving destruction of livelihood for many of the latter should be faced up to now and not simply hidden away in the interests of the total reserves shown in the Plan. No amount of deferring or misrepresenting vital information on the area can make a site acceptable, whatever the constraints imposed on the Mineral Planning Authority, who have in any case accepted the need for flexibility by including both a separate policy for an 'Area of Search', and by putting forward a number of new specific sites which, together with existing site allocations, exceed the anticipated future production by a considerable margin. As a resident adjoining the site, I also concur with the points raised by the residents group RAGE in this and previous consultation responses.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 301	3.8	Paragraph	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	Historic England	<p>Policy MS-1: Production of Sand & Gravel - Great Plantation, Bere Regis</p> <p>The proposed quarry would have a major impact on the settings and significance of three scheduled monuments: a Bronze Age round barrow and two sections of the Battery Bank linear earthwork. These three heritage assets are landscape monuments intended by their builders to have a distinctive topographical and visual presence in the landscape. The landscape setting of the monuments is of key importance to an understanding and appreciation of these heritage assets and is a fundamental and significant component of their heritage significance and public value.</p> <p>The present proposals, both in the position and extent of the quarry and also in the landform created in the post-extraction restoration scheme, would bring permanent major adverse changes to the landform and landscape which provides the primary context and setting of the monuments. We consider that these proposals would result in substantial harm to the significance of these designated heritage assets. We consider that there may be scope for extraction in the area to the north of the Battery Bank and east of the barrow, but the proposals would need significant modification in order to reduce the level of harm to the affected heritage assets to a level where it would be acceptable.</p> <p>The area of extraction would need to be significantly smaller than that currently proposed, and designed so as to retain sufficient historic landform around and between the monuments to maintain the integrity of their landscape setting.</p> <p>Similarly, the present quarry restoration scheme would need to be significantly modified so that it would reinstate ground surfaces at, or close to, the existing historic ground levels within the primary settings of the monuments in order to restore as far as possible their visual landscape settings. We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss this matter with you.</p>	

Inconsistent site boundaries for AS06. The site boundary for site AS06 Great Plantation varies between the following parts of the minerals sites plan, with at least three different site boundaries shown in different parts of the plan. Compare site boundaries in the following areas:

Pre-submission draft Mineral Sites Plan December 2017 - Part 2 (Insets 1-8) (pdf, 11Mb)
https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/223930/Pre-submission-draft-Mineral-Sites-Plan-December-2017---Part-2-Insets-1-8/pdf/Pages_76-92_insets_1-8.pdf

Submission policies maps inset 7 Site Assessments for allocated mineral sites Mineral Site Assessment 2017 - AS06 Great Plantation (pdf, 2Mb)
https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/224266/Mineral-Site-Assessment-2017---AS06-Great-Plantation/pdf/AS06_Great_Plantation_-_Site_Assessment.pdf

Background documents, site appraisals, Purbeck
https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/211589/AS06-Great-Plantation-Assessment-Proforma/pdf/AS06_Great_Plantation_Assessment_Proforma.pdf

The inconsistencies in these documents mean that there has not been a meaningful consultation on the nomination of the site, as the site has not been clearly defined.

Inaccurate assessments, with incorrect location for proposed site AS06: Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report - Mineral Sites Plan - Nov 2017 (pdf, 1Mb)
https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/223910/Habitats-Regulation-Assessment-Screening-Report---Mineral-Sites-Plan---Nov-2017/pdf/HRA_Screening_Report_for_Draft_Mineral_Sites_Plan_-_Nov_17_FINAL.pdf

Page 11 incorrectly places AS06 into Bere Regis, it is not located in Bere Regis, but in the parish of East Stoke.

Heritage Assessment for AS06 Great Plantation - Phase 2 (pdf, 1Mb)
https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/224036/Heritage-Assessment-for-AS06-Great-Plantation--Phase-2/pdf/Heritage_Assessment_for_AS06_Great_Plantation_-_Phase_2.pdf

Page 1 incorrectly places AS06 into Bere Regis, it is not located in Bere Regis, but in the parish of East Stoke. The factual inaccuracies in these documents mean that there has not been an appropriate assessment with regards to habitats regulation and heritage (fails the legal compliance test)

Coupled with the inconsistent site boundaries, we cannot be sure to which site boundary these assessments relate (fails the "justified" test).

Incomplete assessment for site AS06 https://www.dorsetforyou.gov.uk/media/224266/Mineral-Site-Assessment-2017---AS06-Great-Plantation/pdf/AS06_Great_Plantation_-_Site_Assessment.pdf

Page 5 Criterion C11 " Impact on archaeology. is incomplete, states "Revised comments based on reduced area awaited!" Fails the justified test. More generally. the inconsistencies across the stages of the development of the minerals sites plan with regard to this site mean that there has not been meaningful consultation regarding the inclusion of the site. Documents which refer to the site using a name (Great Plantation) that whilst technically correct is contrary to the name of the site on information boards at the public entrances (Hethfelton Woods, East Stoke), and which assert that

This should be resolved by removing site AS06 from the plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					the site is located in an entirely different parish mean that few people affected have even been aware of the proposal.	
PSD - MSP 164	3.8	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	We cannot find any mention of Binnegar Extension, AS-01, including Appendix D: Sites Considered During Preparation of the Plan within the supporting document Sustainability Appraisal Report - PART 2 - Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2017	
PSD - MSP 136	3.8	Paragraph	Mrs Hilary Chittenden		EDEP supports the exclusion of Horton Common/Redmans Hill for the reasons previously given - appended as Annex A1 and A2 (of document attached to this comment). EDEP supports the exclusion of Purple Haze South for the reasons previously given " appended as Annex B (of document attached to this comment).	

My comments relate to Site AS12 - Philliols Farm- as I strongly believe that this area should be deleted from the Site Allocation List. I made comments in the previous 2016 consultation response and these should be taken in to account again. I believe that the plan is unsound as it flawed, has been put together with very little preparation and none of the issues on which it was last turned down has been dealt with or investigated as it would appear that all areas of impact can be 'mitigated'. However, no consideration has been given to the mitigation since last it was attempted to put it in the plan and it would be unsound to put such tenuous mitigations within the plan, granting very great flexibility and presumption that conditions would be met at the planning stage.

The amounts of gravel available would appear to have been severely over-estimated compared with previous figures put forward and on a smaller site. When Hyde Farm was included, which is where (we were told) the majority of reserves lay, the figure was estimated at .69m tonnes but the estimate is now 1.5m tonnes - again, an assumption with nothing to substantiate that figure, so very unsound.

The introduction to the draft claims that sites have been allocated on the basis of a comprehensive process of site assessment and selection but this is unsound as no further process of assessment has been carried out since it was last rejected. It is too late to do assessments at the planning stage and why have a detailed process now but defer everything until the site has been included to the planning stage? Whilst allocating a site does not necessarily proceed to the granting of planning, as much consultation takes place at this stage, there is then a general presumption in favour of planning permission and justification for declination. It would be unsound to include this site within the draft now, leaving ultimate decisions with the planners, when there are so many unresolved issues.

Whilst there is pressure to find more amounts of gravel, I believe that there is a national policy to encourage recycling aggregates and destruction of sensitive areas should not be encouraged by including them within draft plans on such flawed and inadequate information. This demonstrates that this is not a sound reason for including this site. There is no fresh evidence to justify overturning of the inspector's decision less than 2 years ago, indeed use of the forestry has increased dramatically over the last few years and the environment has become even more sensitive and endangered and should not be destroyed if there is absolutely any other option available. It is stated in the plan that the land would revert in part to agriculture, this is absolutely impossible since the land will be so lowered and destroyed that it will be many, many years before anyone would know the true outcome of any extraction.

It is stated that an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out as part of any planning application to identify management of existing hedgerows and ancient trees. This is not sound as assessments should not be left to the planning stage and then disasters 'mitigated' as it will be impossible for existing hedgerows and trees to survive once the land has been lowered and it has become a wetland area.

There would be total destruction of the rare and endangered fairy shrimps which live in the pond in the middle of the area - the plan is clearly unsound as 'mitigation' would be impossible. Their existence depends on the natural drying out of the pond and its subsequent refilling to utilise the pressure of water to hatch their larvae and no amount of mitigation could protect their pond. There are a number of badgers, badger setts and other endangered and protected species living on the farm (nightjars, ravens, ospreys, smooth snakes, dormice, buzzards, kingfishers, bats) and the stream (salmon, crayfish and trout). Assessments are to be carried out prior to the planning stage again - but no amount of assessments will protect these species. The badgers can not be 'rehomed' as no one will welcome badgers on to their land, their setts would be destroyed as you can not remove aggregates without digging and it is anyway illegal to harm or threaten the animals, or their habitat, so the presumption that planning could mitigate it could, actually, be an illegal consideration.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>There are 2 grade 2 listed buildings within the site, both in drastic need of maintenance and the plan actually suggests that this would be more likely if extraction were to take place and that these buildings could, therefore benefit. This is a very weak assessment as the listed buildings should be protected and maintained, not used as a means of inserting the area within the draft minerals plan, and illustrates further how unsound this plan is with regard to the Philliols Farm site.</p> <p>The inspector in 1996 stated that the open views were particularly vulnerable to the visual effects of gravel working and earthmoving. The farm can be seen from many miles away and viewpoints on the Purbeck and this would clearly have a negative affect on the visual impact, not only for the farm house and cottages, who would be 'bunded in', but on tourism in the entire Purbeck area. To say that mitigation could deal with the visual impact is unsound.</p> <p>Noise Impact on Human Receptors - the plan grading this as 'B' is unsound and it should be regraded as 'A' red, having a very significant impact as it would be impossible to extract gravel from the Philliols site with only a significant adverse impact, rather than a very significant adverse impact. The houses in the vicinity, of which there are many, would be very significantly affected, not only by noise, but by dust and traffic. Whilst the lorries will be using the Wareham Road as the haul road, there is a busy lane dissecting the site, used currently by small traffic, walkers, horse riders and a large number of cyclists and this would have to be crossed to gain access to the forestry haulage road. To conclude - I believe that there are too many areas where the Minerals Plan in respect of AS12 (Philliols Farm) is unsound and that inclusion of the site within the plan would therefore be completely contrary to the consultation process. There has been no justification put forward for its inclusion within the plan when it has already been rejected twice, nor that there is justifiable reason for overriding an inspector's previous decision.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 168	3.8	Paragraph	Cllr Trevor Poole	Affpuddle & Turnerpuddle Parish Council	<p>1. The Affpuddle & Turnerpuddle Parish Council welcomes that the Hurst Farm and Station Road sites are proposed to be worked consecutively so as to avoid undue negative effects on nearby residents. However, we have severe concerns about HGV traffic generation from both these sites and from the proposed Woodsford Farm Site that may travel north along the B3390 over Hurst Bridge, via Waddock Cross and Affpuddle as a means to access the A35T.</p> <p>Our Parish boundary to the south starts in the centre of the River Frome and the roads that HGV's may use from this point going North are not of sufficient width or alignment to accommodate existing HGV traffic safely let alone additional HGV traffic. We have lobbied DCC Highways for a long time to make improvements to Hurst Bridge, Waddock Crossroads and the B3390 from the point just south of Beehive Cottage through the single track section. past the old Rectory and Mill, over the River Piddle and on past North Barn to the A25T approach.</p> <p>We are told that "there is no budget for these works" and that "past collision data does not indicate a problem" but we still consistently hear from our Parishioners about frequent near misses and non-injury accidents. It is our view that insufficient weight has been attributed to the observations we made previously in connection with this document and therefore we conclude that the inclusion of these three sites cannot be justified without re-assessing the need to have a defined and acceptable routeing policy for these three sites for HGV's accessing the A35T 2.</p> <p>Additionally, we add support to our residents that live in Pallington and Tingleton who are concerned that the environmental issues of working the Woodsford Farm proposed extension have not been properly considered.</p>	<p>1. The site assessments for Hurst Farm, Station Road and the Woodsford Farm Extension should be reworded to consider HGV Routing going north and a paragraph should be added to this section to draw DCC's attention to the need to do this.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
151

3.8

Paragraph

Mrs
Kathleen
Baldwin

My comments relate to Site AS12 - Philliols Farm- as I strongly believe that this area should be deleted from the Site Allocation List. I made comments in the previous 2016 consultation response and these should be taken in to account again. I believe that the plan is unsound as it flawed, has been put together with very little preparation and none of the issues on which it was last turned down has been dealt with or investigated as it would appear that all areas of impact can be 'mitigated'. However, no consideration has been given to the mitigation since last it was attempted to put it in the plan and it would be unsound to put such tenuous mitigations within the plan, granting very great flexibility and presumption that conditions would be met at the planning stage. The amounts of gravel available would appear to have been severely over-estimated compared with previous figures put forward and on a smaller site. When Hyde Farm was included, which is where (we were told) the majority of reserves lay, the figure was estimated at .69m tonnes but the estimate is now 1.5m tonnes - again, an assumption with nothing to substantiate that figure, so very unsound. The introduction to the draft claims that sites have been allocated on the basis of a comprehensive process of site assessment and selection but this is unsound as no further process of assessment has been carried out since it was last rejected. It is too late to do assessments at the planning stage and why have a detailed process now but defer everything until the site has been included to the planning stage? Whilst allocating a site does not necessarily proceed to the granting of planning, as much consultation takes place at this stage, there is then a general presumption in favour of planning permission and justification for declination. It would be unsound to include this site within the draft now, leaving ultimate decisions with the planners, when there are so many unresolved issues. Whilst there is pressure to find more amounts of gravel, I believe that there is a national policy to encourage recycling aggregates and destruction of sensitive areas should not be encouraged by including them within draft plans on such flawed and inadequate information. This demonstrates that this is not a sound reason for including this site. There is no fresh evidence to justify overturning of the inspector's decision less than 2 years ago, indeed use of the forestry has increased dramatically over the last few years and the environment has become even more sensitive and endangered and should not be destroyed if there is absolutely any other option available. It is stated in the plan that the land would revert in part to agriculture, this is absolutely impossible since the land will be so lowered and destroyed that it will be many, many years before anyone would know the true outcome of any extraction. It is stated that an Environmental Impact Assessment will be carried out as part of any planning application to identify management of existing hedgerows and ancient trees. This is not sound as assessments should not be left to the planning stage and then disasters 'mitigated' as it will be impossible for existing hedgerows and trees to survive once the land has been lowered and it has become a wetland area. There would be total destruction of the rare and endangered fairy shrimps which live in the pond in the middle of the area - the plan is clearly unsound as 'mitigation' would be impossible. Their existence depends on the natural drying out of the pond and its subsequent refilling to utilise the pressure of water to hatch their larvae and no amount of mitigation could protect their pond. There are a number of badgers, badger setts and other endangered and protected species living on the farm (nightjars, ravens, ospreys, smooth snakes, dormice, buzzards, kingfishers, bats) and the stream (salmon, crayfish and trout). Assessments are to be carried out prior to the planning stage again - but no amount of assessments will protect these species. The badgers can not be 'relocated' as no one will welcome badgers on to their land, their setts would be destroyed as you can not remove aggregates without digging and it is anyway illegal to harm or threaten the animals, or their habitat, so the presumption that planning could mitigate it could, actually, be an illegal consideration. There are 2 grade 2 listed buildings within the site, both in drastic need of maintenance and the plan actually suggests that this would be more likely if extraction were to take place and that these buildings could, therefore benefit. This is a very weak assessment as the listed buildings should be protected and maintained, not used as a means of inserting the area within the draft minerals plan, and illustrates further how unsound this plan is with regard to the Philliols Farm

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>site. The inspector in 1996 stated that the open views were particularly vulnerable to the visual effects of gravel working and earthmoving. The farm can be seen from many miles away and viewpoints on the Purbeck and this would clearly have a negative affect on the visual impact, not only for the farm house and cottages, who would be 'bunded in', but on tourism in the entire Purbeck area. To say that mitigation could deal with the visual impact is unsound. Noise Impact on Human Receptors - the plan grading this as 'B' is unsound and it should be regraded as 'A' red, having a very significant impact as it would be impossible to extract gravel from the Philliols site with only a significant adverse impact, rather than a very significant adverse impact. The houses in the vicinity, of which there are many, would be very significantly affected, not only by noise, but by dust and traffic. Whilst the lorries will be using the Wareham Road as the haul road, there is a busy lane dissecting the site, used currently by small traffic, walkers, horse riders and a large number of cyclists and this would have to be crossed to gain access to the forestry haulage road. To conclude - I believe that there are too many areas where the Minerals Plan in respect of AS12 (Philliols Farm) is unsound and that inclusion of the site within the plan would therefore be completely contrary to the consultation process. There has been no justification put forward for its inclusion within the plan when it has already been rejected twice, nor that there is justifiable reason for overriding an inspector's previous decision.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
188

3.8

Paragraph

Mrs
Helen
Edwards

The plan is not sound. The plan is not justified We previously submitted our objection and justification for the Philliols Farm site (AS12) being deleted from the Site Allocation List in our response to the 2016 Consultation. With regard to comments on the current (2017) Site Assessment for Philliols Farm, we completely agree with and fully support all the comments made by RAGE, but also include our own comments below. The current Site Assessment is not justified as it is not based on robust and credible evidence and the assessments are incomplete; the choices made in the assessment are not, in many instances, backed up by fact. We are concerned that none of the reasons for rejection given by the Inspector in 1996 have been mitigated and therefore all of the following reasons for rejection are still valid namely, visual impact, impact on recreational land, noise impact, impact on the local economy and impact to nature conservation value. The approach that has been taken in many sections of the 2017 Site Assessment to defer both risk assessments and the proposal of mitigation methods to the planning stage is an unsound approach and cannot be justifiable as part of a properly performed Site Assessment. Examples are as follows: Topic: Biodiversity: An Environmental Risk Assessment has not been performed thus no mitigation measures are proposed. Topic: Landscape: An Environmental Risk Assessment has not been performed Specifically in relation to C8 the enormity of the visual impact of this mineral site development on the extremely special open views across the forest is unquestionable and the suggested mitigation measure would not in any way mitigate the loss of these open views. It is significant that this site will require the construction of a new haul road right through the forest to the C7 as existing tracks would not be adequate. Both the visual and audible impact (estimated 200 haul lorry movements a day in addition to site workings) on this beautiful and tranquil part of the Forest will be severely damaging and detrimental to both residents locally and recreational users (walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders). This part of the forest is used widely by tourists visiting the area as a peaceful and tranquil spot to enjoy as part of their holiday. In addition, the wildlife that lives here will be disturbed and their habitats destroyed. The development of the Philliols Farm site together with the necessary haul road will negatively impact the landscape adversely affecting both wildlife and the use any enjoyment of this area for recreation by locals and tourists. Topic Water: A full Hydrological Assessment has not been carried out and thus no mitigation has been proposed. Topic: Material Assets (Economic Development) An Environmental Risk Assessment has not been performed thus no mitigation measures are proposed. Tourism is an increasing important industry locally. There are many holiday properties in the area, together with several caravan parks, these businesses are important to the local economy. Visitors come and stay in the area to enjoy the outside amenities and particularly the forest and the surrounding countryside. The site itself, the additional heavy traffic on the roads in and around the forest (estimated 200 lorry movements a day) and the associated noise and dirt will undoubtedly deter visitors to the area and adversely affect many local businesses associated with recreation and tourism both directly and indirectly. Topic: Social Considerations (To enable safe access to the countryside and open spaces). C23 states that the agricultural land has no formal or informal recreational use. However, this only refers to the extraction site itself not the haul road that will have to be constructed through the forest. It is not clear where this route would run, but in order to get the minerals from the site to the C7 the haul route will undoubtedly have to run through an area of the forest enjoyed by many recreational users for is peace, beauty, and tranquillity. The haul road will cut right through this beautiful area of the forest; the impact on the recreational use of this land has not been assessed. C24 although it is stated that a bridleway runs along a section of the site and screening is proposed an impact assessment on public rights of way has not been carried out. In addition if the haul road comes out on the C7 at the same place as the bridleway this would be unacceptable in terms of safety for both horse riders and other users of the bridleway (walkers, dog walkers, cyclists). Any proposal to divert the bridleway must consider the need for these users to have a direct crossing of the C7 to the adjoining bridleway directly opposite the current bridleway crossing of the C7. In view of the estimated 200 lorries accessing the site daily the safety concerns relating to this point are self evident.

The changes that should be considered necessary to make the plan sound for the Philliols Farm site are: Relevant risk/impact assessments must be conducted to permit a proper and sound evaluation of the site. A proper assessment of the quantity of gravel available for extraction must be made based on the actual site. Proper consideration should be given to the infrastructure required around the site, in particular the construction of a new haul road and worker access. The relevant impact assessments need to be conducted in relation to the infrastructure needed to support the site. Only with an identified operator should the site be considered as an allocated site

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>The Plan is not effective With regard to whether the plan is effective, we do not agree that it is. There is no operator who is interested in taking the site forward. This raises questions as to the economical viability of the site particularly as this site requires a new haul road to be built which we would expect to involve significant cost. The infrastructure to support the site is not in place (haul road required to be built) and although there will be no direct access to the site from the D50307 it is expected that this small country lane with restricted passing will be used by workers accessing the site. This narrow road with restricted passing, used by local residents and, recreational users accessing the forest, is unsuitable for coping with increased traffic from site workers and would raise safety concerns. We are extremely concerned by the discrepancies in the information regarding the amount of gravel that the Site has and we refer directly to the comments made by RAGE on this; if the amounts available for extraction are over stated then this raises serious concerns regarding the whole Site Assessment. We consider the Site Assessment for Philliols farm to be unsound for the reasons that we have given and we also agree with and support the comments made by RAGE. None of the reasons for rejection given by the inspector in 1996 have been mitigated and therefore all of the reasons for rejection are still valid namely, visual impact, impact on recreational land, noise impact, impact on the local economy and impact to nature conservation value. Consequently, we strongly request that the Philliols Farm Site is removed from the Site Allocation List.</p>	
PSD - MSP 197	3.8	Paragraph	mr Vesey Brook-Fox		<p>I wish to add to the comments I have made on the PHILLIOLS FARM Site to confirm that I do not believe the proposed plan which has been constructed is either justified or effective. This is to correct the impression that I made originally where I replied YES to justified and Effective when I should have replied NO.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 234	3.8	Paragraph	Mr John Wicken den		<p>The lifetime of the plan is stated as 2018 to 2033. The plan also states that AS25 and AS26 will not be quarried simultaneously. Given AS26 has a life of 16 years (2018+16 = 2034), also assuming its developed immediately (which would be illegal to achieve) and would be quarried ahead of AS25 as it is contiguous with AS19 this means AS25 cannot be quarried in the lifetime of the plan (to 2033).</p> <p>The tonnages required are inconsistent with reality and policy. The DCC state the Permitted reserves are 13.6 million tonnes (2016) and by 2018, 10.78 million tonnes. The plan estimates a need of 22.65 million tonnes (for 15 years to 2033).Therefore 11.87 million tonnes are deemed necessary by the DCC. The plans proposed allocated sites could produce 16.4 million tonnes (AS6,9,12,13,15,19,25,26). This is 4.6 million tonnes over requirement.</p> <p>Furthermore they have ignored Recycled Aggregates (typically producing 0.3 million tonnes), Marine dredged (~0.1 million tonnes) and Land won sand and gravel (1.5 million tonnes). In total 1.9 million tonnes has been ignored. So the over estimate becomes (4.6 + 1.9) = 6.5 million tonnes. Note: the building regulations now allow recycled aggregate for concrete thus reducing need for virgin material. This means the immaturely planned sites of AS25 and AS26 can be removed from the plan completely and the DCC would still meet their quota.</p>	<p>AS25 timeline lies outside of the plan due to DCC's own constraint (and for good operational reasons) declared in the plan that AS25 and AS26 would not be developed simultaneously, therefore AS25 must be withdrawn as development falls outside of the DCC Stated Plan Timeframe. The tonnage requirements stated in the plan are over-stated so sites AS25 and AS26 should be withdrawn particularly as their assessments are so immature and the benefit to quarry over conservation is not proven.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
293

3.8

Paragraph

Mike
Gee
Jane
Wright

Legal Compliance We have no reason to consider that the Draft Plan has been prepared in a manner that is not legally compliant.

Soundness We consider the Draft Plan to be unsound. In particular, we consider the Draft Plan to be: not positively prepared " it does not achieve sustainable development, for the reasons set out below; not justified " it does not provide the most appropriate strategy, for the reasons set out below; not effective " it is not necessarily deliverable over the Draft Plan period, for the reasons set out below; and inconsistent with national policy " the Draft Plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, for the reasons set out below.

Our specific objections relate to the allocation of site AS12 at Philliols Farm, Hyde and that part of the Area of Search for sand and gravel which lies to the north east of the River Piddle, between it and Bere Heath / Philliols Heath, including Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm.

Chapter 3 " Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel Site AS12 - Philliol's Farm, Hyde We object strongly to the inclusion of this site. In our opinion the required sand and gravel supplies could be secured from other sites which would have a lesser impact on ecology, landscape and other matters. We note that Policy MS-1 cross-refers to Appendix A and expects and development proposals for the allocated sites to address the development considerations in Appendix A. Furthermore, that development will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Finally, the Habitats Regulations Appraisal screening indicates that development at AS-12 Philliols Farm may have significant effects on displacement of recreation and species in particular. In this case any development proposal must either mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place. We find this approach to be totally inadequate. This clearly shows that the Draft Plan has not been positively prepared, is not justified, will not be effective and would not ensure delivery of sustainable development. Proposals within a Minerals Local Plan should be sufficiently evidenced to demonstrate that any allocation is achievable without undue environmental and other impacts and, thus, is a sustainable and deliverable proposal. That is clearly not the case in the instance of Site AS-12 at Philliols Farm as both Policy MS-1 and the development guidelines at Appendix A refer to the need for further impact assessments to determine whether extraction is acceptable and potential / unspecified mitigation measures.

Having reviewed both Policy MS-1 and Appendix A, we have the following further comments: Natural Environment - there is no evidence to suggest that biodiversity impacts (either directly from the workings or the haul road, or indirectly as a result of hydrological impacts in the area) would be acceptable having regard to national and European legislation, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated; Historic / Cultural Environment " as stated at Appendix A, there is likely to be high archaeological potential at this site. The Appendix goes on to state that heritage and archaeology matters are important considerations, and the significance of any affected heritage assets and their setting must be understood to ensure their significance is safeguarded. Furthermore, this is particularly relevant to the Listed Buildings at the centre of the site (ie at Philliols Farm). There is no evidence to suggest that an archaeological / heritage assessment would find the impacts to be acceptable, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated. Indeed, the listed buildings could be adversely affected structurally by the close proximity of extraction works, are unlikely to have any productive use during any extraction period and thus be prone to neglect, vandalism and general deterioration, and their setting would be lost on completion of any extraction works. With

regards to the latter, you should be aware that the NPPF places great importance on matters of setting. After any mineral extraction, the Philliols Farm buildings would effectively be stranded on elevated land entirely divorced from the agricultural setting that is historically appropriate and which they presently have; Hydrology / Flood Risk - there is no evidence to suggest that hydrological / hydrogeological impacts would be acceptable, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated; Transport / Access " as stated in Appendix A, it is clear that the local road network is inadequate to serve any extraction proposal. The suggested haul route from the site to the C7 public highway would be through Philliols Heath / Bere Heath. The Heaths form part of a recreational area to the west of Wareham heavily used by walkers and cyclists. The haul route would be approximately 2 km in length and would inevitably have a severe impact upon the character / enjoyment / public access to the heathland / recreational area; Landscape / Visual Impacts " as stated in Appendix A, it is clear that this is an intimate and sensitive part of the Heath Forest Mosaic and development would affect the existing rural character and views from close proximity sensitive visual receptors (residential and bridleway). Furthermore, any mineral extraction would introduce a new obtrusive use into this landscape. There is no evidence to suggest that the landscape and visual impacts would be either acceptable or capable of satisfactory mitigation. Indeed, the site lies in a highly sensitive and open valley and water meadow landscape framed by the heaths and woodlands in the surrounding area. The nature of the landscape is simply such that in our judgement impacts could not be satisfactorily mitigated either in the short or longer term; Other Matters - it is highly unlikely that the land could be satisfactorily returned to agriculture at a lower level. The land levels in the area are such that extraction would reduce them to levels at or below that of the adjoining River Piddle and the connecting Bere Stream. Any opportunities to increase flood water storage, provide for restoration with a wildlife focus, or to provide for increased public access do not amount to a justification for extraction. In any case, there is no reason to suggest that these benefits could not be achieved by other means (if required) whilst conserving the current predominant agricultural use. We are surprised that since the 2016 consultation there appears to be no additional evidence produced by the Council to demonstrate the acceptability of Site AS-12. In the light of the considerable caveats / uncertainties expressed in the current consultation document around the impacts of any mineral extraction at the site this is a very serious omission. To our mind, this clearly shows that the Draft Plan fails to meet the various tests of soundness laid down in National Planning Policy Guidance. In short, we do not consider that Site AS-12 at Philliols Farm could contribute sustainably to the supply of aggregate. It is noted that the Philliols Farm site was excluded at the time of the 2015 consultation on the basis that impacts of working the site include nature conservation, hydrology / hydrogeology and amenity. At that time other sites were considered to be more suitable options for supplying aggregate. We see no justifiable reason for any different conclusion to be reached. Chapter 3 " Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites

Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search We are concerned by and object to the spatial extent of the Area of Search in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm in the Piddle valley to the south east of Bere Regis. This is a landscape area between the heaths and woodlands to the north and south that is attractive and composed of open meadows in the valley floor. This is a landscape that would be highly sensitive to change and the area around the two farms to the north of the River Piddle should be excluded from the Area of Search. More generally, our objections to the allocation of Site AS-12 apply equally to the portion of the Area of Search to which we refer. We suggest that the Area of Search should follow the recognisable and defensible boundary of the River Piddle, ie to not extend to the north of the River Piddle in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm. Conclusion We trust that you will take account of our comments and for the reasons set out above: omit the allocation of Philliols Farm (site AS12) for sand and gravel extraction; and exclude the area around Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm from the Area of Search; We can confirm that we may wish to appear at any future examination in

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>public. Our appearance may be necessary to further explain our case. We look forward to hearing from you and to be advised of future consultation stages. (Comment inserted at each of section 3.8; Figure 12; section 3.10)</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 169	3.8	Paragraph	Mrs Caroline Harrison		<p>This relates to site AS12 - Philliols Farm. In 2016 I made comments, I strongly believe this area should be deleted from the site allocation list. My comments from 2016 should be taken into account again. This plan has been put together with very little preparation.</p> <p>The amount of gravel that appears to be available at Philliols Farm has been severely over estimated. When Hyde Farm was included we were told the majority of the reserves lay in that area. The figure was then estimated at .69m tonnes, it is now 1.5 m tonnes so one of these assumptions is very unsound.</p> <p>The introduction to the draft claims that sites have been allocated on the basis of a comprehensive process of the site assessment and selection but this again is unsound as no further monitoring or assessment has been carried out since it was last rejected.</p> <p>There is pressure to find more gravel. however I believe this area is a sensitive area and sensitive areas should not be included. This again gives reason why this is not a sound reason to include this site. There is no fresh reason why to overturn the inspector's decision less that two years ago.</p> <p>The use of the forestry has increased dramatically for recreational activity, which is a very difficult area to 'mitigate' , the environment has become more sensitive and endangered and this should not be destroyed .</p> <p>The land will never return back to agriculture use, this is impossible as the land will be lower and destroyed and the land will just flood.</p> <p>On Philliols Farm there are rare and endangered Fairy Shrimps which live in the pond in one of the fields,it is a natural pond that encourages Fairy shrimps. The plan is clearly unsound as mitigation would be impossible . At present the pond naturally dries out then the pond re fills itself to utilise the pressure of water to hatch there larvae, no amount of mitigation could protect the pond. There are several badger setts on the farm the setts have increased in the last two years, nightjars, ravens, smooth snakes, buzzards, kingfishers, bats, in the stream salmon, trout and crayfish . Assessments are to be carried out prior to planning stage, however no amount of assessments can protect these species. It is illegal to harm and threaten these animals. The badger setts would be destroyed and again this is illegal. In 1996 the inspector said that open views would be vulnerable to the visual effects of working gravel. This would have an effect on local tourism.</p> <p>At Philliols there are two grade two listed buildings both buildings need a lot of maintenance doing to them, in the assessment it said these bulidings would benefit from extraction - this is weak as these bulidings should be protected not used as a way of inserting the area with draft minerals plan. To finish, I believe there are too many areas where this site AS12 is unsound. This plan has already been rejected twice. There is no justifiable reason to over ride an inspectors previous decision.</p>	<p>I believe that no amount of 'mitigation', which has not even be identified could make it a sound area to include in the draft mineral plan and that it should be deleted.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 262	3.8	Paragraph	Mrs Susan Vincent		The document does not recognise the Government's support of the importance for tourism of sites of national interest and I refer to the Listed buildings and Conservation Areas Act of 1990 to remind everyone Moreton is in a conservation area and this includes the grave of T.E.Lawrence which thousands of world wide visitors attend every year.	<p>Create a greater distance from the proposed new Station road quarry and this will preserve the present peace of the village and honour the memory of a national figure Lawrence of Arabia or T.E.Lawrence.</p> <p>The Lawrence Whistler windows in the church at Moreton also need to be seen both from the inside and outside so noise and dust will not enhance this experience.</p> <p>Does Station Road and As25 have to be developed at all as if the other new sites go ahead there will be still a surplus of aggregates expected to be delivered. This site could anyway be surplus to requirements.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 275	3.8	Paragraph	Dr Dominic Stubbing	Frome, Piddle and West Dorset Fisheries Association	<p>Regarding sites AS12 and AS26: Gravel workings over the whole country and in our river catchment have a long history being unable to contain washings. This can lead to sediment particles in the river. If its raining and relentlessly, that its does often in the Dorset, water will have to leave the workings somehow and end in the river. The sediment will be carried in that water. Some particles take two weeks to settle and so they will be carried in the water and even in intra gravel flows to the river (Theurer et al. 1998). The problem point of this is that it smothers many fish eggs, and river bed spawning fish are very venerable to this, and it causes survival values down to zero.</p> <p>The Frome SSSI is protected for what it is and that means its species. Salmon (riverbed spawners) stocks in the River Frome are at level from which it is about to collapse. Sedimentation of eggs from pollution is looking like it will almost certainly be the main culprit. Other species like grayling, trout, bullheads, Dace and minnows will suffer badly (Greig et al. 2005).</p> <p>Similar problems have happened at AS19 and so extensions here are not justifiable. References Greig, S.M., Sear, D.A., & Carling, P.A. (2005) The impact of fine sediment accumulation on the survival of incubating salmon progeny: Implications for sediment management. Science of the Total Environment 344, 241-258. Theurer, F. D., Harrod, T. R., & Theurer, M. (1998) Sedimentation and Salmonids in England and Wales. P194. Environment Agency.</p>	Regarding sites AS12 and AS26 The close proximity to the river of proposed pits in the plan definitely means sedimentation will be a big problem. If there was a distance of 500m or more from the river with normal silt collection procedures in place, things could be slightly less problematic.
PSD - MSP 366	3.8	Paragraph	Mrs Joanne Baker	Aggregate Industries UK Limited	Please see report attached to representation number PSD-MSP 365.	Inclusion of Westford Park Farm as an allocation in the Policy MS-1.
PSD - MSP 581	3.8	Paragraph	Mr George Whalley	Christchurch Borough Council	Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel: This proposes to allocate the following sites located in Christchurch: * Hurn Court Farm Quarry Extension, Hurn " approximately 600,000 tonnes (Inset map AS-09) * Roeshot Quarry Extension, Christchurch " approximately 3,500,000 tonnes (Inset Map AS-13) The Council sets out detailed representations regarding these sites in response to AS-09 and AS-13.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 18	3.1	Paragraph	Councillor (Borough of Poole) Marion Pope		<p>As a plan should be a detailed proposal for doing or achieving something, this Plan is deficient in its proposals as they affect the ward of Merley and Bearwood in the Borough of Poole.</p> <p>Many of the Minerals Safeguarding Area sites are within the SE Dorset Green Belt, but they have not been identified in the Plan. In consequence, the community has not been consulted on such sites neither have they been subjected to a sustainability appraisal. The plan in this respect is not legally compliant.</p> <p>As no sites have been identified, neither can the Plan be regarded as sound. Instead of specific sites, under Policy MS-2 there is a general Sand and Gravel Area of Search. This allows for the development of 'unallocated sites' within the area of search, provided certain conditions are met. This is completely unacceptable. Those who live within the ward, or are seeking to move here, need certainty about what is to happen in the area. This is not dissimilar to the situation the community faced in 2015 when an application for the extraction of 950,000 tonnes of sand and gravel from the Canford Magna Golf Course site was brought forward (APP/16/00339/Y refers). Although the Council was aware in 2014 that the mineral would need to be extracted before there could be a change of use from a golf course to a SANG, it did not disclose this either to elected members, or to the public. It would have had a devastating impact on the lives of local people for a period of 7 years as well as on the adjacent Canford School, a major educational establishment not just in Poole, but nationally. The Sand and Gravel Area of Search is reminiscent of the lack of openness and transparency with the golf course, referred to at the time as a 'windfall site'.</p>	Local residents are aware of those Areas of Search within the Ward which could well be brought forward for mineral extraction.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 53	3.1	Paragraph	Mr Trevor Poole		<p>The wording of Policy MS2 as written is contradictory.</p> <p>MS2 (i) permits sites to come forward within the Area of Search if they offer net environmental benefits that justify their development but MS2 (iv)(a) in relation to (i) precludes this development if the site results in a delay or prejudices the development of an allocated site(s) which produces the same mineral to serve the same geographical market.....</p> <p>I think this Policy lacks clarity, it refers to all allocated Sand & Gravel sites even those for which no planning permission has been granted and those which are not in production. It seems to me that this is not conducive to the most environmentally friendly sites being worked before other less favourable site, for example an un-allocated sand & gravel proposal could be brought forward on environmentally sterile farming land within the Area of Search that may be more environmentally acceptable than an un-planned allocated site situated on Heathland with Protected Species.</p> <p>The working of the un-allocated site in this example could offer significant environmental benefits over the allocated site but it would be refused in line with this policy as it would delay or prejudice the working of the allocated site, hence creating an environmental dis-benefit!</p>	Insert the word "active" after "of" in MS(iv)(a)
PSD - MSP 34	3.1	Paragraph	Mr MJ Bell			Re potential Sand and Gravel extraction - Sandford It is nonsense to be registering a site next to Sandford School (it looks on the diagram as though the school is removed !), the new Care Home and significant housing. Please revise the proposal. Such a site is incompatible with the above. Please let me know whether a change for the above is adopted before the meeting.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 44	3.1	Paragraph	Ms Debbie Weller	Wareham St Martin Parish Council	The search area around Organford and Slepe should be removed from the plan as the area consists of working farms, holiday caravan camps, residential areas and tourist areas. It covers or is close to SSSI, Green Belt and environmentally sensitive areas. The roads are narrow rural ones lighting and pavement only where houses are, they were not built to withstand the HGV traffic of today. Loss of amenity to residents, damage to road structure, adverse impact on tourism business in this area, loss of employment and increase of ill health due to dust, noise, stress and contamination are not in the national interests. Part of this area was removed last time due to immense opposition from local people, local environmental bodies and local businesses. This is not a suitable area for development for sand and gravel.	Remove the whole site from the plan.
PSD - MSP 214	3.1	Paragraph	Mrs Janice Doyle		A significant area of land identified as an Area of Search in policy MS-2 lies within the Stour Valley between Wimborne and the A348 between Bear Cross and Ferndown. It is within the Green Belt and part is adjacent to Canford School, a listed building set in historic parkland. The Green Belt is already under threat from development already approved by Poole Council or proposed in this area. The policy is unspecific as to which parcels of land may be brought forward within the Area of Search for development for the extraction of sand and gravel during the life of the Plan, subject to certain conditions being met. Accordingly there has been no public consultation on such sites, which can only take place when a planning application is actually submitted, unlike other policies in the Plan. This Policy creates great uncertainty and will blight the whole area. Such development has a serious detrimental affect on the environment with noise and traffic generation and will impact on the lives and property of those living in the vicinity or considering moving to it.	The parcel of land identified above should be removed from Policy MS-2
PSD - MSP 159	3.1	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	MS-2 currently reads "Proposals for the development of unallocated sites from within the Area of Search will be permitted if." This phrasing will make it difficult for the MPA to refuse or even assess an application.	Instead of "will be permitted", you may wish to say "may be permitted"

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 181	3.1	Paragraph	Mr John Wicken den		The DCC policy says the area of search is based on BGS data. The BGS data I have found shows that the boundary between sand and gravel and no sand and gravel runs diagonally through AS25 so AS25 should not have been included in the plan at all.	Remove AS25 to be consistent with DCC policy.
PSD - MSP 268	3.1	Paragraph	Mr Barry Heath		<p>My comments relate to the AS 12 Philliol's Farm site. This is a site I know pretty well. It is a site that the independent inspector has in the past referred to as being in a peaceful and tranquil area. It remains so, with a narrow public lane the only access to it and the Forestry Commission, Wareham Forest immediately to the north.</p> <p>The site comprises, from what I can see, pretty much the whole of the currently farmed area of Philliol's Farm. I understand this tenant farm has been active for at least 3 generations and consists largely of level well drained agricultural land. I understand that the current tenant wishes to continue farming there and does not believe that farming could continue if a quarrying operation was to be given the go ahead. So a current livelihood would be terminated.</p> <p>I am aware that there are at least 8 residences situated along the public road that are either within the planned site or immediately on its boundary. I do not see how any mitigation measures can effectively protect the residents from the detrimental noise and dust that is always associated with sand and gravel excavation and clearly this plan does not offer these people anywhere near adequate protection.</p> <p>The proposed haul road that the plan deems necessary, given the inadequacy of the current lane, will need to cut through the Philliols Heath/Bere Heath areas of Wareham Forest. I understand that there could be issues that conflict with the statutory responsibility of the Forestry Commission in relation to the plan for potentially 80 to 100 movements a day on this route. Were this issue to be overcome then further detriment to the local environment would occur with movements along the C7 road, where there are a number of popular camping/caravan sites. I also understand that the site contains a number of protected species and this plan has not addressed the matter of how the habitat will be sustained.</p> <p>Finally there is conjecture over the figure quoted in the plan for the tonnage of sand and gravel existing, as the site in the plan is reduced in area from that on which this figure is based. This could mean that there are not commercially viable quantities of sand and gravel at the current site. So in summary I think AS12 needs to be removed from the plan due to significant detrimental factors and dubious figures associated with it.</p>	Remove AS 12 Philliol's Farm from the plan, given my response to question 4.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 220	3.1	Paragraph	Mrs Deborah Smith		<p>The Area of Search (Submission Policies Map - Inset B) identifies an area from Sandford Primary School through Holton Heath, Organford, Slepe and Morden. This area has never been proposed in any of the previous documentation and now that Gore Heath has been discounted it seems that the adjoining areas are being submitted via the 'back door', i.e. Section 2. 5</p> <p>Policy SS2 of the Minerals Strategy "Identification of Sites in the Mineral Sites Plan" notes that the new minerals sites will be primarily identified through the Mineral Sites Plan although permission will be granted for unallocated (windfall) sites where it can be demonstrated that there is a need that cannot be met within allocated sites and where development would not prejudice the delivery of allocated sites. This effectively rules out any further public inquiry before mining may take place.</p> <p>This site should not be considered as it includes/borders environmentally sensitive areas and cannot demonstrate that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from its development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. This greenbelt is not just sterile farm land, it is working farmland and is surrounded by SSSIs and incorporates watercourses that drain into Poole Harbour. There is a school, many residential settlements, campsites that supply much local employment, tourist/recreation destinations and internationally important landscape in very close proximity. Local roads are frequently gridlocked and the A35 has a bad accident record. So far there are few comments as this seems to have been hidden in the text. At no stage have the local communities that this effects been contacted and made aware of the impact. This should have happened especially after the furore that the adjoining Gore Heath proposal caused. The very fact that this area is being considered will have an adverse effect on home owners and businesses. This is not a suitable area for development for sand and gravel. There should be an extension to the very quiet and locally unpublicised consultation to allow for local input. I have heard nothing from any of our government representatives on this.</p>	Remove this site from the Plan.

PSD
-
MSP
294

3.1

Paragraph

Mike
Gee
Jane
Wright

Legal Compliance We have no reason to consider that the Draft Plan has been prepared in a manner that is not legally compliant.

Soundness We consider the Draft Plan to be unsound. In particular, we consider the Draft Plan to be: not positively prepared " it does not achieve sustainable development, for the reasons set out below; not justified " it does not provide the most appropriate strategy, for the reasons set out below; not effective " it is not necessarily deliverable over the Draft Plan period, for the reasons set out below; and inconsistent with national policy " the Draft Plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, for the reasons set out below.

Our specific objections relate to the allocation of site AS12 at Philliols Farm, Hyde and that part of the Area of Search for sand and gravel which lies to the north east of the River Piddle, between it and Bere Heath / Philliols Heath, including Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm. Chapter 3 " Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel Site AS12 - Philliol's Farm, Hyde We object strongly to the inclusion of this site. In our opinion the required sand and gravel supplies could be secured from other sites which would have a lesser impact on ecology, landscape and other matters. We note that Policy MS-1 cross-refers to Appendix A and expects and development proposals for the allocated sites to address the development considerations in Appendix A. Furthermore, that development will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Finally, the Habitats Regulations Appraisal screening indicates that development at AS-12 Philliols Farm may have significant effects on displacement of recreation and species in particular. In this case any development proposal must either mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place. We find this approach to be totally inadequate. This clearly shows that the Draft Plan has not been positively prepared, is not justified, will not be effective and would not ensure delivery of sustainable development. Proposals within a Minerals Local Plan should be sufficiently evidenced to demonstrate that any allocation is achievable without undue environmental and other impacts and, thus, is a sustainable and deliverable proposal. That is clearly not the case in the instance of Site AS-12 at Philliols Farm as both Policy MS-1 and the development guidelines at Appendix A refer to the need for further impact assessments to determine whether extraction is acceptable and potential / unspecified mitigation measures. Having reviewed both Policy MS-1 and Appendix A, we have the following further comments: Natural Environment - there is no evidence to suggest that biodiversity impacts (either directly from the workings or the haul road, or indirectly as a result of hydrological impacts in the area) would be acceptable having regard to national and European legislation, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated; Historic / Cultural Environment " as stated at Appendix A, there is likely to be high archaeological potential at this site. The Appendix goes on to state that heritage and archaeology matters are important considerations, and the significance of any affected heritage assets and their setting must be understood to ensure their significance is safeguarded. Furthermore, this is particularly relevant to the Listed Buildings at the centre of the site (ie at Philliols Farm). There is no evidence to suggest that an archaeological / heritage assessment would find the impacts to be acceptable, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated. Indeed, the listed buildings could be adversely affected structurally by the close proximity of extraction works, are unlikely to have any productive use during any extraction period and thus be prone to neglect, vandalism and general deterioration, and their setting would be lost on completion of any extraction works. With regards to the latter, you should be aware that the NPPF places great importance on matters of setting. After any mineral extraction, the Philliols Farm buildings would effectively be stranded on elevated land

entirely divorced from the agricultural setting that is historically appropriate and which they presently have; Hydrology / Flood Risk - there is no evidence to suggest that hydrological / hydrogeological impacts would be acceptable, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated; Transport / Access " as stated in Appendix A, it is clear that the local road network is inadequate to serve any extraction proposal. The suggested haul route from the site to the C7 public highway would be through Philliols Heath / Bere Heath. The Heaths form part of a recreational area to the west of Wareham heavily used by walkers and cyclists. The haul route would be approximately 2 km in length and would inevitably have a severe impact upon the character / enjoyment / public access to the heathland / recreational area; Landscape / Visual Impacts " as stated in Appendix A, it is clear that this is an intimate and sensitive part of the Heath Forest Mosaic and development would affect the existing rural character and views from close proximity sensitive visual receptors (residential and bridleway). Furthermore, any mineral extraction would introduce a new obtrusive use into this landscape. There is no evidence to suggest that the landscape and visual impacts would be either acceptable or capable of satisfactory mitigation. Indeed, the site lies in a highly sensitive and open valley and water meadow landscape framed by the heaths and woodlands in the surrounding area. The nature of the landscape is simply such that in our judgement impacts could not be satisfactorily mitigated either in the short or longer term; Other Matters - it is highly unlikely that the land could be satisfactorily returned to agriculture at a lower level. The land levels in the area are such that extraction would reduce them to levels at or below that of the adjoining River Piddle and the connecting Bere Stream. Any opportunities to increase flood water storage, provide for restoration with a wildlife focus, or to provide for increased public access do not amount to a justification for extraction. In any case, there is no reason to suggest that these benefits could not be achieved by other means (if required) whilst conserving the current predominant agricultural use. We are surprised that since the 2016 consultation there appears to be no additional evidence produced by the Council to demonstrate the acceptability of Site AS-12. In the light of the considerable caveats / uncertainties expressed in the current consultation document around the impacts of any mineral extraction at the site this is a very serious omission. To our mind, this clearly shows that the Draft Plan fails to meet the various tests of soundness laid down in National Planning Policy Guidance. In short, we do not consider that Site AS-12 at Philliols Farm could contribute sustainably to the supply of aggregate. It is noted that the Philliols Farm site was excluded at the time of the 2015 consultation on the basis that impacts of working the site include nature conservation, hydrology / hydrogeology and amenity. At that time other sites were considered to be more suitable options for supplying aggregate. We see no justifiable reason for any different conclusion to be reached. Chapter 3 " Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search We are concerned by and object to the spatial extent of the Area of Search in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm in the Piddle valley to the south east of Bere Regis. This is a landscape area between the heaths and woodlands to the north and south that is attractive and composed of open meadows in the valley floor. This is a landscape that would be highly sensitive to change and the area around the two farms to the north of the River Piddle should be excluded from the Area of Search. More generally, our objections to the allocation of Site AS-12 apply equally to the portion of the Area of Search to which we refer. We suggest that the Area of Search should follow the recognisable and defensible boundary of the River Piddle, ie to not extend to the north of the River Piddle in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm. Conclusion We trust that you will take account of our comments and for the reasons set out above: omit the allocation of Philliols Farm (site AS12) for sand and gravel extraction; and exclude the area around Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm from the Area of Search; We can confirm that we may wish to appear at any future examination in public. Our appearance may be necessary to further explain our case. We look forward to hearing from you and to be advised of future consultation stages. (Comment inserted at each of section 3.8; Figure 12; section 3.10)

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 345	3.1	Paragraph	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	<p>The RSPB welcome the approach described in paragraph 3.11 which describes an assessment to identify areas within the Sand and Gravel Area of Search that carry higher environmental sensitivities and equally to identify areas likely to have less constraints. This is pragmatic and helpful approach, providing clarity for developers over the potential of new sites.</p> <p>Regarding unallocated sites coming forward within the Sand and Gravel Area of Search, we support the addition of the detailed text to safeguard European and internationally important wildlife habitats and species within the policy. Specifically: Sites will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.</p>	

Policy MS2 Sand and Gravel Areas of Search

- 1 This policy takes forward Areas of Search (AoS), shown in Figure 2, for bringing forward sites for extraction if there is a shortfall due to any difficulties with sites identified in MS1. The precise weight to be given to considering a site to resolve any such shortfall from within or without the AoS is somewhat unclear, but the relevant paragraphs imply that preference shall be given to sites within the AoS. The apparent primary determinant of including or excluding possible sand and gravel resources in the AoS was a landscape and ecological assessment, thereby excluding from the AoS, areas presumably considered in that assessment to be of higher constraint to extraction. This assessment does not appear in the list of documentation.
- 2 The scale of the relevant maps of the proposed AoS makes it difficult to evaluate precisely the relationship to sand and gravel resources and the significance of the landscape and/or ecological assessment. However, the following considerations arise: The defined AoS frequently overlies (a) marginal sand and gravel resources of limited economic potential or non-sand and gravel mineral (clay, Chalk), and excludes sand and gravel mineral where there are unlikely to be major landscape or ecological considerations. Some parts of the defined AoS could be equally contentious for landscape and ecology reasons as well as for other reasons. Some of the map output seems of such a spatial form that there must be doubt as to significance of the boundaries or the inclusion/exclusion of areas on landscape or ecological grounds.
- 3 The Plan is therefore unsound because:
 - Not Positively Prepared: The minerals inside/outside the AoS have not been objectively assessed and may not be delivered sustainably.
 - Not Justified: The output is not justified by any supporting documentation and/or is not an accurate picture of either the resources or the constraints.
 - Not Effective: The AoS is therefore not effective
 - Not Consistent with National Policy: Because the AoS is ineffective.
- 4 The extent to which a site could overcome constraints is clearly, as demonstrated by the requirements of the identified sites, a matter for detailed evaluation. The AoS should be withdrawn or more broadly drawn. If withdrawn, a criteria based policy should be put in place.
- 5 It should be noted that the description of Henbury in the schedule of safeguarding sites in Appendix B is incorrect as to date and as to comments which seem to have been transferred from Masters North.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 352	3.1	Paragraph	Laura Cox	PRO Vision Planning	<p>The aggregates area of search set out within Policy MS-2 is also supported by the Charborough Estate. The area of search focusses on relatively unconstrained sites, such as Tatchells Quarry, which is outside the more sensitive areas in Dorset, including Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation, Special Protection Area and Ramsar site, and Poole Harbour Special Protection Area and Ramsar site. The proposed area of search is therefore the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, and is justified.</p> <p>Less constrained sites, such as Tatchells Quarry, with fewer costs associated with mitigation measures, are likely to be more deliverable. Therefore, the proposed area of search is effective. The designation of areas of search within Local Plans is advocated by the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 27-008-20140306). Policy MS-2 is compliant with paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which identifies that policies in Local Plans should ensure that operations do not have an adverse effect on the natural environment.</p>	
PSD - MSP 318	3.1	Paragraph	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>The map showing the proposed Area of Search for further, unallocated, sites for sand and gravel extraction has been considerably refined, and although it is still difficult to use to check small details of boundaries, DWT is pleased to see that, as far as can be checked, all nature conservation designated sites, including European sites, SSSIs and SNCIs have been removed from the area of search.</p> <p>Provided that other sites such as Local Nature Reserves, ancient woodlands etc. have also been removed, then hopefully this will mean that there will not be significant conflicts of interest with biodiversity issues from the outset of any future sites put forward.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 582	3.1	Paragraph	Mr George Whalley	Christchurch Borough Council	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search: This policy sets out an approach for dealing with applications for minerals working from unallocated sites within the Area of Search. In order to be sound and consistent with national policy it needs to be made clear that proposals must be in accordance with the development plan for the area including adopted Core Strategies and Local Plans. It is recommended that the following amendment is made: i) The proposals are in accordance with the development plan including adopted Local Plans and Core Strategies.	
PSD - MSP 241	3.2	Crushed Rock	Mr John Bibra		Swanworth quarries is in an AONB where the National Planning Policy Framework does not support aggregate extraction unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no Exceptional Circumstances in this case.	Site PK16 should be excluded from the Plan
PSD - MSP 149	3.19	Paragraph	Mrs Jane Atkinson		I have nearly given up on my journey this far to put forward my views due to the complexity of this process...however if by legal compliance you mean does this break the National Planning Policy Framework then no it is not compliant. There are no exceptional circumstances in which extraction can occur in an AONB. This part of the coast is also designated as a World Heritage Coast. Allowing this extension would set a dangerous precedent for the future. Planning has been declined twice in the past and nothing has changed since then The road network is inadequate and there are also residents close to the proposed site who would be adversely affected.	
PSD - MSP 23	3.23	Paragraph	Joanne Lurie		Please note the comment following from Portland Stone Firms Ltd.	The part of the form casting doubt on Portland's ability to step up production enough to fill any gap left by the closing of Swanworth should be removed. That is para. 3.26

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 5	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Tim Clotworthy	Portland Stone Firms Ltd		
PSD - MSP 13	3.25	Paragraph	Mrs Sasha Dorey		The extension of this quarry would have a considerable visual impact on a protected area of AONB and World Heritage site. The local economy relies on tourism and this huge quarry extension would have a negative effect on this, negating any gains from employment .	I would suggest the proposed extension should be turned down to protect the AONB and World Heritage status .
PSD - MSP 22	3.25	Paragraph	Joanne Lurie		<p>There is no mention of the water supplies to Kingston village which are dependent on the Encombe Estate which, in turn, are dependent on the area that the proposed extension covers.</p> <p>What studies have been carried out to make absolutely sure that the water table that supports the streams that feed into the Encombe estate's water collection for Kingston village are not going to be impaired?</p>	<p>This document needs to prove without a shadow of a doubt first of all the need for an extension (we were assured at a public meeting in Corfe that we have the legally necessary four years of supply of crushed stone).</p> <p>Portland people have indicated that they are perfectly capable of stepping up supply to cover any deficit on the closure of Swanworth - long promised by the way.</p> <p>It also needs to prove that any extension will not impinge on Kingston's water supply. Tradition is a lazy man's way of not thinking.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 28	3.25	Paragraph	Ms Lindsey Walker			How does this form allow a true representation of the views of the tax paying residents of Worth Matravers? Unless they are legally trained, how can anyone comment on whether the proposal is 'legally sound'? where is the box to tick for 'ruining an area of outstanding national beauty, and making it impossible to comment'?
PSD - MSP 12	3.25	Paragraph	Mrs Sasha Dorey		<p>Regarding distances travelled although as the crow flies the distance from Worth Matravers to Poole and Bournemouth maybe shorter than from Portland the roads travelled along have not been considered.</p> <p>Since the Olympics were held in Weymouth the road out of Portland and onwards to Poole and Bournemouth have been greatly improved and developed making the journey time considerably quicker. The road out of Purbeck however is unban, slow and congested especially in the summer months, meandering through historic Kingston, Corfe Castle and Sandford.</p> <p>The number of extra lorries would add further pollution, congestion, noise and road damage.</p> <p>I note that Swanworth Quarries have mitigated some of this by saying the lorries will travel during less busy times. The only time this road is not busy is at night.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 16	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Tim Arnold		<p>These are complex plans, supported by a mass of professional expertise. I am not a professional, but I am a full-time resident of Worth Matravers. Most of our neighbours are deeply upset by these proposals which will create noise, dust, heavy road traffic and a massive scar on our beautiful landscape, designated an AONB for good reason.</p> <p>I am reasonable computer literate - yet for me this has taken several hours to get to this point. Any assumption that the residents of this village are happy with your plans, based on any lack of response, would be incorrect.</p> <p>An extension of Swanworth Quarry will have a massively detrimental effect on our landscape and our quality of life. Stick with Portland, with its easy access and road network.</p> <p>Have you asked the residents of Corfe Castle? Have you considered the impact on the Corfe bottleneck with any increase in traffic?</p>	I'm not really sure about this 'legally sound' jargon. The proposals probably are legally sound. However, they are (in my view) wonton criminal negligence and vandalism!!!
PSD - MSP 21	3.25	Paragraph	Joanne Lurie		This document throughout assumes that Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset be treated as one unit whereas, it is more than likely that Poole, Bournemouth and Christchurch will become one authority and the remaining parts of Dorset another. It is important not to subsume the needs and wants of a small rural population near quarries to that needs and wants of the larger urban area.	The whole exercise would be better off waiting for the clarification of the proposed unitary authorities and what their input is.
PSD - MSP 33	3.25	Paragraph	MR DAVID way			
PSD - MSP 48	3.25	Paragraph	Dr Mary Sparks	Langton Matravers Parish Council	<p>The Council did not consider all policies included. However, they did comment on Policy MS-3, Swanworth Quarry Extension, and MS-6, Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone.</p> <p>MS-3 , Swanworth quarry extension . The Council supported this policy as long as it does not create any significant increase in vehicle movements.</p> <p>MS-6 Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone The Council supported this policy as long as it does not create any significant increase in vehicle movements.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 303	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	Historic England	Policy MS-3: Swanworth Quarry Extension Historic England (Keith Miller) in recent dialogue with the prospective applicant and their agent, have discussed, and as we understand, agreed a scheme to minimise the level of harm to the settings of two scheduled round barrows. If such arrangements/conditions are reflected in the Plan Historic England considers the allocation would be soundly based.	
PSD - MSP 212	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Antonio Espinosa Zamora		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset -I lived in Swanage for three and a half years in the past-. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and my familys -I have a two-years-old kid-. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 249	3.25	Paragraph	Mr John Suttle	Suttle Stone Quarries	<p>Whilst it is understandable that Portland operator representatives would wish to defend their own desire and capacity to increase production, as they have done in response to the wording in this document, I feel that, although vaguely worded, the thrust of the argument that is made by the Mineral Plan draft in 3.26 is sound.</p> <p>The reality is that regardless of the operators desire, it would generally not be desirable to shift all of Dorset's crushed limestone output to West Dorset (or out of the county), especially when the biggest market is in East Dorset and is currently well contributed to by Swanworth which is at least 40 miles closer.</p> <p>The status quo sustainably allows for a balanced contribution from Portland, Swanworth and (less desirably) from outside the county.</p> <p>The important point, should there be a threat to Swanworth's continuation, is sustainability; why should Portland and Weymouth residents undergo the effects of a 100% increase in crushed rock operations and transportation, only for emissions, journey time and aggregate costs in Dorset more widely to hugely soar as a result? Indeed, why should the jobs at Swanworth quarry and its general economic contribution as a Purbeck SME be lost in the process?</p> <p>Purbeck is over-reliant on a tourism industry that has prospered despite the impacts of quarrying, surely it is not desirable to further erode well-paid, non-seasonal, quarrying jobs that are offering at least some employment diversity in the area?</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 260	3.25	Paragraph	Mr David Penney		<p>I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally. Swanworth is integral to the supply of Crushed Limestone for the immediate Purbeck area and for the larger Poole/Bournemouth conurbation. With the construction industry struggling in the current economic climate, this shift in location would only bring further issues to many contractors currently working in the area. Not only would prices increase for materials but the service they highly depend on would drop considerably. This is without even considering the employees of the company who would be out of work and would struggle to find anything similar within the local area. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and that of my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.</p>	
PSD - MSP 194	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Alan Spalding		<p>I consider the proposal is unsound as it does not fully take into account the effect on a world heritage site, the landscape and the wildlife. The increase in lorry traffic through the already blighted village of Corfe Castle would not be acceptable. The Suttles' lorries at present totally ignore the 30MPH speed limit through this vulnerable village and more lorries would be a potential danger to the residents, including school children and visitors. It could possibly discourage tourist from the area adversely affecting the local economy.</p>	

Not Legally Compliant

(a) National Policy Legislation " the Plan does not comply with national policy on AONB and the NPPF "Exceptional Circumstances" requirement;

(b) Duty to Co-operate " there is no evidence of co-operation with Portland, where adequate reserves, extraction of which produces significantly lower adverse impact on Purbecks roads, AONB, World Heritage, Council of Europe Diploma status (etc), are available.

The Plan is not Sound

(a) Not "Positively Prepared"

(i) it is difficult to understand how an objective assessment at this time could make a different decision to that which was made in each of 1968 and 1988 in respect of corresponding proposals in respect of which decisions were taken by reasonable and objective public bodies carrying on the same function as now carried on in the current decision-making process " it is difficult to see that the decisions taken previously were decisions that no reasonable authority could have taken, or that there is something substantially different now which would result in a different decision;

(ii) the significant difference seems to me to be that the Swanworth Quarry is now owned locally;

(iii) there is no evidence that reasonable account has been taken of the availability of provision by Portland of crushed stone.

(b) Not Justified

(i) there is a realistic alternative to the Swanworth Quarry extension for crushed rock, being Portland, using the Olympic road infrastructure improvements at Portland;

(c) Not Effective

(i) there is no evidence of there having been detailed consideration of the "bridge" across Purbeck Way " which bridge will need to support 70 HGV movements each day for 15 years " and whether as to what that bridge would look like, the visibility of it, the cost of it, the increased dust and noise created by movements across it;

(ii) noting the distinct extension of the north-west corner of the proposed extension to reach a small farm track leading from Kingston Barn (and there joining the B3069), there is no evidence of consideration being given to why this particular extension (which is very distinctive on the maps provided) is included, whether it is simply a coincidence that the farm track in question has grown significantly in usage since this consultation process began, and whether a different approach would be taken to the proposed permission if, in fact, permission were sought for access to the quarry via an expanded farm track joining the B3069 at Kingston Barn (already a very dangerous corner);

(iii) there is no evidence of a developed "joined up" strategy with Portland;

(iv) traffic " the Plan lightly refers to there being no increase in traffic movements " ignoring the fact that there are in fact 15 years additional traffic movements beyond that currently agreed, through roads which are increasing busy from the success of sustainable tourism in Purbeck since 1988 (and whether walking, cycling, Dorset Water Park, "coasteering", re-emergence of Swanage as a prime tourist destination etc.);

To make the Plan legally compliant and sound the Swanworth Quarry Extension should be removed entirely from the Plan.

There is no evidence to support this allocation and such reasoning as is given for the allocation conflicts with stated national and local policies and is inconsistent with the evidence.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>(v) redevelopment " it is difficult to understand how the old quarry can be restored as proposed in circumstances where there will be 70 HGV movements through the old quarry each day;</p> <p>(vi) AONB " the reports in site assessment of the Swanworth Quarry extension demonstrates the very significant adverse impact of the proposals;</p> <p>(vii) Kingstons Water " there is passing reference to a prospective impact on Kingstons Water, when in fact the aquifer underneath the proposed quarry forms a significant part of Kingstons water supply, there is no evidence of significant consideration of this, including the potential material adverse detrimental public health aspects.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
174

3.25

Paragraph

Mr
John
Suttle

Suttle
Stone
Quarries

I can only comment from the point of view of our own submission to the plan, but our proposal has been positively prepared by team members of a family business that has quarried in the area for four generations.

We feel that the allocation is justified as the current quarry has provided ~100 years of local employment and has helped shape the local area (now an AONB) during that time. The extension is slightly different in terms of physical and visual situation, but it does not create a cumulative impact with the current quarry, since restoration of quarried areas will be completed before the next area begins. The operation of the quarry, including processing, haulage and access will remain exactly the same and so we feel that by current standards the extension's inclusion in this document is also justified.

The document itself could be more effective as it does not clearly represent some of the impact mitigation that has already been made toward the site allocation. Also, whilst it is understandable that the site boundary map shows the proposed site area in red, it is slightly misleading as the actual quarried area will be smaller than that shown once bunds and screening is accounted for. National policy says that aggregates quarries should not be adopted in AONBs except in exceptional circumstances. Swanworth has been allocated in this document, and is exceptional for many reasons: -

It is the only aggregates quarry to have quarried Portland-Purbeck beds and has existed in Purbeck for almost a century. It provides Purbeck District with 30,000-40,000tpa of aggregates and rock armour (and a nominal amount of dimension stone). Hauling this from elsewhere would mean higher economic and environmental costs, with some other negative traffic impacts, including larger articulated lorries having to tip crushed rock for reloading onto lorries for redistribution in Purbeck. - it is uniquely positioned close to the largest market of Poole and Bournemouth and can sustainably contribute to that market whilst mitigating local temporary impacts. The economies of hauling stone over greater mileages from elsewhere make this a crucial point and there are even more important environmental impacts. -

It maintains more than 30 full-time, non-seasonal, well-paid, skilled jobs against the backdrop of an increasing over-reliance on the seasonal tourism industry locally. The families of these 30+ locals (90% from Purbeck) are supported in-turn. It also supports a further 30+ associated positions at our other reliant depots. - It pays £millions to local suppliers each year. - It pays £millions in tax and levies each year. -

It provides emergency and planned sea defence materials such as rock armour and is uniquely placed to supply the local area and the South-East coast quickly and efficiently via established local and national authority supply chains. -

Finally, it is true that the large-scale of the local tourism industry provides significant employment in the area. Swanworth is exceptional because it is an aggregates quarry in a well-visited AONB and the current site is screened very successfully for its scale compared to smaller dimension stone quarries locally. The Purbeck tourism industry has not suffered during the 30-40 years since Swanworths peak output levels in the 1980s, so why would it discourage visitors in future if the same management of visual impacts continues at the same output levels? Moreover, it is precisely because the tourism industry is so prevalent that Swanworth is an exception to the generally low-paid, seasonal employment opportunities in the area. It is this exceptional situation that should be preserved and actively encouraged in order to provide a diversity to job prospects and economic activity in the area.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 246	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Matthew Suttle		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and have played a part in our submission to Dorset County Council's Mineral Sites Plan. I live locally in Purbeck as do almost all of my colleagues at Swanworth Quarry. Swanworth continuing is very important to my family and my livelihood. I strongly believe this document is legally compliant and sound, my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 182	3.25	Paragraph	Miss Lauren Davis		I have worked for Suttles for 3 years, and live locally in Corfe Castle, along with my parents who also work for Suttles. The continuation is very important to my me and my family, as my whole household will be effected by this decision. i believe that the document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence for this.	
PSD - MSP 173	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Steve Sparke		<p>Firstly I think Dorset council needs to consider whether they are acting in the interests of local residents by providing this ridiculously complex document to comment on important proposals for the area - and shrouding it in "legal jargon" !</p> <p>There are several concerns: I have seen no study of the impact of this proposal on the Kingston Village water supply (provided by Encombe Estate) upon which I, and the whole village, are reliant - could you let us know what study has been made, and its results.</p> <p>This is a huge area to become an eyesore in an AONB which is reliant for local employment on tourism - due both to its visibility and the impact on the roads of heavy lorries in an area which already struggles with road transport in high season. The noise impact from this will be material. What assessments have been made of the noise impact and the impact on road traffic ?</p> <p>There is clearly a vibrant and successful crushed rock industry in the area - clearly satisfying demand for the duration of the plan - so describing this as an "exceptional circumstance" is simply incorrect in law. The proposal is entirely motivated by money. To make this document legally sound there needs to be in-depth material supporting: 1. The assertion that this is an "exceptional circumstance" 2. The impact on road transport system in the area 3. Any potential impact on the Kingston Village water supply 4. The impact on tourism in the Purbeck area</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 179	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Liam Tucker		I work for Suttles and live locally, the continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and my familys. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 175	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Steve Lamb	Suttle Stone Quarries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of the Swanworth Quarry Extension area for the future provision of crushed rock is supported. • Swanworth has very limited reserves remaining and currently supplies approximately 50% of the limestone crushed rock produced in Dorset. • Swanworth lies closer to the Bournemouth/Poole market and the Purbeck market area than other sources of crushed rock and consequently involves reduced road miles, fuel usage and engine emissions than supply from other sources. • Great care has been taken to design the extension area to reduce impact on the surrounding area. • The development of the extension area would not result in any increase in the current level of production, vehicle movements or working hours. • The site would be restored with inert infill back to agricultural use at original ground levels so there would be no long term impact on the area. • Suttle Stone Quarries is a fully integrated part of the Suttles business which includes a recycling depot at Mannings Heath, dimension stone quarry at California Farm and specialist civil engineering business. • A large number of employees rely on the continued operation of Swanworth Quarry. 	
PSD - MSP 198	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Roger Funnell		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my and my family's livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 205	3.25	Paragraph	Mr James Wilms hurst		I work for Suttles and live locally in the Dorset area. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important me. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 204	3.25	Paragraph	Mr David Jesse Shiel		I work for Suttles and live locally in West Moors. For me, the continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and wellbeing. Without Suttles, I would be in insecure work. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 216	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Mike Bilson		I am involved with the Suttle Group from a business perspective and support this plan in the knowledge that the company conducts its affairs in the most professional manner, with the interests of the environment, public, and economy in mind. The directors have a long successful track record in this industry and in working sympathetically with nature and the landscape. At the same time the company provides good employment and adds substantial value to the local economy from which many people in Dorset benefit. I support the proposal and plan.	n/a
PSD - MSP 215	3.25	Paragraph	Mr John Harley		As an employee of the Suttle Group I rely on the business maintaining its output across all divisions for the business to justify the levels of employment in the Purbeck area. I believe that the document is legally compliant and after internal review I have seen this has been demonstrated sufficiently.	
PSD - MSP 228	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Ali Maidman		I work for Suttles and live locally in Poole. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and the livelihood of my family. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 247	3.25	Paragraph	mr Gordon Parr		I have worked for Suttles for 5 years and live locally in Swanage. The continuation of Swanworth quarry is very important to my families livelihood. I believe that this document is sound and that my employer has provided supporting evidence of this. Suttles are a fantastic, family run company, to work for and look after their employees and customers very well. They support lots of local charities and organisations and have a very positive attitude to local needs and concerns. They are very sensitive to the environmental concerns of locals as they are all locals too. The Swanworth Quarry extension is a Must, for the future of so many local people.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 171	3.25	Paragraph	Mrs Sally Feben Smith		<p>I object to the following proposal for mineral extraction for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) unless there are exceptional circumstances. No case has been made that there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the Dorset and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014. Extraction in the Mendips, could easily use the existing rail link to transport aggregate to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of diesel haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck and avoid wear and tear damage to the AONB over many years. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only part of an AONB, the site of an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site and overlooks Corfe Castle. This is not the right place for an industrial landscape with the noise of blasting, crushing machines and large quarry lorries. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This 35acre new quarry , on the rolling Purbeck uplands would be impossible to camouflage. To quote the AONB: "one of the Purbeck Plateaus key characteristics is its visual openness". People come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. Legally this is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent for further expansion. Suttles purchased the current quarry knowing that it had a finite lifespan and plans for its restoration to a Nature Reserve were widely welcomed. This quarry has planning upto 2024, which gives plenty of time for the present employees to be absorbed into Suttles other businesses. Our natural landscapes provide life-giving, beneficial qualities to humans and that is why so many visit this area. Theresa Mays recent speech and the governments 25 year Environment Plan is committed to connecting people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing. "Look on your works, ye mighty, and despair." This proposal is inappropriate and without justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	<p>The document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities' own policies. To make is legally compliant Site PK-16 should be removed from the plan.</p>
PSD - MSP 178	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Adam Parker		<p>I work for Suttles as an IT manager. On a personal level, the continuation of Swanworth Quarry is vital to my livelihood, and to the wider area it contributes around half of Dorset's crushed limestone output, so is vital to the local economy. I think this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 276	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Richard Gledhill		I have a number of concerns in relation to the information on the website. A key argument for the extension appears to be the threat to supplies post 2014. However the website contains inadequate information on the market for crushed rock in Dorset and Somerset to assess this argument. The website notes the potential impact of the extension on the surrounding AONB, but does not explore the impact on tourism, habitat, local communities etc of the extension. I would have expected due consideration of changes in the level of activity, noise, volume of traffic etc from the extension, as well as just the increase in land area committed to the quarry activities. As a user of Encombe Water I am also very concerned at the possible risks of the. Extension to local water supplies. Finally I note that I am confused by the first bullet of Question 3. What is meant by "positively prepared"? I have answered "dont know"	
PSD - MSP 208	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Lewis Mayne		As an employee of Suttles and a local resident living in Poole. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important for mine and my family's livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 213	3.25	Paragraph	Miss Sanchez		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 229	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Joe Paine		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and my familys. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and we have provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 227	3.25	Paragraph	Ms Julie Purver		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset, the continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood (and my family's). I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 231	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Ricardo Leite		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 250	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Martyn Jessop		The plan would destroy 35 acres of an AONB. Aside from the ecological issues, this destruction and disruption must be detrimental to those of us who depend on income from the tourist trade for our living. There are ample supplies of crushed rock elsewhere in Dorset, as similar proposals were rejected in 1968 and 1988 and little has changed since then why is this being considered now? A quarry at this location and of this size cannot be camouflaged its visual impact will be immense and will discourage visitors to the area. The lorries accessing the current quarry contribute to the traffic problems in the area. In practical terms there is nothing that can be done to alleviate the congestion in Corfe Castle at the bend by the Bankes Arms. I'm sure it will be claimed that the proposal will not result in more lorries but the point is we need to minimise regular traffic and if the existing quarry were to close in a few years this would be a substantial relief. In economic terms Corfe relies far more heavily on tourism for income than quarrying. We need to conserve the uniqueness of the AONB and surrounding natural and human environment.	
PSD - MSP 252	3.25	Paragraph	Mr Nikola y Nikolov		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset the continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and my familys. By my opinion this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 258	3.25	Paragraph	Mr ashley Cameron		I work for Suttles and live locally in Dorset the continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood [and my familys]. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 263	3.25	Paragraph	Mr James Walton		I work for Suttles and live locally in Wimborne. The continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood [and my familys]. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 319	3.25	Paragraph	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	We have no further comments to add to those already given. It seems likely that the biodiversity issues relating to the nearby SAC/SPA can be overcome and the remaining issues relate to Landscape and the AONB. A restoration vision which includes some nature conservation after use and restoration of areas of semi-natural limestone grassland is supported.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 19	3.3	Recycled Aggregate	Councillor (Borough of Poole) Marion Pope		<p>Ref. paras 3.32-3.43 White's Pit Inert Recycling Facility was originally granted temporary planning permission to prepare recycled aggregates and soils in order to cap the now defunct landfill. That permission expired on the 31 December 2010 when all machinery was to have been removed and the land restored to the Green Belt. However, work continued without permission for another three years. No attempt was made by the LPA to enforce closure and restoration. In 2014, the owners applied for permission to remain on the site in perpetuity (APP/14/00120/Y refers). Capping of the landfill was still incomplete possibly because recycled aggregates were by then being sold in bulk for other projects in the County. At this stage, the production of recycled material was much greater than originally permitted. The owners admitted that the site had more characteristics of a brownfield site than those of the Green Belt. Despite strong objections from the local community, temporary permission for a further 7 years was granted. Natural England objected to the application because work was already causing damage to Canford Heath SSSI and other internationally protected sites. A condition of this temporary permission was that sales of recycled aggregates to the public was prohibited. Avon Material Supplies (Aggregates, grab lorry, tipper and skip hire in Dorset) operates such a business from Canford Recycling Centre. From the original purpose for the recycling facility, a business to produce bulk recycled aggregates has evolved exponentially. Given that the concerns of Natural England were not addressed in 2014, it is difficult to have confidence that there will be no adverse impacts from the continued use of this site, or that this would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites.</p>	<p>The many failures to observe planning consents and conditions in the past gives no optimism that there will be any change simply because a new mineral sites plan has been prepared. The only way this could become legally compliant or sound is for the Minerals Planning Authority to rigorously enforce consents and conditions and observe its legal duty to protect the Heath and other important sites.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 150	3.44	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	<p>The supply of Ball Clay needs to be available for the foreseeable future. In the absence of any national strategy the Plan acknowledges is a shortfall in the predicted requirement of Ball Clay, even after the allocation of the Trigon Hill extension; so the Plan should have actions to a) press for a national strategy b) carry out actions during the period to 1933 which would facilitate mining beyond the Plan window when surface extraction sites are depleted.</p> <p>However, in general we do not support a predict and provide model and reluctantly accept this for Ball Clay in the absence of any better alternative. We do not see a scenario in which sanitary wares are not required in the distant future, so extraction must not be excessive now if the supply of Ball Clay is going to be future proofed.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 302	3.48	Paragraph	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	Historic England	<p>Policy MS-5: Site for the provision of Ball Clay - Trigon Hill Extension, Wareham The proposed quarry would have a major impact on the settings and significance of the scheduled Bronze Age round barrow monument on Trigon Hill. This designated heritage asset is a landscape monument intended by its builders to have a distinctive topographical and visual presence in the landscape. The landscape setting of the monument is of key importance to an understanding and appreciation of the heritage assets and is a fundamental and significant component of its heritage significance and public value. The present proposals, both in the position and extent of the quarry and also in the landform created in the post-extraction restoration scheme, would bring permanent major adverse changes to the landform and landscape which provides the primary context and setting of the monument. We consider that these proposals would result in substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets. We consider that there may be scope for extraction in part of the remaining natural landscape around the barrow, but the proposals would need significant modification in order to reduce the level of harm. We would strongly suggest that the area of extraction would need to be significantly smaller than that currently proposed, and designed so as to retain sufficient historic landform around the monument to maintain the integrity of its landscape setting.</p> <p>Similarly, the present quarry restoration scheme would need to be significantly modified so that it would reinstate ground surfaces at, or close to, the existing historic ground levels within the primary settings of the monuments in order to restore as far as possible its visual landscape setting. We would welcome the opportunity to further discuss this matter with you.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 346	3.48	Paragraph	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	<p>MS-5: Site for the provision of Ball Clay The RSPB strongly support the addition of the detailed text to safeguard European and internationally important wildlife habitats and species within this policy. Specifically:</p> <p>Any proposals for the development of this allocation must address the development considerations set out in Appendix A, as well as any other matters relevant its development, and demonstrate that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority. Sites will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Habitats Regulation Assessment screening indicates that development at BC-04 Trigon Hill Extension may have significant effects on species in particular. Development proposals must mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place.</p>	
PSD - MSP 320	3.48	Paragraph	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>The issues raised originally are still of concern with regards to this site. However, the HRA screening report states that discussions have established that adequate mitigation can be provided to ensure that effects on Annex 1 birds which are qualifying species of the European heathlands are reduced to a non-significant level. Provided that all the measures listed in that report are implemented and that adequate mitigation against any adverse impacts on the immediately adjacent SNCI, including an appropriate buffer area, can also be secured, then DWT has no objection to this site going forward. As with other sites, the restoration vision which emphasises the importance of to link with existing heathland sites to create a large and continuous habitat, managed by extensive grazing, is strongly supported.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 49	3.52	Paragraph	Dr Mary Sparks	Langton Matravers Parish Council	The Council did not consider all policies included. However, they did comment on Policy MS-3, Swanworth Quarry Extension, and MS-6, Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone. MS-3 , Swanworth quarry extension . The Council supported this policy as long as it does not create any significant increase in vehicle movements. MS-6 Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone The Council supported this policy as long as it does not create any significant increase in vehicle movements.	
PSD - MSP 321	3.56	Paragraph	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>Policy MS-6: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone</p> <p>PK-19 Broadmead Field DWT welcomes the removal of the SNCI from this site allocation, but would like to ensure that a substantial buffer to that site is included in any proposed quarrying of the remainder of the site. For all the allocated</p> <p>Purbeck Stone sites DWT is pleased that the restoration vision includes nature conservation after-use, integrating semi-natural grasslands (as well as native hedgerow and copse retention) as a key element.</p> <p>We would like to have seen the suggestion of some additional pond creation to benefit Great Crested Newts, for which this area is known to be important, stated in the restoration vision too, since assessment for impacts on this species is recognised as a key requirement of any application.</p>	
PSD - MSP 9	3.57	Paragraph	Mr Barry Barry Cullimore		<p>I do not believe that the gallows gore PK21 site allocation is consistent with national policy as it is immediately adjacent to a large number of residential properties and access is across and along an extremely narrow public highway.</p> <p>Some of the adjoining residential properties have seen a potential drop in value and this will be the case for the duration of the licence to operate on this field.</p> <p>There are many other fields on the Purbeck plateau which have far better road access and would give access to the same strata within the Purbeck beds that are distant from any residential properties.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 24	3.57	Paragraph	Joanne Lurie		Any planning that even considers quarrying at Gallows Gore with the access via Haycrafts Lane is criminally unsound. The impact on residences, on traffic on a single car lane that twists and turns whilst going steeply uphill (or downhill depending on choice) is beyond belief. To say that the area has historically been quarried is meaningless in today's reality.	This proposed choice of a quarry at Gallows Gore should be removed.
PSD - MSP 165	3.57	Paragraph	Mr Andrew Painter		<p>In reference to the Gallows Gore site (PK21) my understanding was that access to the site via Haycrafts Lane had previously been ruled out by DCC on grounds of safety, therefore any proposal for this site would be unsound and open to legal challenge if it includes access via any part of Haycrafts Lane.</p> <p>As the original proposal ruled out access via Haycrafts Lane respondents would not have felt it necessary to voice their concerns regarding this. To change the proposal at this stage would render the previous consultation invalid.</p> <p>I would also have thought that common decency would have been taken into consideration - some residents will be surrounded by quarries if the proposal for this site goes ahead. There are many places where stone can be extracted on the Purbeck Plateau without having this impact on residents.</p>	Pk21 Gallows Gore should be removed from the document. This would then prevent any challenge based on inconsistencies in the consultation process
PSD - MSP 166	3.57	Paragraph	mr andrew painter		<p>In reference to the Gallows Gore site (PK21) my understanding was that access to the site via Haycrafts Lane had previously been ruled out by DCC on grounds of safety, therefore any proposal for this site would be unsound and open to legal challenge if it includes access via any part of Haycrafts Lane. As the original proposal ruled out access via Haycrafts Lane respondents would not have felt it necessary to voice their concerns regarding this. To change the proposal at this stage would render the previous consultation invalid. I would also have thought that common decency would have been taken into consideration - some residents will be surrounded by quarries if the proposal for this site goes ahead. There are many places where stone can be extracted on the Purbeck Plateau without having this impact on residents.</p>	Pk21 Gallows Gore should be removed from the document. This would then prevent any challenge based on inconsistencies in the consultation process

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 97	3.58	Paragraph	Mrs Joyce Meates		<p>PK21 has been left in whilst adjoining Quarr Farm site has been taken out.</p> <p>The verges in Haycrafts Lane were designated as Blue Pole verges, therefore protected. When Purbeck Marble was quarried from Quarr Farm by the same operator a few years ago, access was onto Haycrafts Lane.</p> <p>Because of the large size of the quarry vehicles a large turning area was required resulting in severe damage to a large area of the verge which had to be rebuilt. As the proposed access to Haycrafts Lane from PK21 is a lot narrower considerable damage to the verges will result. We were not informed of the original application.</p>	
PSD - MSP 341	3.58	Paragraph	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	<p>Purbeck Stone sites</p> <p>The objective of the restoration vision for this sites should not just be for limestone pasture but for limestone pasture of conservation interest (e.g. species-rich limestone pasture).</p> <p>Moreover, some areas should be left to naturally revegetate as early successional limestone habitats are particularly valuable. In addition the restoration vision should include provision for the establishment of bat roosts (designed specifically for bats and with provision for access for monitoring). Bat roosts are an important feature of old abandoned quarries in this area.</p>	
PSD - MSP 2	3.6	Other Building Stone	Mr Alan Holiday	DIGS	<p>In Chapter 5 (block stone) of the Mineral and Waste Local Plan there is no mention of the possible use of Local Geological Sites as a possible source of small amounts of block stone. This was in an earlier plan. This was used for conservation work on Wolfeton Riding House (Charminster) where stone was acquired from Poxwell. We recommend that this be reinstated in the new plan. Attached images: Replacement stone in mullion window; replacement stone work.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 323	3.67	Paragraph	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	Policy MS-7: Sites for the provision of other building stone (excluding Portland and Purbeck stone) BS05 Whithill Quarry, Lillington DWT is pleased to note the recognition that a full ecological assessment of this site will be required to include any adverse impacts on the nearby Honeycombe Wood SNCI.	
PSD - MSP 158	4	Puddletown Road Area	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	As Waste and Mineral sites are closely associated, often with the same operator, we suggest that Waste sites are included in the Puddletown Road Area Policy. You may also wish to include other industrial activities, but this will probably vary the Plan too much. Should this suggestion be adopted, we also suggest that the Waste Sites Plan be amended accordingly.	
PSD - MSP 304	4	Puddletown Road Area	Mr Rohan Torkildsen	Historic England	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy It would be helpful if the local authority were to confirm why this Policy only appears to address potential issues relating to the natural environment.	
PSD - MSP 157	4.1	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Other Area Policies The Puddletown Road Area Policy model can be applied elsewhere. We are not suggesting that the Plan should be specific at this stage but are suggesting that an enabling paragraph is added to the Puddletown Road Area Policy MS-8 to allow the Minerals Planning Authority to allocate policies for other areas. The areas we have in mind are Moreton / Crossways, Purbeck Plateau and Portland which interestingly correspond to inserts A, D and E of the Submission Map.	Add the following paragraph to the end of Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy "A similar integrated area approach may be adopted for other areas where the Minerals Planning Authority deems this to be beneficial for environmental, social, economic or natural beauty purposes."
PSD - MSP 200	4.1	Paragraph	Mr David Payne	Mineral Products Association	We support the coordinated approach to development and restoration to maximise benefits for biodiversity	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 185	4.1	Paragraph	Mr Rob Westell		<p>The Puddletown Road area has only become of particular interest for large scale quarry restoration due to the concentration of quarry activities in that area. Quarrying has created and will continue to create a landscape scale opportunity to develop a heath/forest mosaic habitat. The future of quarrying in this area will continue to provide further opportunities to provide further opportunities and this should be recognised in Policy MS8, rather than simply focussing on restoration.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to policies which encourage extraction up to ownership boundaries, rather than leaving a network of causeways in the landscape.</p> <p>Consideration also ought to be given to landscape design on a much wider scale that site specifics would allow; for example, the Puddletown Road itself will become a causeway alien in the landscape.</p>	Recognise the importance of quarrying in Policy MS8, without which the opportunity to carry out landscape scale restoration would not exist. MS8 should be more positive towards mineral working up to ownership boundaries between sites to maximise resources.
PSD - MSP 203	4.1	Paragraph	Mr David Payne	Mineral Products Association	We support the coordinated approach to development and restoration in the Puddletown Road to ensure opportunities for landscape-scale biodiversity enhancement are realised.	
PSD - MSP 343	4.1	Paragraph	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	The RSPB strongly support the inclusion of Policy MS-8 Puddletown Road Area Policy. The RSPB is pleased to acknowledge the general support and enthusiasm from within Dorset County Council, the conservation community and from mineral operators themselves for the general ambition set out in this section of the draft plan and we look forward to future engagement in delivering its objectives.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 347	4.1	Paragraph	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	The RSPB strongly support the leadership of Dorset County Council minerals planning team in developing this section of the draft plan. The introductory remarks and context set out very clearly the rationale and benefits of collaborative working in the proposed Puddletown Road Area Policy, which the RSPB is pleased to be engaged with. The Puddletown Road Area Policy presents a very significant opportunity for landscape scale conservation to benefit wildlife and people. It is one of the most significant habitat creation and restoration opportunities in the south west of England. Policy MS-8, together with this helpful supporting text, will enable stakeholders to work collaboratively to bring the vision for this area to life.	
PSD - MSP 325	4.1	Paragraph	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the Puddletown Road Area Policy, and would wish to be included in any discussions or meetings which might help to further the aims and ensure a consistent approach to development, restoration and management of the sites within this area to secure the long-term conservation objectives.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 289	5	Safeguarding	Mr Anthony Smale	Railfuture, Wessex Branch	<p>Section 5 & Appx B fail to list all railheads in the County and those in neighbouring counties, and fail to encourage the development of new railheads. Lack of any policy statement about trans-shipment by sustainable modes.</p> <p>Section 5 Safeguarding Figure 9 shows railheads at Wool and Poole only. In Appendix B, only Hamworthy, Wool and Furzebrook sidings are cited for safeguarding. While we welcome the Councils commitment to safeguarding these railheads, we recommend that a number of other sites around the County be added to the list of railheads for safeguarding, for example:</p> <p>Gillingham Shell Star siding; Maiden Newton ACE siding; Weymouth Jersey sidings and Quay; Dorchester South yard; Winfrith Siding.</p> <p>There needs to be a policy of encouraging minerals 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 mineral 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 Minerals Plan lacks any policy statement about preferred methods of trans-shipment. We recommend the inclusion of a statement along the lines of Policy 12 in the Waste Plan (as amended in our response to the Waste Plan). The Minerals 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>	
PSD - MSP 273	5.1	Paragraph	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Find the wording of the first sentence problematical. Perpetual growth is by definition not sustainable in a finite system. Also mineral resources are finite.* * Some scenarios being explored by the scientific community, e.g. mining of asteroids, should not be taken into consideration until they are shown to be realizable, which is unlikely in the strategy / planning timeframe.	Suggest 'Minerals are essential to the functioning of the economy and our quality of life'.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 356	5.1	Paragraph	Susan Chapman		<p>Policy 6 Safeguarding- Paragraph 6:1 "Minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life". Please note oxymoron "sustainable economic growth". Your document needs to challenge the endless consumption mantra. We are NOT safeguarding future generations. Sustainable Dorset - Dorset's Sustainability Hub (www.sustainabledorset.org) supports a zero carbon, zero waste policy. Behaviour change is needed on a significant scale. A proper programme of bite- sized chunks enabling the steps for ordinary citizens to change, adapt, use different methods. Not the shocking leadership of (latest atrocity) an environment minister determined to poison all bees. This looks like an act of insane criminality. Ordinary people need to take control of their own communities with safe growing methods. The Demain Film has many Transition solutions to the convergence of crises facing us. Good that a circular economics is mentioned in the WASTE document 3:17 but alas is not yet established as a culture of waste invades all life. Bournemouth is currently encouraging more waste in Wessex Fields (unnecessary roads) to add to the 400,000 Hiroshimas of carbon a day poisoning our atmosphere. Policy inconsistency. David Pilling (Financial Times) in the Growth Delusion points out that GDP is not the best measure of our economic health. Bhutan measures success as Gross National Happiness. Neither Bournemouth nor Poole's draft local plan are beefy enough to match the challenges of the 21st century. All citizens need to be educated, incentivised and motivated. Culturally normalised to our collective detriment is the use of Extinction Energy which is wiping out Life on Earth. No more oil extraction please. PD040 - PD048 California farm and elsewhere. Our sandcastle system is still encouraged by central government who, despite greenspeak, fail to deliver the democratic, decentralised, decarbonised world we need. Industrial society must be incentivised to recoup all materials, rescoop from landfill and restrain all new extraction. Many jobs. Lovely clean machines are now scooping ocean waste. Government should stop pretending and back all conservation, all solar, wind & other renewable programmes including Navitus. And start mass planting of fruit, nut trees as well as medicinal plants and herbs. Soil protection essential. We should aim at self-sufficiency. All systems are now threatened, only ozone improving. 60 years of global harvests left. Professor William Ripple and 15,363 colleagues from 184 countries issue a second Warning to Humanity, an update on the previous warning of 1992. Why is this warning not being shouted from the rooftops? We are out of time. Poor leadership enables us to Grenfell ourselves. Dead cat distractions are everywhere. Time to focus on survival. It is all hands on deck time: the solutions are to hand. Elon Musk has shown how renewables and batteries can provide the energy we need. Transition Towns are showing how local food can meet local needs from mental health and happiness to actual food growing. Incredible edibles etc. Passivhauses with solar panels are needed. BREEAM level 6 or outstanding. Water harvesting and water saving: "mellow yellow, brown down" philosophy. Copenhagen style mass cycling and public transport. End overconsumption. Ration flying until zero carbon transportation is in place. Conservation of all resources. Dunkirk leadership.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 201	5.5	Paragraph	Mr David Payne	Mineral Products Association	We support the safeguarding provided to sites, resources, and minerals infrastructure.	
PSD - MSP 311	5.5	Paragraph	Mr Dave Ogborne	Wessex Water	Policy MS-9: Preventing Land-Use Conflict The provision of a 250 metre consultation zone is accepted.	
PSD - MSP 353	5.5	Paragraph	Laura Cox	PRO Vision Planning	The Charborough Estate supports the safeguarding of mineral sites and associated infrastructure, set out within Policy MS-9. The proposed approach is promoted by the Planning Practice Guidance, which identifies that Local Plans should manage potentially conflicting objectives for the use of land (Reference ID: 27-007-20140306). However, the list of sites and infrastructure to be protected must be updated regularly, so that the plan is positively prepared (i.e. that the objectively assessed development and infrastructure needs set out in the plan are met). Safeguarding of mineral sites and associated infrastructure will support the deliverability of the Local Plan, ensuring that the policies are effective.	
PSD - MSP 218	6.14	Paragraph	Mrs Deborah Smith		There has not been 'extensive informal and formal consultation with a wide range of interested parties' because no one that I have spoken to had any idea that a site so close to their property was even being proposed.	Local events to publicise new proposed sites such as those in the AOS section 3. The Sandford site has never been seen before.
PSD - MSP 162	Table 2	Implementation and Monitoring	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	As the last Portland Stone site has dropped out of consideration with the Bower's Mine Extension under the cemetery having been permitted, there is no longer anything in the Plan to state that the Minerals Planning Authority is an interested party in any future Portland Stone applications. Likewise for Oil and Gas extraction. I believe this could be very misleading and that some generic statement(s) should be added to highlight these interests.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 11	Table 3		Mr Terry Sneller	West Dorset District Council	<p>It is suggested that an additional indicator be included to aid in the implementation of Policy MS-2. The indicator should seek to assess the impact of the area of search on non-minerals development to ensure that the residential and employment growth much needed in the area is not prevented or held up. This concern relates to the requirement for the local planning authority to maintain a five-year supply of deliverable residential sites.</p> <p>Suggested indicator: the number of non-minerals developments delayed or prevented as a result of Policy MS-2.</p>	
PSD - MSP 26		Submission Policies Map and Inset Maps	Mrs Alison Clothier	Sturminster Marshall Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council are concerned at the extent of the Search Area identified in Inset Map C. If further mineral extraction were to take place, the Parish Council would not wish to see any minerals extractions along riverbeds.</p>	
PSD - MSP 184		Appendix A: Site Allocations	Jan Wardell	Rambles Association - Dorset Area	<p>I am responding to the above consultation on behalf of the Ramblers, Dorset Area, having viewed the documents on-line. I do not have expertise in matters of legal compliance and soundness, in relation to either of these Plans, but I would like to make the following observations concerning public rights of way and access, and matters connected with those.</p> <p>Wherever there are public rights of way (PROW) directly or indirectly affected by any of the proposals, due legal process must be followed if there is any likelihood that operations will prevent use of these by the public. This also applies to Open Access Land.</p> <p>Bournemouth Dorset & Poole Mineral Sites Plan Having looked at the various reports for the sites identified as possibly affecting public rights of way (numbered 12), and in particular section C24 they all note DCC RoW/Ranger comments that either screening or some form of mitigation will be required, apart from one " Trigon Hill (BC04) which states "DCC RoW Officer comments awaited". I suggest that this be followed up, to avoid any potential future query.</p>	

Sustainability Assessment - In relation to AS19, AS25 and AS26 some common benefits are claimed:

- The potential for Improved public access There is no evidence for this claim " it is most unlikely that The Frampton Estate will grant public access to either AS25 or AS26; and similarly by Woodsford Farms limited to AS19. Does DCC have guarantees from the landowners and/or would they make this a condition of granting planning permission, which they are prepared to enforce in 20-30 years' time?
- Local and national economic benefits The economic benefits are assumed/presumed, not properly assessed. Certainly no cost-benefit analysis has been undertaken to offset the economic costs (including intangibles) against the benefits assumed. No impact of the loss of farmland and farm incomes has been taken into account (post-Brexit food production may have even greater benefits to the local economy; no negative impact on tourism has been assessed or even considered; no negative impact on house values has been assessed or even considered; no costs of increased pollution have been included. The benefit to the local economy could be non-existent or even negative.
- Reduction of nitrates entering the ground and surface waters and the Frome , possibly on a long term basis, with benefits to water quality and to nature conservation designations in Poole Harbour There is no evidence that excessive nitrates are in fact entering the River Frome from these sites, in particular from AS26 which is a dairy farm and not under intensive arable agriculture. If this is not the case then the benefit claimed is illusory. In addition Flocculants are being used currently at Woodsford quarry and it is likely that will be needed in AS19 and AS26; if there is a current pathway to the River Frome for nitrates there will be one for these flocculants and this will have a negative impact on the SSSI river and the designated Poole Harbour. In addition, what evidence is there that the landowners will permit large areas of their land to be restored to non-productive wetlands. Current they earn either from rents or directly from agricultural use of the whole area. Would DCC make restoration of the northern areas of AS19 and AS26 into wetlands a condition of any planning consent and enforce this condition in 20 or 30 years time?
- Indeed under the impacts for AS19, the Sustainability Assessment states: mitigation will be required, including pulling the northern boundary of the site back; and Pulling the northern boundary back and leaving an area of unworked land to be managed as wetland will both assist in reducing nitrate flows to the river and reducing impacts on surrounding receptors. If this has already been identified, why has the northern boundary of AS19 been pulled back as part of this Plan and a written commitment of the landowner been sought to accept a smaller overall site and an area of wetland as described?
- In describing the Impacts of AS19, AS25 and AS26 in the Sustainability Assessment and in other Documents various mitigation commitments seem to be being made: The issue of cumulative impact must be carefully addressed. The proposed site (AS19) is immediately adjacent to the proposed Hurst Farm site (AS26) and adjacent areas of these two sites should not be worked simultaneously, particularly in the northern parts of each site, to minimise impacts on residences and businesses across the river Whereas three quarries in the area are currently operated (Woodford Farm, Warmwell and Moreton Pit), this Plan envisages only two quarries at any one

time. AS25 and AS26 would not operate simultaneously, even though the processing plant will be for both would be on AS26 These imply therefore that: As Moreton Pit and Warmwell quarry become fully exhausted, AS26 would (if granted planning permission) come on stream sometime around 2020-2022 " it would operate simultaneously with Woodsford Farm Given that AS26 has a lifetime of up to 16 years, AS25 (if granted planning permission) would become operational only after 2036-2038 i.e. beyond the horizon of this Plan AS19 would only become operational after Woodsford Farm has been exhausted so that the only two quarries in operation in the late 2020s/early 2030s would be AS19 and AS26, and then in such a way that the northern boundaries of AS19 were drawn back and that adjacent areas of AS19 and AS26 were not operational at the same time. Is DCC willing to make this phasing and these commitments explicit in the Plan and commit to enforcing them over the next 20 years?

- In describing the impacts of AS26 and AS25 The Sustainability Assessment states: A Transport Assessment will be required and there may be some transport-related impacts, but it is expected that these will be capable of mitigation A detailed Transport Assessment was carried out in December 2016 and dealt with cumulative effects of AS19, AS25 and AS26, with various scenarios to cover possible housing developments in Crossway and Moreton. However the Assessment is wholly inadequate, in that the Planning Authority gave the study too narrow a brief, Despite Affuddle Parish Council having pointed out the potential adverse impact to the north of these sites, the assessment only looked at the impact on the B3390 to the south of AS25 and AS26. It is obvious that a significant proportion of the cumulative impact will be to the north along the B3390; where ever-larger quarry HGV (and those delivering inert waste to restore Moreton Pit and Warmwell quarries, traffic ignored completely in the assessment!) will encounter: The single lane, listed Hurst Bridge " Purbeck DCs Conservation Officer has raised the issue of weight limits on this bridge Waddock Cross, a road safety cluster site Narrow roads with blind bends through the woods north of Affpuddle Single lane sections of road combined with a blind bend in Affuddle A Further extremely blind bend near the church in Affpuddle and two narrow bridges over the River Piddle
- Cumulative traffic impacts in Bere Regis, particularly if one mitigation is to avoid Affpuddle. Bere Regis already experiences high volumes of quarry traffic from the Puddletown Rd quarries. .None of this was included in the Traffic Assessments and it is unclear how, on the basis of a flawed traffic assessment, DCC can reach a conclusion that the transport-related impacts will be capable of mitigation. It simply does not know.
- In relation to AS25 the Sustainability Assessment states Development of this site could lead to impacts on neighbouring properties and the village of Moreton. However, all impacts will be required to be appropriately mitigated and it is expected that this will be possible , particularly given the size of the site. There is no could about it- the word is WILL! There is no basis either for expecting adequate mitigation to the heritage assets and the Conservation Area " see more detailed comments from FRAME on this matter

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 163	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Mr Clifford Morse	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	The conclusion to allocate is not supported by the body of evidence that you have provided, e.g. many very significant adverse impacts listed in the Site Assessment. If it must go ahead the smaller allocated area published should not be extended and a great deal of mitigation will be needed. The site must be restored to dry sandy heath and not to wet heath. There is no known way to properly mitigate damage to sand lizard habitat: see Dr. Keith Corbett's earlier submission.	
PSD - MSP 240	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Ralph Holmes	Open Spaces Society	<p>The nominated site, the Great Plantation (AS06), is entirely on officially designated Access Land. The site is almost 15 hectares. For dog walkers, ramblers and other recreational users the closure of such a large area of access land would be a very serious loss. This is particularly so as some of the key circular walks from the small car parks on the A352 would no longer be possible. The draft Minerals Site Plan mentions the need for mitigation to deal with such matters, but lacks soundness as it does not give details or examples of appropriate mitigation. It is left too vague as to what the planning authorities should expect.</p>	<p>Details and examples of appropriate mitigation should be included, eg Alternative land should be allocated as open access land - possibly to include land already quarried. That could possibly include most of Hyde Pit, especially as activity at Hyde Pit is expected to be completed before mineral extraction begins on Great Plantation land. The creation of access to the Great Plantation, and possibly to the new areas mentioned above, from Puddletown Road. To include a small car park with interpretation facilities in an appropriate place, eg near Long Bottom. A possible entrance to this would be from near where the aerial electricity cables cross Puddletown Road, near the existing main entrance to the Hanson site. There are also existing entrances, within a mile of this point, both to the east and west along Puddletown Road. I believe the Forestry Commission currently use at least one of these three entrances. To create new footpaths on existing Great Plantation land to enable circular walks to the more northern parts of the Access Land from the A352 to still take place. Presumably the quarry developer would pay for these but they would be planned by or at least in full agreement with the Forestry Commission.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 287	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Daniel Harper	Hanson Aggregates	Hanson are content that the draft Plan is legally compliant and sound. Hanson's comments are thus confined to issues associated with the proposed Great Plantation allocation site AS06.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 349	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	<p>Within Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel, Great Plantation (AS-06) is allocated, subject to the proposal being "in accordance with the development plan".</p> <p>The RSPB has concerns over this allocation, given its existing role as public open space, and the potential displacement of recreational users in the event the site is developed for mineral extraction. These concerns have been raised previously (RSPB responses of 25 February 2014, 9 October 2015 and 5 August 2016). We note that the proposed allocation has been reduced significantly in scale.</p> <p>The Habitats Regulations Assessment and Appendix A: Site Allocations documents identify the environmental issues associated with this allocation. Within Appendix A these are given as : Impacts on biodiversity are of key importance. These include, but are not limited to, issues such as: Recreational displacement Proximity to European designated sites and protected species characteristic of such sites Impacts on nationally designated sites Potential for benefits from site restoration Potential for impacts on Nightjar and other Annex 1 birds Impacts on protected species, such as smooth snake and sand lizard Full assessment will be required, with appropriate mitigation identified and implemented. Initial assessments have concluded that effects on species, proximity and displacement of recreation in particular may be significant. Development proposals must mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place.</p> <p>The RSPB support the above analysis of the potential issues associated with this allocation. Within Appendix A (p.109) a Heathland Support Area is mooted, " in the vicinity of Great Plantation to further protect designated heathlands from potential displacement of recreation" . No detail is provided at this stage about how the HSA would operate, but we understand that it may function in conjunction with additional improvements to the remainder of Great Plantation (designed to increase its attractiveness to recreational users) and off-site improvements to other local sites in the promoters control. Progression of this allocation will require full confidence in the suite of mitigation measures.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 588	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England	<p>Our previous letter dated 22 Dec 2016 gave comments on several sites in relation to Building Stone, Purbeck Stone, and Aggregates. Some clarification on these comments was provided by Trevor Badley, Dorset County Council, on 14 Dec 2017. Aggregates In line with our previous response, and dealing with each site in turn, we have commented below in relation to sites that have the potential to impact on the SRN (Strategic Road Network).</p> <p>AS06 Great Plantation As noted in our previous comments, this site is expected to be a follow on of the working of the existing Hyde and Hines pits, and as such it is not expected that this would result in additional traffic.</p> <p>It is noted and welcomed that a Transport Assessment is to be produced, to assess possible impacts and identify appropriate mitigation. Should there be a change to the expectation that this site will not be worked simultaneously with current workings at Hyde/Hines pits, Highways England should be informed.</p> <p>Likewise, if the level of extraction, operating hours, or load per HGV changes, we would wish to be informed as this may have implications on the level of traffic using the SRN.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 336	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	<p>In summary, we have previously commented at length on this proposal at several different stages of the sites plan process and these responses cover the key issues in some depth.</p> <p>As you know, in the light of these concerns the proposal has been considerably reduced in scale and addition mitigation has been introduced so that in our view, providing the proposed mitigation is implemented in full, at this stage it is reasonable to expect that a planning application would be able to meet the relevant tests within the Habitats Regulations/Directive.</p> <p>Within the Sites Plan itself we would recommend that a better link is made between the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report (HRA) and plan policy for some of the detail about the nature of the mitigation is within the HRA rather than the development guidelines. This would ensure that the requirement for specific mitigation is enshrined within Policy rather than only being within supporting documents; the change is therefore important in allowing the Plan itself to meet the relevant tests in the Habitats Regulations/Directive.</p> <p>An addition to MS-1 is suggested below.</p> <p>Policy MS-1: . Proposals for the development of these allocations will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects; implementation of the full range of mitigation measures listed in Appendix 2 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report is expected to be a key element in meeting these requirements.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 433	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Mrs Tessa Wiltshire		<p>Part B, para 4 I consider that the document is not legally compliant as: Two supporting documents (Assessment under Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation, Nov 2017, and Heritage Assessment, Nov 2017) identify site AS06 (The Great Plantation) as being in the Parish of Bere Regis, when it is in fact in the parish of East Stoke. They also identify it as being 'near Bovington' when public access is through Hethfelton Wood at East Stoke. This incorrect information is misleading.</p> <p>It is difficult from the website to obtain information clearly differentiating the 2015 and 2016 proposals from the new 2017 proposal which is significantly different. The 'Site Appraisals for draft mineral sites plan' leads you to a page that details (with map) the pre-2017 proposals.</p> <p>The 2017 proposal is so greatly modified from earlier ones that it could be said to be a new proposal. It has only been available for public consideration since 1st December 2017 and consultation closes on 31 January. No time is allowed for answers to public responses to this revised proposal before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State. I consider that the document is unsound as, firstly, there are errors in the supporting documents, as stated.</p> <p>I believe the proposal is not justified as it remains in the draft plan when other sites with similar features have been removed, even though they were likely to have been more productive (example Moreton Plantation). I believe it is not justified, as valued open access land would be lost to the public, whilst producing a relatively low yield of sand and gravel.</p> <p>The government is currently promoting the importance to public health and wellbeing of open access land. I believe the document is unsound, as it is ineffective and cannot be delivered. Further assessments are required in the fields of Biodiversity, Heritage, Water, Social Considerations including human health and amenity, safe access to the countryside and Open Spaces, vehicular access, as well as mitigation requirements in all these fields. There is no time for these assessments to be carried out and considered by the public before the plan is submitted to the Secretary of State, and no further opportunity for public response.</p> <p>No proposals have been provided for mitigation for the loss of public access and there is no opportunity for public involvement in any such proposals. It is not clear that vehicular access would be entirely via the present works to the north of the site, the remainder of Hethfelton Wood must be protected and there is no reassurance that this would be the case. Re. vehicular movement: there is no evidence that neighbouring parishes of Bere Regis and Arne have been consulted under 'duty to co-operate'. Both are likely to be affected by an increase in vehicle movements - the former by use of the Puddletown Road and A35 junction at Bere Regis, and the latter at the junction of the Puddletown Road and A352 at Worgret.</p>	<p>Correcting the two documents which place the Great Plantation in the Parish of Bere Regis would assist with legality but this error is likely already to have caused confusion to anyone researching the site. I do not see how anything can be changed at this late stage to make the proposal sound (deliverable).</p> <p>There is too little information for informed response, and no further public representation allowed.</p> <p>The question of mitigation of public access is one that deserves to be debated. The concerns over Biodiversity and Heritage are best addressed by specialists in those fields. Vehicular access needs to be very clearly and categorically defined. It is my view that the proposal for site AS06, the Great Plantation, should be removed from the plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 313	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>DWT retains great concerns about the allocation of this site in the Plan, as we believe it will be very difficult to adequately mitigate the likely impacts of mineral extraction on European Sites and species associated with them including Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Nightjar.</p> <p>However, we recognise that the size of the proposed allocated site has been reduced to remove any area of SAC/SPA from within the minerals development area, and we see from the details within the HRS screening report that a heathland support area has been proposed to mitigate the effects of displacement of recreational activity onto the nearby European Sites, as well as additional heathland within the allocated site.</p> <p>Provided that all of the measures outlined in the HRA screening report are adhered to and that any planning proposal for mineral extraction in this area is shown to have reduced biodiversity impacts on European Sites and their associated species to non-significant levels before planning permission is granted, then we will not retain an objection to its inclusion within the Plan.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 546	Figure 10	Great Plantation	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>No objection provided areas of nearby SSSI/ SPA/SAC/Ramsar are not impacted from the proposals. Also provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage and that the points raised below can be addressed.</p> <p>Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Greater than 1 hectare hence FRA required in accordance with the requirement of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. The prior written Land Drainage Consent is required from the LLFA (DCC) for works that could affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse.</p> <p>Fisheries and Biodiversity We are satisfied with the development guidelines outlined in Appendix 1: Site Allocations and agree with the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) that the issues identified must be resolved prior to the commencement of any development. We note that a mitigation corridor has been included in 2017 plan. We note in the HRA that discussion about this site has been held between the operator, Natural England and the Dorset County Council Mineral Planning. We would therefore defer to NEs advice in reference to the HRA.</p> <p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land Proposed development will require hydrogeological and contaminated land assessment. Isolation of SSSI pockets will potentially dewater these islands " so will impact any wet heath / mires in these areas. We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required.</p> <p>Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Protect and enhance water features in site Water Framework Assessments (WFD) as necessary Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 31	Figure 11	Hurn Court Farm Quarry extension	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Hurn Parish Council	<p>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.</p> <p>DRAFT MINERALS PLAN Hurn Court Farm Extension Hurn Parish Council object to this proposal. Councillors have several concerns about this proposed extension site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. They object to the site extending so close to Dales Lane as shown on the AS09 plan. The proximity of the proposed workings to the Grade II listed Dales House will have a detrimental impact on it. The Parish Council requests a minimum buffer zone between mineral extraction workings and Dales House of at least 65m. There is a buffer zone of 90m between the workings and Mill House on the current Hurn Court Farm quarry site. Similar consideration should be given to Dales House. 2. The location of the proposed site is immediately adjacent to Bournemouth International Airport, and it may increase the risk of bird-strike to aircraft. Aircraft safety is of paramount importance and evidence should be provided of the possible risks and any mitigation. 3. The B3073 Parley Lane is already extremely busy, and often at a standstill with traffic at peak times. The proposed extension, if agreed, should not be operational at the same time as the existing Hurn Court Farm site, as the Parish Council consider the impact of additional lorries on Parley Lane would further degrade the already difficult traffic problems in Hurn. 4. As well as the existing Hurn Court Farm Minerals Site, there is planning permission in place for mineral extraction at Avon Common in Hurn. Now the proposal for the Hurn Court Farm Extension has been put forward, with the potential for 3 mineral sites in the Parish of Hurn. The Parish Council object to the concurrent working of any of the above mentioned sites, because of the transport impacts on the Hurn road system. 5. Since the traffic assessment was carried out for the extension to the Hurn Court Farm Site the access road to the Berry Hill treatment works has been constructed. This will significantly increase the number of HGV movements along Parley Lane. 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. 	
PSD - MSP 251	Figure 11	Hurn Court Farm	Mr Conor O'Luby		It will not be able to reduce environmental impacts to 'non-significant' levels.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 333	Figure 11	Hurn Court Farm Quarry extension	Ms Helen Patton	New Forest National Park Authority	<p>As you are aware, as with the proposed Roeshot site, the Authority considers that reducing the impact of mineral traffic on the roads running through the National Park should be considered as a priority.</p> <p>Again, the Authority is concerned to note that while a Transport Assessment will be required, it seems to suggest in the document that the assessment will only focus on Parley Lane and other roads in the local vicinity, rather than an assessment of the wider traffic impacts extending through the National Park. The Authority therefore requests that this should be addressed in the final Submission document.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 547	Figure 11	Hurn Court Farm Quarry extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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 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 River Corridor Buffer Zone - In order to minimise developed encroachment and impacts on river corridors and their associated wildlife, a no go buffer zone must be provided alongside any watercourses or wetland features of interest. The required width of the buffer zone will need to be determined subject to the provision of further site information. No activities associated with any stage of the mineral extraction must occur in this buffer zone, including light spill. Groundwater and Contaminated Land Hydrological assessment - We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for each site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological Assessment Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study if water features present in site Protect and enhance water features in site. Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment may be required due to water features near the site</p>	
PSD - MSP 374	Figure 11	Hurn Court Farm	Mr Rob Flower	New Milton Sand & Ballast	<p>I am writing to confirm that I would like to attend the Hearing to support AS09 Hurn Western Extension on behalf of the mineral operator New Milton Sand & Ballast Co. Nick Dunn</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 334	Figure 11	Hurn Court Farm Quarry extension	Mrs Linda Leeding	West Parley Parish Council	<p>Although not within the geographical Parish of West Parley, the proposed extension to Hurn Court Farm Quarry, is estimated to provide a further 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel and the Roeshot Extension 3.5 million tonnes. However, even without the proposed extensions, there is a current surplus in supply for the Plan period from elsewhere in Dorset.</p> <p>The value of the mineral deposits will not diminish and it therefore appears totally unnecessary to allocate both sites for expansion at this juncture. We re-iterate our point that the roads infrastructure -even with the modifications currently being proposed to alleviate some problems on the B3073 corridor- cannot cope with what is currently proposed under the Core Strategy for housing and employment, let alone the significant proposals for the Eco and Hurn Court Farm sites.</p> <p>Therefore, in conclusion the Parish Council is of the view the proposed strategy is not sound nor justified. Other sites in Dorset do not have the site constraints as these two, but can provide sand and gravel deposits locally over the Plan period without the allocation of both identified Christchurch Sites.</p>	

The proposed allocation at Hurn Court Farm is for an extension to the existing sand and gravel quarry for 14.2ha and approximately 600,000 tonnes (south east of the existing site). The Council maintains its objection to this proposed allocation and this representation deals with the following issues: * Transport Impact * Airport Aerodrome Safety * Floodrisk / Environmental Issues * Impact on Heritage Assets * Visual Impact / Disturbance to Residents & Businesses Transport Impact:

The estimated number of traffic movements is identified as the same as for the existing quarry. Traffic generation has been estimated at around 60 trips per day for a period of 4 years. Access to the site is proposed from the existing signalised junction that also serves as the main access to Bournemouth Airport. Parley Lane is already subject to high levels of congestion which includes HGV traffic from the existing Hurn Court Farm site and from Eco Composting, Chapel Lane. The Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy plans for further employment development at the Airport and residential development including allocations at West Parley. The Core Strategy and Local Transport Plan 3 identify a package of improvements to the B3073 to mitigate the impact of planned development. The Bournemouth International Growth Programme is programming a package of transport improvements to the B3073 corridor which are part funded by the governments Growth Deal funding. However, a transport assessment has not been undertaken to support this plan so it is not clear at this stage whether the proposed allocation is effective and deliverable. It needs to be demonstrated at this stage that a suitable package of mitigation measures can be delivered to address the in-combination impact of planned residential and employment development along the B3073 corridor. It is not considered appropriate to leave this assessment to the planning application stage.

The Council objects to the concurrent working of the proposed Hurn Court Farm Extension and the existing Hurn Farm site in respect of the transport impact on the B3073, Parley Lane. The Council also objects to the concurrent working of these sites alongside the site with planning permission at Avon Common. These cumulative impacts have not been tested through a transport assessment which is required at the plan making stage to determine effectiveness and deliverability.

Airport Aerodrome Safety: This site is located immediately adjacent to the airport and within the 13km safeguarding consultation zone and will also be subject to Policy DM9 of the Minerals Core Strategy and Site Selection Criterion C20. The allocation of this site would give rise to an increase in bird-strike hazard in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport. Policy DM9 of the Minerals Core Strategy recognises that proposals that do not recognise this risk should not be permitted. If allocated, an assessment will need to be submitted which fully assesses the impact on aerodrome safety during the working of the site as well as through its restoration. It is welcomed that this issue is addressed in the Development Guidelines and that the site will be required to be developed and restored in accordance with best practice to prevent bird strike.

Floodrisk / Environmental Issues: The Hurn Court Farm site and proposed extension are located within Flood Zone 1 but in close proximity to Flood Zones 2 and 3 as identified in the Councils Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 2). Contaminants from minerals operations / washing of lorries may drain into the River Stour via groundwater and watercourses to the south of the site. Although not itself protected, the Stour supports a range of species and flows past the Moors River SSSI and eventually into the Christchurch Harbour SSSI. It is welcomed that this issue is addressed in the Development Guidelines and that a site specific strategy for surface water management and detailed flood risk assessment for all phases of work will be required.

Impact on Heritage Assets: The Council objects to the site extending as far south as Dales Lane as shown on the AS09 site plan. The nominated site boundary runs adjacent to the Grade II listed Dales House. The Development

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>Guidelines include reference to the need for adequate and appropriate screening to be in place prior to working. However, it is considered that given the proposed site boundary it is not possible to provide adequate separation distance and screening measures while allowing room for extraction. The Councils Conservation Officer has commented in greater detail in relation to the current planning application for this site. Therefore, the proposed allocation is not considered effective or deliverable as it has not been demonstrated how harm will be avoided on this heritage asset. The settings of Grade II listed farmhouse and barn at Merritown Farm and Dales House will be harmed. However, it is accepted that the proposed extraction will take place in phases throughout the area, with quick restoration to agriculture at a slightly lower level behind each phase, and the impact on the setting of the listed building will be temporary.</p> <p>Visual Impact / Disturbance to Residents & Businesses: The Council objects to the visual impact of the site, as viewed from Parley Lane, Dales Lane, and Hurn Court Lane. The Christchurch Borough " Wide Character Assessment notes that the landscape character of this area (RL Area 7: River Stour Terrace) is sensitive to changes that undermine the rural/agricultural character of the land and notes minerals extraction as a specific potential threat. The working of this site will also have a detrimental impact on the adjoining Adventure Wonderland theme park, an important tourist attraction in the Borough, both through workings themselves and loss of car parking. A larger 100m buffer should be considered to this site. The 'Development Guidelines' refer to the need for a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) with appropriate mitigation identified and implemented in order to minimise impacts on surroundings, including possible cumulative impacts with restoration of the original site. An LVIA has not been undertaken at the plan making stage so it has not been demonstrated that adverse impacts can be mitigated for the allocation to be effective and deliverable.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 39	Figure 12	Phillioli's Farm	Mrs P Crabb		<p>I am writing to say NO to digging gavel at Phillioli's Farm, Bere Regis, Wareham, Dorset BH20 7NS.</p> <p>It is not right to take a working farm away from a young family.</p> <p>The C road is not wide enough for heavy lorries. It is used by walkers and bike riders and as no passing places would be very dangerous for them.</p> <p>If they are going to dig the river up, it will flood the road and house worse than it does now. Phillioli's Farm has large lakes on it when it rains; that is why the wild geese and egrets live there.</p> <p>If the heavy lorries are going onto the Cold Harbour road. It has 4 caravan parks and houses. The traffic is bad enough now without more lorries.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 41	Figure 12	Philliol's Farm	Mr Christopher Nother		<p>1) General point about the questionnaire: the 'Yes'/'No' selection in the questions is ambiguous - does, for example in question 3, selecting 'Yes' mean agreement with the statement immediately preceding or does it mean the statement is considered unsound. My selection relates to agreement or otherwise with the preceding statement so that, in question 3, I do not believe that the document is 'positively prepared'.</p> <p>2) I believe the document fails to set out its development guidelines in sufficient detail. Although it indicates some ecological issues, it is not broad enough in identifying the risks to extremely sensitive and internationally rare environments (namely lowland heath and chalk stream). The required mitigation of the detrimental effects is not specified but expressed only in subjective and relatively meaningless terminology.</p>	<p>The environmental risks should be set out in much more detail and no consideration of the development proposals be entered into until full ecological studies have been carried out.</p> <p>The site of the proposed development is low lying and adjacent to the river Piddle and the Bere Stream, both important chalk streams that are representative of an ecological environment that is not only rare and increasingly under threat in this country but of international significance too.</p> <p>The impact on the Fairy Shrimp has been identified but the significance of the impact on other invertebrates, fish, birds and mammals that require this special environment (and many of these are under severe threat e.g. water voles) has been under-stated. Extraction of gravel will inevitably affect the water table and create excavations that are not only close to these important streams but penetrate below the level of the running water. It is also unlikely that any buffer zones would be 100% effective in ensuring run off does not get into the streams</p> <p>The proposal appears to acknowledge that the roads in the vicinity of Philliol's Farm are inadequate for the mineral traffic that would be generated so suggests a new route over the heath to the C7 Wareham to Bere Regis road. This would damage another severely threatened internationally important environment, lowland heath. Once dismissed as worthless land, lowland heath has suffered through housing development, mineral extraction and non-native coniferous forestation so that it is now much broken up into smaller and smaller pockets that become increasingly less viable in supporting their specialist animal and plant communities. A roadway for mineral traffic adds to the threats.</p> <p>When forestry and mineral companies, already with operations taking place on heathland, are co-operating with environmental organisations to try to re-establish heathland, it seems perverse to consider such a proposal.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 128	Figure 12	Phillio's Farm	Mr David King		<p>I have already submitted a response on behalf of Rage In The Piddle and agree with everything written.</p> <p>In summary my reasons why I think AS12 Phillio's Farm site submission is unsound and not justified are as follows: In summary we believe the Plan for the Phillio's farm site AS12 is unsound for the following reasons:-</p> <p>The Site Assessment is incorrect in a number of places.</p> <p>Too many of the identified issues in the Site Assessment are dismissed by stating mitigation is possible although little or no mitigation methods have been provided. It is therefore not based on robust or credible evidence .</p> <p>There is no new evidence to justify that this Mineral Plan should overturn the decision of the Inspector who rejected the site in 1996 . It is therefore not based on robust or credible evidence.</p> <p>The Landscape Type for the site has been classified as Forest/Heath Mosaic even though the site itself is obviously farmland and pasture.</p> <p>The proposed and only possible haulage route is however through Forest/Heath Mosaic Landscape. It is therefore not robust .</p> <p>Site surveys and studies have been requested by Authorities but none have been carried out such as a hydrological survey that the Environment Agency required to be done as part of the site allocation process.</p> <p>It is therefore not based on robust or credible evidence. Natural England have also said in their response (see the Site Assessment) that the hydrological impact on adjoining SSSI and SNCI have not been sufficiently well identified. It is therefore not based on robust or credible evidence.</p> <p>We also think it is unsound to defer mitigation methods and studies to the planning application stage especially as this site was rejected by the Inspector in 1996, and as the inclusion of an allocated site is a very heavy presumption that the conditions for planning permission can be met.</p>	<p>The changes which I think should be made to the AS12 Phillio's site Submission are the same as written in the Rage In the Piddle response which as follows:</p> <p>First and foremost the site should be deleted from the Site Allocation list for the reasons stated.</p> <p>The Site Assessment for AS12 should be amended as already detailed above as well as the changes identified in our original submission in 2016.</p> <p>Evidence should be provided to justify overturning the decision of the Inspector who rejected the site in 1996</p> <p>The Landscape Type should be amended to show the site consists of Farmland and Pasture and that the Haulage route is through Landscape of Forest/Heath Mosaic.</p> <p>Site Surveys and studies should be provided as requested by the Authorities to justify overruling the Inspectors decision in 1996. Mitigation methods should be clearly identified for all the possible impacts in order to justify overruling the Inspectors decision in 1996.</p> <p>An Operator needs to be identified who believes the site is economic to work within the constraints identified.</p> <p>A detailed investigation should be carried out into the amount of sand and gravel that may exist as contrary estimates vary considerably.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 45	Figure 12	Philliol's Farm	Ms Debbie Weller	Wareham St Martin Parish Council	My comments have been registered earlier but I would add that given the highly sensitive nature of the whole area as described in this document, the irreplaceable loss of species, environment and employment indicated above, all this can only mean this site should be removed from consideration and not be brought forward again. It has been refused several times and the situation has not changed.	Remove site from the plan.
PSD - MSP 127	Figure 12	Philliol's Farm	Mr David King		SEE SEPARATE RAGE REP	
PSD - MSP 88	Figure 12	Philliol's Farm	Mr John Williamson		<p>Being a resident living by the C7 (Bere Regis to Wareham Rd.), I find it quite alarming that we are going to have to put up with up to five sand and gravel reliant operations, including a clay pit along this road,</p> <p>All the extra HGVs or LGVs are going to finish destroying the road surface and in particular the road edges and verges, this is an increasing danger to other road users which has caused some of them to leave the road completely by accident.</p> <p>In my opinion the only sensible option is to upgrade the whole length of the road to accommodate this influx of large vehicles. I appreciate that these materials can only be won from the areas where they lay but something needs to improve for the safety of the local populus and the many visitors (campers) that use this road.</p>	
PSD - MSP 82	Figure 12	Philliol's Farm	mrs karen furmen ger			

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 91	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mrs B Brittin		<p>I feel extremely disappointed that this project is being considered again, as it was rejected in 1996, for the area around Philliols Farm. I live in one of the cottages and feel that the peace, character and wildlife in this valley will be severely compromised.</p> <p>I came here to have peaceful walks in the forest with my dog and to enjoy the wild life. I am strongly opposed to this project for the reasons set below.</p> <p>Peregrine Falcons nesting in the pylons for the past 20 years will be disturbed. Fairy shrimps in pond field will disappear, they rely on the water drying up every year laying their eggs in the mud and as the water comes back they hatch out. Years of leaving the edges of the fields for wild life, whilst farming, all that hard work will be lost.</p> <p>All the dust created from this project means I will not be able to hang my washing out, open my windows and enjoy sitting quietly in my garden due to the noise pollution.</p> <p>All the hedgerows will die, due to lack of moisture when the ground has been lowered around them, plus all the internal hedges will go and the wildlife corridors will be lost for ever.</p> <p>I do not know much about farming but it seems to me that all the hard work put in by the three generations of the same family of farmers on Philliols Farm, fertilizing, chain harrow, rolling, pasture topping, keeping the hedges neat and tidy will all be a waste of time and money. How will the farm survive as a going concern? You state that you will restore the ground as it was before digging for gravel/sand, but will you fertilize the land to the same standard as it was? Taking the livelihood away from the farmer.</p> <p>All private owners around Philliols, their property will lose value. It seems that the properties at Philliols will be left on islands, how will this affect the structures of the buildings especially the listed buildings?</p> <p>All this upheaval for low quality bagshot gravel?! My partner suffers from severe asthma this will be affected greatly. The residential access via a small lane would not support any more heavy traffic than it does at this present time. There are always holes appearing in the road during the winter months. In these economic times, during Brexit, I would have thought it more viable to keep hold of as much farming land as possible.</p> <p>Still there is always a plus it will get rid of the many badger sets in and around the farm at Philliols. I do not think this plan is sound due to the following reasons:- Saying nothing has changed from 1996 report is incorrect. Water levels have changed. In 1996 the Inspector rejected the plan but in 2008 it reappeared again to be removed again in 2015, now it has appeared again. What has changed nothing apart from the water levels and removal of Hyde Farm! Hyde Farm has been removed from the 1996 report so how can you state that the amount of Sand/Gravel extraction will be the same? Inconsistent! Environment agents requested a Risk assessment to be done. Has it? A full hydrological report to be done. Has it? Tourist industry disrupted along by Bere Road and the livelihood of the caravan businesses. I do hope this project will not go ahead changing the whole character of this lovely valley, also possibly affecting the quaint Chapel which is on the lane leading to Philliols Farm.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 62	Figure 12	Phillio's Farm	Graham Parker		<p>I strongly object because I do not believe the document and range of the plan adequately considers the impact of personal homelife within the area and lands adjacent with regard to noise, possible dust, increased traffic volume on local 'c' roads, and wildlife.</p> <p>I am not aware of consideration of or by the Environment Agency. I do not believe that the plan has truly established the commercial amount of aggregate available and that the value should warrant the destruction of viable pastureland, heathland and touristic accessibility of the area. There can be no justification of a reassessment of a site (and plan) previously rejected, wildlife, recreation, tourism, local economy and a realistic peaceful homelife will suffice for a relatively modest commercial gain by an as yet named agency or contractor.</p> <p>The Plan appears to be ill-conceived and ill-prepared. This is a previous part of a (to date) beautiful and historic area. I understand there is even an unexcavated Roman Villa within the site plan. It behaves the DCC to regard other sites less eco-dependent within the County: Barnsfield Heath? And to ***** agency reports and recommendations for acceptance of a short term/short fix commercial enterprise which will have devastating and long term consequences on a natural landscape, wildlife and *** homelife.</p> <p>Barnsfield Heath, Gravel Uplands, East Dorset.</p>	

The Philliols site AS12 should be removed from the list of potential sites for the following reasons:

Lack of Site Promoter We understand that Aggregate Industries have not renewed their option owing to, amongst other reasons, the known discrepancy in sand and gravel available on this site.

History There should be a presumption against using a site previously deleted after Public Inquiry to avoid: continuing unnecessary distress and uncertainty to residents and businesses, the ongoing economic impact created by a fall in property values and failure to rent properties whilst this is debated again and again, creating a longstanding blight to property, and the cost to the taxpayer and the drain on Council resources of potentially taking something to Public Inquiry again that has already been through this process and rejected.

Landscape Being situated in a valley, sand and gravel extraction on this site will create an obvious visual and audible intrusion, which will be seen for many miles, including from the Wool to Bere Regis road, which would therefore have a significant detrimental impact on the area as a whole. It will create an industrial gateway to the Purbecks, creating an unfavourable impression for the many tourists who use this route to Lulworth Cove and Monkey World to name just two popular local tourist destinations.

It will have a devastating impact on properties immediately adjacent to and in the middle of this site (including listed buildings).

It will also have a significant detrimental impact on parts of Philliols Heath and Bere Heath (within Wareham Forest) to the North where the haul road would be located and thus the recreational enjoyment of this land by walkers, bird watchers, riders and large numbers of cyclists (being on a designated cycle route owing to the quiet lanes and forest which cyclists can safely enjoy).

Traffic I do not understand why no significant impacts are expected when 100+ lorries per day, 6 days per week are anticipated, a figure which I note does not include the onward freight distribution of the minerals from the processing site. It is proposed by the aggregate company that all minerals will be removed and processed off site by carrying the sand and gravel through Hyde and Bere Heaths in Wareham Forest and along Bere Road between Bere Regis and Coldharbour. This would dramatically increase traffic on an idyllic country C road, not fit for this volume and tonnage of traffic, causing an enormous impact not just on residents but on the tourist industry given the number of camping and caravan parks along this road. If tourists move on more quickly than they would have because of noise and dust nuisance and don't return, there is the potential for a further significant negative impact on the tourism of the Purbecks as a whole, as well as these park owners in particular.

Mineral traffic gaining access across Hyde and Bere Heaths within Wareham Forest will damage bridleways, interfere with access to the Forest and endanger walkers, cyclists and horse riders - residents and tourists alike. Residents may be 'stuck' but tourists will inevitably choose not to return.

Water Excavations for hydrological assessment have, to date, already resulted in increased localised flooding destroying the road surface adjacent to Philliols Farm each winter. As the excavated site is already planned to be at least three metres lower than it currently is, should we expect drainage of the adjacent Hyde Bog (which has European protection) damaging its ecology? Will it lead to pollution of the SSSI Bere Stream and River Piddle which support sensitive protected species? These questions have still not been answered/addressed in spite of twenty plus years promotion of the site!

Ecology There will be a major detrimental impact to protected species of international importance on and adjacent to the site, such as fairy shrimp, nightjar etc, as well as an impact on other rare and sensitive species. The fairy

shrimp, a rare and protected species, dependant on exacting ecological conditions is one of only two groups in Dorset. Their protection has not been addressed in twenty years! Why is this?

Amenity Residents living on the site or in close proximity may have a claim under the Human Rights Act claiming interference with the right to respect for their private and family life and home (which includes business. The tenant farmers enjoy, I understand, a rare Protected Tenancy) under Article 8 as well as the rights protected under Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions). This would potentially incur further costs to the Council which would presumably be passed on to all Dorset residents in terms of local taxes, for a site already rejected after a previous Public Inquiry.

No attempt has ever been made by the aggregate company (who originally sponsored this development) in their submissions to provide details to residents as to how they propose to mitigate against noise and dust pollution and the minimum distance excavations will take place from residential property. Residents have also been told by an employee of the aggregate company that they would not be compensated for loss of business or devaluation in property value.

Historic Environment The site plan mentions the listed buildings in the middle of the site but not the Roman village that we understand an archaeological dig revealed to the east of the site near Bere Lodge. Why is that? Is relevant information being deliberately hidden?

Much of the land is Conclusion The current use of the proposed site is agricultural land with at least 75% being "best and most versatile land". Much of the land is (i) less than 3 metres above the levels of the River Piddle and Bere Stream and (ii) adjacent or very close to the recognised flood plain. Given the proposal to excavate up to 4 metres including the overburden and remove up to 3 metres of sand and gravel, much of the ground will end up below the current rivers flood level. The land will therefore become water logged and could not be returned for agricultural use as proposed, resulting in the tenant farmers losing their farm and other local residents being at greatly enhanced risk of flooding. The Philliols Farm area would be a greenfield site and a previous MSAD Discussion Paper states a preference for utilising existing sites rather than opening up new areas for mineral extraction. There are numerous other sites in close proximity along Puddletown Road that have been extracting sand and gravel for many years. These sites should be fully exploited and restored before this new site is considered. The Council could encourage moral / environmental responsibility by not allowing new sites unless absolutely necessary, insisting on the recycling of aggregates (which the government encourages) and (if necessary) by importing aggregates from other West Country sites where I understand they are 'dumped' as an undesirable by product. Thus the Council could take the lead in joined-up regional thinking and preserve the West Country as a tourist destination, as well as a highly desirable place to live. If this proposal is not deemed satisfactory it is clear that there are other sites for aggregates in Dorset that are not as sensitive as this one and which fulfil any requirement of the Council to 'bank' aggregates.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 154	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mr. Stephen Bickerstaff		<p>This greenfield site was originally rejected in 1996 as it would lose its tranquil landscape character. This is even more relevant today given the increasing urbanisation of South-East Dorset. There would be an increase in dust, noise, mud, and traffic as is evident on Puddletown Road where there are a number on quarries. This would affect nearby properties and the hamlets of Bere Heath, Lane End, Warren and Hyde. The more unkempt appearance of the landscape is likely to encourage litter and fly-tipping. It is difficult to see how these points can be mitigated against.</p> <p>The area is home to many protected species. Barn Owls, Otters, Bats, Red Kites and even migrating Ospreys have been seen near Philliols Farm.</p> <p>The proposed haul road across Wareham Forest would disturb Sand lizards, Smooth snakes, newts, Dartford Warblers, Hobbies and Peregrines. The impact upon the diverse wildlife of this area does not appear to have been properly assessed. More extreme wet weather events in the past few years have not been taken into consideration. I live within a mile of the proposed quarry on a similar geology and my garden is now waterlogged every winter. Increased flooding also adds to the possibility of polluting the river Piddle, a chalk stream. There is no plan as to what will happen to Philliols Farm post-extraction. It is debatable whether it can be restored to agricultural land. This also brings into question the future of the tenant farmer.</p> <p>The surrounding district is a very popular recreational area for dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists, bird watchers and general tourism. There is likely to be a detrimental impact upon local businesses, B&B's, caravan parks etc. The proposed haul road will take lorries onto the C7 Wareham-Bere Regis road which has been the site of a number of serious accidents recently. There is a lot of holiday traffic and the junction with the A35 is dangerous. This has not been taken into consideration. No mineral operator has expressed an interest in the site and there is some doubt as to whether there is enough sand and gravel to make quarrying the site an economically viable proposition. This, along with the previous points mentioned, calls into question whether the proposal is sound. It does not seem to have been thoroughly thought through, with decisions on possible mitigation deferred until the Planning process, by which time it will be too late to re-consider the proposal. Stephen Bickerstaff,</p>	Reject the proposal.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 141	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mr. Stephen Bickerstaff		<p>This greenfield site was originally rejected in 1996 as it would lose its tranquil landscape character. This is even more relevant today given the increasing urbanisation of South-East Dorset. There would be an increase in dust, noise, mud, and traffic as is evident on Puddletown Road where there are a number of quarries. This would affect nearby properties and the hamlets of Bere Heath, Lane End, Warren and Hyde. The more unkempt appearance of the landscape is likely to increase litter and fly-tipping. It is difficult to see how these points can be mitigated against. The area is home to many protected species. Barn Owls, Otters, Bats, Red Kites and even migrating Ospreys have been seen near Philliols Farm. The proposed haul road across Wareham Forest would disturb Sand Lizards, Smooth Snakes, Newts, Dartford Warblers, Nightjars, Hobbies and Peregrines. The impact upon the diverse wildlife of this area does not appear to have been properly assessed. More extreme wet weather events in the past few years have not been taken into consideration. I live within a mile of the proposed quarry on a similar geology and my garden is now waterlogged every winter. Increased flooding also adds to the possibility of polluting the river Piddle, a chalk stream. There is no plan for what will happen to Philliols farm post-extraction. It is debatable whether it can be restored to agricultural land. This also brings into question the future of the tenant farmer. The surrounding district is a very popular area for dog-walkers, horse-riders, cyclists, bird watchers and general tourism. There is likely to be a detrimental impact on local businesses, B&B's, caravan parks etc. The proposed haul road will take lorries onto the C7 Wareham-Bere Regis road which has been the site of a number of serious accidents recently. There is a lot of holiday traffic and the junction with the A35 is dangerous. This has not been taken into consideration. No mineral operator has expressed an interest in the site and there is some doubt as to whether there is enough sand and gravel to make quarrying a viable economic proposition. This, along with the previous points mentioned, calls into question whether the proposal is sound. It does not seem to have been thoroughly thought through with decisions on possible mitigation deferred until the Planning process by which time it will be too late to re-consider the proposal. Stephen Bickerstaff, 2, Donkey Lane, Lane End. BH20 7NP</p>	Reject the proposal

Bere Regis Parish Council objected to this Plan in 2016. We have considered the draft Minerals Sites Plan and our view has not changed. The NPPF requires that development proposals meet sustainability tests. It is the opinion of this Parish Council that the Minerals Plan fails to meet sustainability criteria and is, therefore, not legally compliant for the following reasons:

Sustainability: - Loss of livelihood - the occupants of Philliols Farm (a husband and wife with two small children) will lose their entire livelihood. The holiday lets at Dormer Cottage and the Mainsonette, and Woodlands will also lose their income (all three properties being within 1.5km of the proposed site). - The proposal includes 25 acres of viable, productive farmland from the neighbouring farm of Lower Stockley. Thus, resulting in a reduction in their livelihood.

- There are 74 dwellings within 1.5km of the site, apart from Philliols Farm which sits in the centre of the site. No noise mitigation assessments have been provided. The Parish Council further believes that the Plan is not Sound for the following reasons:

Justification - The suggested amount of available gravel from the site has increased threefold in the application since 2016. However, the survey was carried out by the site owners' agent and this cannot be taken as independent evidence of the quantity.

- As at July 2016, although recommended, no hydrological impact had been carried out so the effect on the Bere Heath and the watercress beds was unknown. There is no evidence contained within the Plan that this work has now been undertaken. The effect on Bere Heath and the watercress beds is, therefore, still unknown.

- The proposal is ambiguous in setting out how the land is to be restored. In one sentence it implies farmland, in another heathland. Will the site be backfilled using waste material and, if so, how is this going to affect the watercourses in the area? If not, is the area going to be left as a lake? The Plan makes no reference to this. - How will the pit be backfilled with inert waste when DCC say there is a shortage of such material in the county due to suitable material being recycled?

Effective - It is known that the site is owned jointly by at least two parties and this may lead to conflict at a later date. Consequently, there is no certainty the site will actually come forward.

- There is no current interest from any Mineral Operator in developing the site. - The Plan states that there are no known landownership issues as it is tenanted. It is our understanding that the existing tenant holds a hereditary tenancy lasting three generations, of which the current occupants are the second. - Criteria C10 implies there are only farm buildings on the site, saying that the original farm house does not survive. The original farmhouse may not survive but the report fails to point out that there is still an occupied, four-bedroom family farmhouse situated amongst the buildings. The criterion goes on to state that 'There is no significant visual or noise impact on the listed buildings because they are no inhabited by people.' They may not be, but they sit alongside the farmhouse that is very much occupied by the family. To rate this impact as D is highly misleading.

- The Plan states that there is a 'theoretical risk of flooding.' Philliols Farm is low lying with small fields and large ditches. The area lies very wet and the land is often flooded during normal rainfall periods, often for several months of the year. Any mining and additional lorry movements would radically change the landscape and add to water run-off. - Criteria C17 states that 'the nomination of the site would provide significant on-going benefits to the local and wider economy... maintain local employment...' There is no basis for this claim. None of the residents work in

The main population of Dorset (65%) lives in the eastern part of the county, but the Minerals Site Plan proposes that only a small percentage of sand and gravel be taken from that area, despite that area having the greatest need. It seems that potential extraction sites in East Dorset have been rejected by DCC in favour of increasing production from the established sites in Purbeck and West Dorset. The cost of the resultant traffic movements and damage to roads does not appear to have been considered. The Parish Council would like to see more consideration given to potential sites in East Dorset.

the existing quarries along the nearby Puddletown Road and the lorries are all external contractors - again, providing no local employment.

An additional 100 lorry movements a day will equate to 1 lorry every 4-5 minutes travelling along enhanced forest tracks to the C7 and then on to Tatchells site. The forest track is highly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Such a number of lorry movements would make this track unusable to everyone other than the lorries.

- Criteria C18 - screening, bunding and standoffs will be wholly inadequate to protect the residents who live in Philliols Farm, or any of those living along the Hyde Road that will be affected by the lorry movements.

- Criteria C 19 - 'No impact on existing settlement.' Again, this statement is highly inaccurate. There are properties that will be within a few meters of this site. In addition, the C7 is already a heavily used holiday route with 4 large caravan sites along its length. The junction with the A35 is often congested. Should the route of the lorries take them to the A31, via the Poole Hill Roundabout, this section of road leading to the junction with the A31 is frequently congested and is a major holiday route as well as a main south coast route. The addition of 100 lorries each day will exacerbate an already highly pressurised road network.

- The main population of Dorset (65%) lives in the eastern part of the county, but the Minerals Site Plan proposes that only a small percentage of sand and gravel be taken from that area, despite that area having the greatest need. It seems that potential extraction sites in East Dorset have been rejected by DCC in favour of increasing production from the established sites in Purbeck and West Dorset. The cost of the resultant traffic movements and damage to roads does not appear to have been considered. The Parish Council would like to see more consideration given to potential sites in East Dorset.

Consistent with National Policy - Roman remains are known to be in the vicinity of Philliols Farm and to extract this area would result in the loss of any possible archaeological and historical discoveries. No detailed archaeological surveys have been carried out and the effect on the nearby protected Scheduled Monument have not been assessed.

- The Plan would be detrimental to the setting of the listed building on the site.

- No studies have been undertaken to fully assess the risk of the proposed haul route with 80-100 lorries per day travelling adjacent to the European heathland sites, the Dorset Heathland SPA or the Hyde Heath SSSI. To say the risk 'could almost certainly be removed by careful planning' is insufficient in the context of such sensitive sites.

- In contravention of the Wildlife & Country Act - the proposed haul route supports significant numbers of smooth snakes and sand lizards. Ponds on Philliols Farm are known to support Fairy Shrimp. The Plan is vague, saying 'mitigation should be possible' but no qualifying studies have been carried out.

In conclusion, we maintain our strong objection to the inclusion of this site for the reasons as set out above; the unknown effect on the local watercourses, detrimental effect on local archaeology and listed buildings, loss of amenity, increased noise pollution, dust, psychological and emotional well-being of the residents of the properties situated within 500m of the proposal, loss of livelihood of 2 farms and local holiday lets, loss of recreational amenity, detrimental impact on nearby SNCI and SSSI sites and protected species, and loss of viable agricultural land. Assurance would be required that no lorries would access the site via the C6 and rural lanes.

We believe that the Minerals Plan in respect of Philliols Farm is unsound for the following 3 reasons:

The Site Assessment has incorrectly graded many of the Criteria as we highlighted in our submission of 2016 (see below).

The Site Assessment ignores the previous ruling by the Inspector to reject the site in 1996. We ask why this ruling should be overruled?

No studies or surveys have been carried out since the site was rejected in 1996 to establish what mitigation methods could be used to overcome the reasons for rejection. We have read, and fully support, the latest submission by our RAGE group.

Our 2016 Submission We gave evidence to the Public Enquiry held in Dorchester in 1996. Resulting from that Enquiry, the Inspector deleted Philliols Farm from the plan. It has now been reinserted with no justification under any piece of legislation. Below are our objections to Philliols Farm being included in the latest proposals, the headings taken from your Consultation Document, page 26.

ECOLOGY Your document states that "further assessment is required", a point made by other local objectors. We shall expect to be consulted on a further Ecology assessment including the detrimental impact of gravel extraction to wild life, flora and fauna and the damage to the pond located north of Philliols Farm which supports a population of Fairy Shrimps.

LANDSCAPES Your document states that "Any localised landscape impacts would need to be addressed". Bearing in mind that Warren House is a listed building, shown in the Plan on page 27, we shall expect to be consulted on matters such as noise from working vehicles, including JCBs, the detrimental impact on the landscape and the historic environment.

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT Extraction would have to take place well away from the listed building on the site.

TRAFFIC Your document states that "No significant impact expected". Why do you make this statement? There will be a huge increase in traffic on to Bere Road transporting minerals from Philliols Farm to Tatchell's for processing. Aggregate Industries have estimated 100 vehicles a day as well as the transportation of the processed minerals to the customer.

WATER Your document states that "Surface and ground water drainage issue to be addressed". After the experience of this winter, 2017-2018, and subsequent to the digging of the pilot holes, we understand that the road outside Philliols Farm is now flooding consistently, causing dangerous potholes to vehicles.

AMENITY Your document states that "Residencies in the vicinity will require careful mitigation and suggests that further assessment is required". We agree with this as there would be huge disruption to any homes and businesses, including farms, in the area. We think also that the walking, cycling and riding amenities of the area will be seriously affected.

SUMMARY Your document states that "The site is actively promoted by nominee". However, we understand that Aggregate Industries have not renewed their application as site promoters. Who, therefore, is the new nominee? A very important point seems to be the great confusion over the amount of gravel at the site. At the Public Enquiry in 1996, the Inspector gave an estimate of 0.69 million tonnes. Aggregate Industries then updated that amount to 1.5 million tonnes even though one third of the area has now been excluded. As very concerned neighbours of Philliols Farm, we need to know how you reconcile these two hugely different figures? The site was deleted from the last Minerals and Waste Local Plan in 1996 following a public enquiry, which we attended and at which we gave evidence, on the basis that "the need for gravel from this site was not great enough to outweigh the damage its extraction would do to the tranquil qualities of the pleasant and quiet corner of Dorset countryside". We stand by this statement and demand that no permission should be granted without a Public Enquiry as in 1996.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 196	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mr alan cross		<p>I consider that the Site assessment for AS12 Philliols Farm relies heavily on mitigation to be submitted at a full Planning Application stage which suggests to me a "fait accompli". There are too many important matters that in my view should be resolved and documented before any Full application stage in relation to this extremely sensitive and tranquil part of Dorset.</p> <p>I also note that in the Criteria for site assessment that there are conflicts between statements C19 and C25 and the Site Information "description of site" Page 2 of the Site assessment of AS12 which states that the new haul road will avoid Philliol's Heath. For these reasons I consider that the Draft Mineral sites Plan is not "sound". I would also add my previous representations sent in relation to the earlier Plans for this site :-</p> <p>The Sites contained within the Plan Update are in an area of special natural beauty and of ecological importance for wildlife diversity and must at all costs be preserved, without any short or long term "mitigated" damage by mineral extraction. If one looks at the Ordnance Survey Explorer Map OL15 the AONB is highlighted generally below the River Frome " in my opinion (and I am sure many of the other objectors would agree) the remaining land northward beyond the existing AONB limit and up to the A35 road generally also warrants inclusion as part of the AONB for the reasons I state in the last sentence. This area of course contains much of Hardys Egdon Heath (much fragmented by past changes) and Internationally rare and as such should be sacrosanct from any further damage or detrimental change " in fact the initiatives from English Nature to regenerate and enlarge the Heathlands should be foremost in Planning considerations.</p> <p>I understand that one of the reasons for the proposed Mineral extraction is to meet the national demands for the building industry to provide gravel, stone and sand. Perhaps there should be some Government requirement/regulation that re-cycling of building material takes precedence before extraction is deemed necessary. Also sustainable methods of construction techniques should be mandatory to limit the necessity for further mineral extraction " for example there is no need to backfill the under floors of houses with graded stone in order to construct the finished floor when simple alternatives can be used . Have these considerations been explored by Government " I urge you to ask the question with the appropriate department. How much unnecessary mineral extraction could be saved??</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 172	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mrs Pat Bowering		<p>I am making further representations regarding the inclusion of AS12 Philliols Farm in this Plan as there has been no response from DCC to my previous queries. There are a large number of criteria in the Appraisal of Site 2016 which are recognised as needing mitigation, yet no solutions are given as to how these problems can be overcome to a satisfactory extent. Adequate discussions cannot take place without the public being in possession of all necessary facts. The soundness of this report has to be questioned. The character of this small valley would be entirely changed by removing the gravel. All of this site is pasture with small fields used for agriculture and an ancient woodland as one of the boundaries. The visual impact would be massive, with hedges being removed, large trees being at risk and farm buildings left on a raised island of land. No mitigation could enable this site to be restored to anything remotely close to Thomas Hardy's Egdon Heath.</p> <p>This part of Dorset is already under great pressure: Bovington Heath is a tank training area; Puddletown Road has been destroyed over decades and will continue to be dug well into the future; Trigon and Tatchells Farm have been worked and are also included in the Plan; miles of the surrounding county are included as an Area of Search. Philliols Farm lies on the edge of present workings and would be an extension of the damaged environment for the whole community. Within this site are two badgers setts, a pond which is habitat to fairy shrimps, two listed buildings and three residential properties. If all these features have to be safeguarded by mitigation, as well as the ancient woodland, the size of this 67ha site will be reduced. The suggested amount of gravel available is under question. In previous plans, land to the south of the site was included which has now been withdrawn. This land was presented as being the highest yielding and best quality gravel, with stocks falling off rapidly going north across the remaining site. The amount of gravel is now said to be 1.5mt, when the previous plan which included the most productive part of the site only predicted 0.75mt. There appears to be no-one interested in utilising this site, which would suggest that yields are not guaranteed. The haul route across Wareham Forest will inevitably have a detrimental effect on the sensitive flora and fauna. Fencing the route will restrict wild life, walkers, horse riders and cyclists, while noise and dust cannot be mitigated either for those who use the forest for recreation or for the residents who live within or nearby the site. The C7 already has traffic generated by Trigon and Tatchells Farm sites. Access to Philliols Farm is via a small country lane. During winter months surface water lies within the fields and flows across the road. Properties adjacent to the River Piddle on the site boundary lie very low and would be exposed to flood risk. The Environment Agency has objected and requested hydrogeological assessments as part of the site allocation process. This has not been completed. The pond which is habitat for fairy shrimps lies within the site, but this has not been made clear to the Environment Agency. Residents in the vicinity of Philliols Farm have lived with the uncertainty of the farm being dug up for gravel since the mid nineties. It was recommended that the site should be removed from the Plan in 1996, due to the sensitive nature and character of the area, only to be reinstated in 2008 and removed again in 2015. There has been no changes to the character of the site, except the likelihood that the area now included will be less productive.</p>	<p>The inclusion of AS12 Philliols Farm in this Minerals Strategy Plan is not based on sound and comprehensive analysis of the site and wider area. There are many criteria raised from the Site Appraisal which pose serious risks to ecology. The impact of a change in hydrology on species and environment within nearby protected sites have not been fully investigated. The amount of minerals said to be available does not agree with figures suggested from past plans. Given the large Area of Search included in the Plan, the possibility of using recycled aggregates to make up some of the projected needs and the amount of damage already caused to this locality, there is no justification to include Philliols Farm over the period of this Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 133	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mrs Joan Sanders		<p>This section for the Philliols Farm site As12 is unsound for the reasons stated by the Rage Submission which I have read and fully agree with. I cannot understand why this site is be included in the Site Allocations list when it was rejected by the Inspector in 1996. No justification has been provided why the decision made in 1996 should be reversed. The impact from gravel extraction will be the same as it would have been in 1996. No new mitigation methods have been proposed. The site is totally unsuitable being a small site right in the middle of a settlement with the only access for the large lorries being through Wareham Forest which will impact hundreds of people that use the forest for riding, walking and cycling. Living in my home overlooking the proposed site, my glorious view of the piddle valley and peaceful outlook will be destroyed.</p>	<p>The site should be deleted from the allocation list as neither the owner or any operator think the site is worth investing time and effort to justify overturning the decision in 1996 and carrying out studies and surveys in advance or to propose mitigation methods to reduce the impact which will occur.</p>
PSD - MSP 297	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Wayne Renton		<p>Our objections to the Philliols Farm (AS12) Myself , Wayne Renton and my Partner Julie Osborne, live at Hxxxxxxx Barn BH20 7NX we have another property there xxxxxx Cottage which we run as a holiday rental. Our main concerns are on the impact on the environment, the area is a place of beauty and is going to be turned into a quarry. Plus the wildlife that will be affected, the other concern is what affect will this have on the water table and which area would this find its way to. Towards Hyde.</p> <p>We also cannot believe that vehicles that will be running through the forest creating a more devastating affect to the wildlife thus creating a larger area of devastation than just the area of the proposed quarry. The other question that concerns us is what amount of noise pollution is this going to cause. People live in this area come to this area for the piece and quite of the country side and not to listen to machinery going all day.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 140	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mr. Stephen Bickers taff		<p>This greenfield site was originally rejected in 1996 as it would lose its tranquil landscape character. This is even more relevant today given the increasing urbanisation of South-East Dorset. There would be an increase in dust, noise, mud and traffic as is evident on Puddletown Road where there are a number of Quarries. This would affect nearby properties and the hamlets of Bere Heath, Lane End, Warren and Hyde. The more unkempt appearance of the landscape would encourage litter and fly-tipping. It is difficult to see how these points can be mitigated against</p> <p>The area is home to many protected species. Barn owls, Otters, Bats, Red Kites and even migrating Ospreys have been seen near Philliols Farm. The proposed haul road across Wareham Forest would disturb Sand lizards, Smooth snakes, newts, Dartford Warblers, Hobbies and Peregrines. The impact upon the diverse wildlife of this area does not appear to have been properly assessed.</p> <p>More extreme wet weather events in the past few years have not been taken into consideration. I live within a mile of the proposed quarry on a similar geology and my garden is now waterlogged every winter. Increased flooding also increases the possibility of polluting the Piddle, a chalk stream. There is no plan for what will happen to Philliols Farm post-extraction. It is debatable whether it can be restored to agricultural land. This also brings into question the future of the tenant farmer. The surrounding district is a very popular recreational area for dog-walkers, horse riders, cyclists, bird watchers and general tourism. There is likely to be a detrimental impact upon local businesses B&B's, caravan parks etc., this cannot be mitigated against. The proposed haul road will take lorries onto the C7 Wareham-Bere Regis Road which has been the site of a number of serious accidents recently. There is a lot of holiday traffic and the junction with the A35 is dangerous. This has not been taken into consideration. No mineral operator has expressed an interest in the site and there is some doubt as to whether there is enough sand and gravel to make quarrying the site an economically viable proposition. This, along with the previous points mentioned calls into question whether the proposal is sound. It does not seem to have been thoroughly thought through with decisions on possible mitigation deferred until the Planning process by which time it will be too late to re-consider the proposal.</p>	Reject the proposal.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 145	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mr. Stephen Bickerstaff		<p>This greenfield site was originally rejected in 1996 as it would lose its tranquil landscape character. This is even more relevant today given the increasing urbanisation of South-East Dorset. There would be an increase in dust, noise, mud, and traffic as is evident on Puddletown Road where there are a number of quarries. This would affect nearby properties and the hamlets of Bere Heath, Lane End, Warren and Hyde. The unkempt appearance of the landscape is likely to encourage litter and fly-tipping. It is difficult to see how these points can be mitigated against. The area is home to many protected species. Barn Owls, Otters, Bats, Red Kites and even migrating Ospreys have been seen near Philliols Farm. The proposed haul road across Wareham Forest would disturb Sand lizards, Smooth snakes, newts, Dartford Warblers, Hobbies and Peregrines. The impact upon the diverse wildlife of this area does not appear to have been properly assessed. More extreme wet weather events in the past few years have not been taken into consideration. I live within a mile of the proposed quarry on a similar geology and my garden is now waterlogged every winter. Increased flooding also adds to the possibility of polluting the river Piddle, a chalk stream. There is no plan as to what will happen to Philliols Farm post-extraction. It is debatable whether it can be restored to agricultural land. This also brings into question the future of the tenant farmer. The surrounding district is a very popular recreational area for dog walkers, horse riders, cyclists, bird watchers and general tourism. There is likely to be a detrimental impact upon local businesses, B&B's, caravan parks etc. The proposed haul road will take lorries onto the C7 Wareham-Bere Regis road which has been the site of a number of serious accidents recently. There is a lot of holiday traffic and the junction with the A35 is dangerous. This has not been taken into consideration. No mineral operator has expressed an interest in the site and there is some doubt as to whether there is enough sand and gravel to make quarrying the site an economically viable proposition. This, along with the previous points mentioned, calls into question whether the proposal is sound. It does not seem to have been thoroughly thought through, with decisions on possible mitigation deferred until the Planning process, by which time it will be too late to re-consider the proposal. Stephen Bickerstaff, 2, Donkey Lane, Lane End. BH20 7NP</p>	Reject the proposal.

AS 12 Phillio's Farm Firstly I support Rage's submission in all respects This document is not legally compliant because:

1. It has not been prepared in accordance with local development scheme for this area which is designated for agriculture, recreation, tourism and scenic beauty. (there is no planning permission for new houses)
2. It has not been prepared fully in accordance with duty to co-operate because it has not complied with Environment Agency's request for a 'Hydrogeological Assessment as part of site allocation' Flood risk has not been properly updated since 2006.
3. It has not been properly subjected to sustainability proposal because
 - a. Mining employment will cease
 - b. Agriculture will be so disrupted and reduced after restoration that it will no longer be viable at Phillio's and severely threatened at Lower Stockley (with 25 acres in the site).
 - c. Tourism and recreation will be suffer from lack of open views within and beyond the intimate landscape and the industrial presence during and after. (See Natural England final comments for Site AS-6 Great Plantation)
4. It has not had proper regard to National Policy because a. See Historic England comments at end of Site Assessment AS12 document: 'This policy document does not appear to comply with S.A Objectives in Criteria 'to conserve and maintain'.

This document is not sound because

1. It is not positively prepared because The plan does not meet objectively assessed etc. It is prejudiced in favour of The Heath and Forest Mosaic and has assessed the site as if it were within the Puddletown Road Policy Area. It is not and it should be assessed as a rural and residential area.
2. It is not justified because the plan does not provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives because the estimated amount of gravel till 2033, 27.28 million tonnes is well in excess of the amount required. The amount of gravel at Phillio's is 50% less since Hyde Farm was removed and will be further reduced if there is a 'stand off' on the south side where most of the gravel is. Recycling is not sufficiently promoted. It is expensive for builders to dispose of rubble.
3. It is not effective because a. the plan is not deliverable because there are too many and too difficult mitigations required. Especially regarding control of surface water, drying out of Hyde Bog, water seepage, and flooding of residences the D50307 to the south. b. Cross boundary strategic priorities are not met regarding agriculture (loss of land), local economy (loss of holiday lets), recreation (destruction of bridle path and forest walk views).
4. It is not consistent with National Policy because See Historic England comments at end of Site Allocation SA12 document ' This policy test does not appear to reflect the Minerals Strategy or National Policy Guidelines or legislation. It refers only to a limited number of factors. Why? In addition there are inaccuracies which render it unsound not legally compliant. Lead Local Flood Authority in comments section refers to theoretical risk of surface water flooding, currently water comes above wellingtons in one of the fields. Fluvial flood risk is no longer accurate since 2006. The Piddle has flooded twice since 2011 up to 1&1/2 feet over the D50307.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 148	Figure 12	Phillip's Farm	Mrs Diana Drew		<p>I agree with many of the other comments regarding the unsuitability of this site, partly because of the loss of well managed farmland, but mainly because of the transport and access issues. In previous draft plans the new access road for the lorries was shown on the plan but in this version there is no attempt to specify where this so-called haul route would be constructed. One assumes that it would be built on one of the present forest tracks or the bridleway which runs from Bere Lodge to the C7 and this would mean bisecting an area of Wareham Forest, creating loss of habitat, noise, dust and danger for all the wildlife in that part of the forest as well as destroying the peace, tranquillity and beauty of this part of the forest which is used by so many walkers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders. This is an area of lowland heath, which should be preserved as a valuable wildlife habitat and as a recreational resource. I personally use this area of the forest nearly every day for dog walking or horse riding and fear that such a "haul track" through the middle of the forest would destroy so much that can never be replaced. In addition I feel that the site is unsuitable because it would mean destroying good fertile well managed farmland and depriving a local farming family of their home and livelihood.</p>	<p>I hope that for these reasons this site is rejected as unsuitable for gravel extraction.</p>

The Site Assessment for AS12 for Philliol's Farm is unsound because:

1. It contains significant inaccuracy and hence is misleading or improbable in its proposals;
2. It does not address requirements set by relevant bodies which means the suitability of the site for gravel extraction is NOT demonstrated;
3. It fails to explain or describe mitigation measures which it asserts can or will be applied but which may or may not be effective, cost effective or even feasible.

Changes apparently needed and which might make it sound, if they are themselves sound, include:

1. Accurate and/or credible description based on a careful examination of the actual site and its surroundings, e.g. Existing land use is agricultural and while it is adjacent to Forest/Heath Mosaic Landscape Type it is NOT of that type; Opportunities suggested in the restoration to provide 'river diversion wetlands on the River Piddle' disregards the absence of any point at which the River Piddle touches the boundary of the proposed extraction site and the height difference between the site and the Piddle (Note: The former mill leat which takes off from the Piddle WNW of Woodlands is NOT part of the river, and is both separated from and well below the level of the site).
2. Requirements for site surveys etc set by the Environment Agency, e.g. hydrological survey, and Natural England, i.e. hydrological impact on nearby SSSI and SNCI, have not been met.
3. Mitigation measures are referred to but with no indication of what they may be, how effective, or indeed any possibility of assessing their complexity or cost, and Site Assessment AS12 is riddled with needs for such detail, e.g.
 - a) Site Assessment of AS12 - Philliol's Farm, page 5, Criterion C11: the County Council opinion that 'full archaeological excavation of this area would be required as mitigation before extraction proceeds' is simply swept aside with the assertion that existing Policies 'provide adequate protection to any archaeology that may be found during development'.
 - b) Site Assessment of AS12, page 6, Criterion C16, 'Noise mitigation will be addressed at the planning application stage' is woefully inadequate for residents of a house (Woodlands) whose northern wall is less than 15 yards from the site boundary and much of whose garden boundary is even closer.
 - c) Criterion C17, Impact on economic development, states that mineral extraction may negatively affect businesses in the locality, but disregards holiday letting or B&B in the immediate vicinity and applies a Score of D which is not the case for a house ON the site boundary.
 - d) Site Assessment AS12, page 6, Criterion C18 Impact on Sensitive Human Receptors states that 'Residences adjacent to the site. Screening/bunding/stand offs will be required' but in the absence of any indication as to what these may be or of the timeline for their creation and the operation of the site, this is wholly uninformative for those residents and this not credible.
 - e) Criterion C23, Impact on Recreational Land refers to the site having no formal or informal recreational use which disregards the many many users on foot, bicycle and horseback who use the road, at the edge of the site, running south of Bere Lodge, including many groups of young people heading to or from the Scout Camp site at Buddens Farm.
 - f) Site Assessment for AS12, Criterion C24, Impact on public rights of way, refers to the bridleway which runs north from Bere Lodge which will be parallel to the haul route. The Assessment says that impact and appropriate mitigation will be identified at planning application stage. (I write as a horse owner and rider of many years who was the British Horse Society Gloucestershire Branch Access and Bridleways Officer for nine years and who in 2013 between 10 May and 8 December rode my horse 2,700 miles round England to 30 cathedrals using both roads and rights of way). If the haul road remains inside the forest/heath area it will either exit onto the C7 within a few yards of the bridleway exit or it will cross the bridleway, or the bridleway will have to be diverted to the east. None of those are desirable for walkers or cyclists. They are particularly undesirable for horse riders and horses especially as incoming traffic will either be waiting to turn right into the haul road at the exit point, or just past the exit point before coming back across the bridleway, or (if the bridleway is diverted to the east) the riders will have to ride along the C7 to reach the

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>next bridleway on the north side opposite the existing exit. I regard the drivers of big lorries as generally pretty careful and courteous around horses but not all horses are comfortable near them and this is putting them into close proximity next to other traffic. Bunding/screening along the bridleway can reduce visual impact but not the sound and it will do nothing at the road exit/entry.</p> <p>g) Criterion C25, 'Are the access proposals acceptable?' refers to the need for a Transport Assessment. Transport Development Management Teams may have little understanding of equestrian use of roads and the ways in which equestrians are both more able to judge traffic visually and aurally than vehicle users and the ways in which horses may be vulnerable. This may not be a straightforward assessment, nor may the appropriate mitigation be obvious. If no other haul route is acceptable, this should have been carried out before Site AS12 was included in the proposals.</p> <p>h) Site Assessment of AS12, page 9 Comments from Lead Local Flood Authority, 'A site specific strategy of surface water management should be requested that does not increase rates of runoff, generate offsite worsening or increase risk to adjacent properties, namely the Philliol's Farm complex, Woodlands and Hyde House.': The land close to Hyde House is no longer in the proposed site. Philliol's Farm is on the 25 metre contour. Woodlands is on the 20 metre contour. The required 'site specific strategy' is needed before planning application.</p> <p>i) Site Assessment of AS12 page 9 Landscape and Visual Impact refers to a 'new obtrusive use into this landscape' and notes 'The capacity is low without mitigation and medium/low with mitigation.' Specific and assessable proposals for mitigation should be required within the Site Assessment and before any approval rather than at planning application stage.</p>	

Legal Compliance We have no reason to consider that the Draft Plan has been prepared in a manner that is not legally compliant.

Soundness We consider the Draft Plan to be **unsound**. In particular, we consider the Draft Plan to be:

- not positively prepared " it does not achieve sustainable development, for the reasons set out below;
- not justified " it does not provide the most appropriate strategy, for the reasons set out below;
- not effective " it is not necessarily deliverable over the Draft Plan period, for the reasons set out below; and
- inconsistent with national policy " the Draft Plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, for the reasons set out below.

Our specific objections relate to the allocation of site AS12 at Philliols Farm, Hyde and that part of the Area of Search for sand and gravel which lies to the north east of the River Piddle, between it and Bere Heath / Philliols Heath, including Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm.

Chapter 3 " Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel Site AS12 - Philliol's Farm, Hyde We object strongly to the inclusion of this site. In our opinion the required sand and gravel supplies could be secured from other sites which would have a lesser impact on ecology, landscape and other matters. We note that Policy MS-1 cross-refers to Appendix A and expects and development proposals for the allocated sites to address the development considerations in Appendix A. Furthermore, that development will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. Finally, the Habitats Regulations Appraisal screening indicates that development at AS-12 Philliols Farm may have significant effects on displacement of recreation and species in particular.

In this case any development proposal must either mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels in order for any development to take place. We find this approach to be totally inadequate. This clearly shows that the Draft Plan has not been positively prepared, is not justified, will not be effective and would not ensure delivery of sustainable development. Proposals within a Minerals Local Plan should be sufficiently evidenced to demonstrate that any allocation is achievable without undue environmental and other impacts and, thus, is a sustainable and deliverable proposal. That is clearly not the case in the instance of Site AS-12 at Philliols Farm as both Policy MS-1 and the development guidelines at Appendix A refer to the need for further impact assessments to determine whether extraction is acceptable and potential / unspecified mitigation measures. Having reviewed both Policy MS-1 and Appendix A, we have the following further comments:

Natural Environment - there is no evidence to suggest that biodiversity impacts (either directly from the workings or the haul road, or indirectly as a result of hydrological impacts in the area) would be acceptable having regard to national and European legislation, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated;

Historic / Cultural Environment " as stated at Appendix A, there is likely to be high archaeological potential at this site. The Appendix goes on to state that heritage and archaeology matters are important considerations, and the significance of any affected heritage assets and their setting must be understood to ensure their significance is safeguarded. Furthermore, this is particularly relevant to the Listed Buildings at the centre of the site (ie at Philliols Farm). There is no evidence to suggest that an archaeological / heritage assessment would find the impacts to be acceptable, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated. Indeed, the listed buildings could be adversely

affected structurally by the close proximity of extraction works, are unlikely to have any productive use during any extraction period and thus be prone to neglect, vandalism and general deterioration, and their setting would be lost on completion of any extraction works. With regards to the latter, you should be aware that the NPPF places great importance on matters of setting. After any mineral extraction, the Philliols Farm buildings would effectively be stranded on elevated land entirely divorced from the agricultural setting that is historically appropriate and which they presently have;

Hydrology / Flood Risk - there is no evidence to suggest that hydrological / hydrogeological impacts would be acceptable, nor that impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated;

Transport / Access " as stated in Appendix A, it is clear that the local road network is inadequate to serve any extraction proposal. The suggested haul route from the site to the C7 public highway would be through Philliols Heath / Bere Heath. The Heaths form part of a recreational area to the west of Wareham heavily used by walkers and cyclists. The haul route would be approximately 2 km in length and would inevitably have a severe impact upon the character / enjoyment / public access to the heathland / recreational area;

Landscape / Visual Impacts " as stated in Appendix A, it is clear that this is an intimate and sensitive part of the Heath Forest Mosaic and development would affect the existing rural character and views from close proximity sensitive visual receptors (residential and bridleway). Furthermore, any mineral extraction would introduce a new obtrusive use into this landscape. There is no evidence to suggest that the landscape and visual impacts would be either acceptable or capable of satisfactory mitigation. Indeed, the site lies in a highly sensitive and open valley and water meadow landscape framed by the heaths and woodlands in the surrounding area. The nature of the landscape is simply such that in our judgement impacts could not be satisfactorily mitigated either in the short or longer term;

Other Matters - it is highly unlikely that the land could be satisfactorily returned to agriculture at a lower level. The land levels in the area are such that extraction would reduce them to levels at or below that of the adjoining River Piddle and the connecting Bere Stream. Any opportunities to increase flood water storage, provide for restoration with a wildlife focus, or to provide for increased public access do not amount to a justification for extraction. In any case, there is no reason to suggest that these benefits could not be achieved by other means (if required) whilst conserving the current predominant agricultural use. We are surprised that since the 2016 consultation there appears to be no additional evidence produced by the Council to demonstrate the acceptability of Site AS-12.

In the light of the considerable caveats / uncertainties expressed in the current consultation document around the impacts of any mineral extraction at the site this is a very serious omission. To our mind, this clearly shows that the Draft Plan fails to meet the various tests of soundness laid down in National Planning Policy Guidance. In short, we do not consider that Site AS-12 at Philliols Farm could contribute sustainably to the supply of aggregate. It is noted that the Philliols Farm site was excluded at the time of the 2015 consultation on the basis that impacts of working the site include nature conservation, hydrology / hydrogeology and amenity. At that time other sites were considered to be more suitable options for supplying aggregate. We see no justifiable reason for any different conclusion to be reached.

Chapter 3 " Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search We are concerned by and object to the spatial extent of the Area of Search in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm in the Piddle valley to the south east of Bere Regis. This is a landscape area between the heaths and woodlands to the north and south that is attractive and composed of open meadows in the valley floor. This is a landscape that would

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>be highly sensitive to change and the area around the two farms to the north of the River Piddle should be excluded from the Area of Search.</p> <p>More generally, our objections to the allocation of Site AS-12 apply equally to the portion of the Area of Search to which we refer. We suggest that the Area of Search should follow the recognisable and defensible boundary of the River Piddle, ie to not extend to the north of the River Piddle in the vicinity of Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm. Conclusion</p> <p>We trust that you will take account of our comments and for the reasons set out above:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. omit the allocation of Philliols Farm (site AS12) for sand and gravel extraction; and 2. exclude the area around Lower Stockley Farm and Philliols Farm from the Area of Search; <p>We can confirm that we may wish to appear at any future examination in public. Our appearance may be necessary to further explain our case. We look forward to hearing from you and to be advised of future consultation stages. (Comment inserted at each of section 3.8; Figure 12; section 3.10)</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 305	Figure 12	Philliol's Farm	DR Dominic Stubbing	Frome, Piddle and West Dorset Fisheries Association	<p>Regarding sites AS12 and AS26: Gravel workings over the whole country and in our river catchment have a long history being unable to contain washings. This can lead to sediment particles in the river. If its raining and relentlessly, that its does often in the Dorset, water will have to leave the workings somehow and end in the river. The sediment will be carried in that water. Some particles take two weeks to settle and so they will be carried in the water and even in intra gravel flows to the river (Theurer et al. 1998). The problem point of this is that it smothers many fish eggs, and river bed spawning fish are very vulnerable to this, and it causes survival values down to zero.</p> <p>The Frome SSSI is protected for what it is and that means its species. Salmon (riverbed spawners) stocks in the River Frome are at level from which it is about to collapse. Sedimentation of eggs from pollution is looking like it will almost certainly be the main culprit. Other species like grayling, trout, bullheads, Dace and minnows will suffer badly (Greig et al. 2005). Similar problems have happened at AS19 and so extensions here are not justifiable.</p> <p>References Greig, S.M., Sear, D.A., & Carling, P.A. (2005) The impact of fine sediment accumulation on the survival of incubating salmon progeny: Implications for sediment management. Science of the Total Environment 344, 241-258. Theurer, F. D., Harrod, T. R., & Theurer, M. (1998) Sedimentation and Salmonids in England and Wales. P194. Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Regarding sites AS12 and AS26 The close proximity to the river of proposed pits in the plan definitely means sedimentation will be a big problem. If there was a distance of 500m or more from the river with normal silt collection procedures in place, things could be slightly less problematic.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 337	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	<p>We have commented previously on this proposed site allocation where the main issue involving internationally designated sites concerns the proposed access road. We are satisfied that this issue is adequately covered within the HRA provided that a better link is made between the HRA and Policy MS-1 through the amendment to MS-1 suggested above.</p> <p>The current restoration vision for the site is not appropriate since although the allocation is with the Forest/Heath Mosaic Landscape Type this is a broad landscape description and the site itself has not been heathland for a very long time if ever and is more directly associated with the river valleys. A wetland restoration (as mentioned under other considerations) with the wetlands hydrologically linked to the Bere Stream and/or the River Piddle would be more appropriate and deliver better public benefits. We have covered this issue in more detail below in our response about Woodsford and Hurst Farm.</p>	
PSD - MSP 590	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England	<p>Tatchells Extension AS15 and Philliols Farm AS12</p> <p>As stated in our previous comments, we note that you expect that there will be a transport assessment submitted by the developers of the Tatchells extension, although it is unclear at what stage of the planning process this would be submitted.</p> <p>Our previous response commented that in order to comply with the NPPF and DfT circular 02/2013, a sufficient transport evidence base needs to be provided at the plan making stage, and further information should therefore be submitted so that we can establish whether there is likely to be a significant impact upon the SRN as a result of this site. Whilst the estimate of 40 vehicle movements per day in relation to the Tatchells extension is sufficiently low that it is unlikely that the development would impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, the cumulative impact of Philliols Farm and Tatchells extension should be investigated.</p> <p>We note that the Trigon extension is not expected to result in any traffic intensification. However, there does not appear to be any trip estimation given in relation to Philliols Farm. In order to establish the potential impact on the SRN, a cumulative assessment of these three sites should be undertaken, and this should be provided at the plan making stage, for us to be able to determine whether mitigation is required in order for us to support allocation of these sites. We note and welcome that the transport assessments will accompany forthcoming planning applications for development of these sites, and this should include a more detailed assessment of the potential cumulative impacts.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 329	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Ann Miller		Having difficulty in commenting on plan. Object to Morden Park Corner proposals: traffic, noise and possible pollution to Morden. Philliols Farm: proximity to SSSIs	
PSD - MSP 363	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Rt Hon Michael Tomlinson		<p>I have been contacted by a number of residents concerned about site AS12 at Philliols Farm, identified for consideration as part of the Minerals Plan. I am aware that this site has been considered, and rejected, at several stages in the past. I have set out a number of reasons explaining why it is my view that this site should not be included in the final submission.</p> <p>I would urge that consideration be given, not only to this response and to all of the responses of my constituents to this draft mineral sites plan 2017, but also to those many and detailed responses given to the original proposal turned down in 2015.</p> <p>The facts have not changed in those two years and the result should be the same. Having met with local residents, who have a detailed knowledge of this area, there are serious concerns about the accuracy of the lands description. I understand that this land should more accurately be defined as low lying river valley land with both hydrology and surface water being at the highest level of sensitivity.</p> <p>I understand that concerns about the impact on adjoining SSSI and SNCI have been raised previously by Natural England. It is my view that this matter is sufficiently important for the long term suitability of this site, that a limited desk study does not provide anywhere near enough evidence to warrant inclusion given the previous decisions taken in relation to this site. The amount of available and suitable gravel on the proposed site is also unclear. The suggested amount for extraction has doubled from the original assessment without showing clearly how this amount has been reached.</p> <p>Whilst accepting that it will be the intention of the Minerals Authority to deal with many of these matters at a later stage in the process, it is my view that there is a sufficient lack of evidence to deem this site viable in the long term. As a result, it is appropriate to remove this site and avoid any further uncertainty.</p> <p>There is a need for gravel and mineral extraction, but to have a Minerals Plan that is based on unclear or undeliverable sites will not provide suitable assurances that future level of extractions can be achieved. Furthermore, the nature of such extraction must be set against the land suitability and impact of neighbouring land. Therefore, it is my strongly held view that this site is not suitable for further inclusion. I would be grateful if you would take this letter as my submission to the consultation.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 548	Figure 12	Phillipol's Farm	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>No objection provided ephemeral ponds and Fairy shrimp (<i>Chirocephalus diaphanous</i>) in the vicinity are assessed and not impacted from the proposals. Also provided that any required assessments, permits, etc are undertaken / obtained at the appropriate stage and that the points raised below can be addressed. 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. The prior written Land Drainage Consent is required from the Lead Local Flood Authority (Dorset County Council) for works that could affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse. Fisheries and Biodiversity We are pleased with the development guidelines outlined in the site allocation, however the documents submitted do not provide any detail on the likely impact of the development on Fairy Shrimp that are believed to be present in ephemeral ponds in the vicinity of the site. We would require an ecological survey to be undertaken to assess the impact on the Fairy Shrimp and its habitat. Appropriate measures must be put in place to protect this species, and if possible improve its habitat. Fairy Shrimp is a protected species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (2001). We note in the HRA that discussion about this site has been held between the operator, Natural England and the Dorset County Council Mineral Planning. We would therefore defer to NEs advice in reference to the HRA. Groundwater and contaminated land Hydrogeological risk assessment is required at the earliest possible stage, in particular this should include an assessment of any potential risks to the adjacent Bere Stream, River Piddle and other water interests in the vicinity. Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels. Agreed mitigation measures may be necessary. This is a sensitive location in terms of water issues. There is the potential risk of sedimentation and possible impact on abstraction licences in the vicinity. Assessment of the potential impacts would be required. We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Ecological study Flood Risk Assessment Protect and enhance water features in site Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence Water Framework Assessments (WFD) as necessary</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 348	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Renny Henderson	RSPB, South West Regional Office	<p>Within Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel, Philliols Farm (AS-12) is allocated, subject to the proposal being "in accordance with the development plan".</p> <p>The RSPB has concerns over this allocation, given uncertainty over the alignment of the allocations haul route. There is the potential for this to alter the characteristic of the heath/forest (Bere Heath and Philliols Heath) to the north of the allocation, effectively displacing current users elsewhere, potentially onto nearby internationally designated heathlands. This is clearly undesirable.</p> <p>The issue is referenced within Appendix A (p 116). Ideally the haul route would be located along the forests western boundary minimising disturbance issues (through noise, light, dust etc) on the remainder of the forest.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 326	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Ms Heather Day		<p>With reference in particular to Site AS12- Philliols Farm I wish to object on the grounds of unsoundness.</p> <p>No evidence is put forward to suggest that biodiversity impacts from the work would be acceptable or satisfactorily mitigated. Neither would hydrological effects resulting from the extraction be satisfactorily overcome.</p> <p>There is also no evidence offered to show that impact on archaeological remains and historic buildings would be properly mitigated.</p> <p>Much vibration and dust would occur, and the buildings setting, considered important, would be lost, owing to lower levels of surrounding land. The route of the necessary new haul road would be disruptive to the many walkers, riders and cyclists who enjoy the area, in terms of visual impact, noise and access. The surrounding woodland and heath landscape would be visually affected by development. It seems to me that this could not be satisfactorily mitigated even over a long time. It is a fragile situation. I fail to see how the land could be properly restored to agriculture as the levels would be so low or even below water. The possible benefits of flood water storage, improvements for wildlife or more public access could, if they are needed, be dealt with without extraction. They are not a justification any more than the possibility for repair of the historic buildings is.</p> <p>I do not see that the council has, since the 2016 consultation, provided any more evidence to justify the acceptability of Site AS 12- Philliols Farm. I consider the proposal unsound. It is not positively prepared so that sustainable development would be achievable. Furthermore, I have shown it to be unjustified, not effective, and I believe it to be not in harmony with national policy.</p> <p>I am, too, concerned by the Area of Search around Philliols and Lower Stockley farms. This fragile landscape should be excluded and the Area of Search not reach north of the river Piddle in the vicinity of the two farms.</p>	
PSD - MSP 314	Figure 12	Philliols Farm	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>DWT welcomes the recognition of the need to protect both the Bere Stream SSSI and Philliols Coppice SNCI as well as the Fairy Shrimp in any proposed mineral developments at this site, with mitigation required to be implemented. A buffer to the River Piddle at the southern end of the site should also be maintained. We are also pleased to see that the restoration vision states that restoration to a heathland and semi-natural grassland /scrub mosaic is the key objective to link with existing heathland sites. DWT strongly supports this.</p>	

PSD - MSP 438	Figure 12	Phillio's Farm	Dian Pitts	<p>Living at the above address I have been invited to comment on the proposed mineral development plans. Past consultations were dealt with by my husband [deceased] which leaves me somewhat confused when looking at the form, [attached to said invitation] to be completed for this consultation. In response to your invitation to comment on the above minerals plan I wish the following to be recorded:</p> <p>Yet again the Piddle Valley is being threatened with scant regard to the effects that the Minerals Plan will have. "This would badly damage the tranquil qualities of this pleasant and quiet corner of this Dorset Countryside" [Statement from Inspector 1996] A response to this plan [Site AS12] on behalf of Rage [of which I am part] has been submitted. It details a number of reasoned objections to this plan and I wish to register my wholehearted agreement with these objections. In particular I am concerned about</p> <p>The effect this development will have on the River Piddle. At this point in time the Environment Agency considers properties along the River Piddle to be in "Flood Zone 2' [Low risk) The Inspector assessed the 1996 Criterion C13 - Impact on Surface Waters as A Red. Nothing has changed since this date but if the development is allowed there is the obvious impact of various materials being washed by surface water into ditches and thence to the river. This impact could seriously affect the risk assessment and thus the value, of the properties concerned.</p> <p>No amount of mitigation in any format will prevent air pollution if this development is allowed. Dust from the site will be of at least three types: Large Particles - referred to as 'nuisance dust' PM10 - these are deemed to be damaging to health iii. PM2.s - "particles are small enough to be inhaled very deep into the lung - described as the high risk respirable convention PM2.s is often described as particles of less than 2.5 µm diameter although this is not strictly correct." [Air Quality [England] Regulation 2000.] All of the above will pose a potential health risk to persons living and working within the proximity of the site.</p> <p>Without any assessment it is not possible to define the size of the area that will be affected. Bere Regis already suffers from a surfeit of vehicles and subsequent problems, through not only its residents' vehicles but also being situated at the junction of three main highways viz. A35 to Dorchester, A31 to Wimborne and A35 to Poole. Whatever decision is made as to the exit route of lorries from the proposed site, the estimated 100 lorries per day will have a serious effect on all roads within a radius of 6.25 miles from the site. This in tum will impact on the already restricted roads around and through Bere Regis and Wareham. In 1996 the Inspector, as quoted above, described the area involved to be "tranquil"! Since this inspection the valley is now affected by the Purbeck Shooting School with whom there is an ongoing discussion as to acceptable noise levels. Bunds, moving stands etc. has done little to mitigate noise levels on 275 out of 365 per year. Understandably further noise across the valley would be intolerable to all residents. These are just four areas where I believe the Minerals Plan in respect of AS12 Phillio's Farm to be unsound. In 1996 the Inspector's decision was to reject this site and I can find no reason for this decision to be overturned.</p>
PSD - MSP 27	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mr Andre w Herrin g	<p>The main issue with regard to the impact of these proposals on New Forest District continues to be the proposed minerals site north of the railway at Roeshot. In particular, the need to ensure that the two sites are not worked simultaneously (ie there is no intensification of traffic generation) and that the Hampshire side of the site is given consent in relation to transport arrangements by the relevant Hampshire authority (Hampshire County Council). We would like to draw to your attention the continuing potential conflict between the proposed use of this site for SANGs to mitigate the impact of the Christchurch urban extension and the proposals for further sand and gravel extraction in this area. It remains unclear how the minerals extraction proposals at Roeshot are compatible with the</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					proposed Site of Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) that is needed to mitigate the development of 800-900 dwellings proposed adjoining the site south of the railway.	
PSD - MSP 32	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mrs Nicola Shaw	Hurn Parish Council	<p>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.</p> <p>DRAFT MINERALS PLAN Roeshot Hurn Parish Council object to this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hampshire County Council already has an area of land in its adopted Minerals Plan which is allocated for mineral extraction, and which adjoins the proposed Dorset Roeshot proposal. The Parish Council is very concerned that if this Dorset proposal is taken forward, then there will be mineral extraction in this location for several decades, giving rise to very detrimental traffic impacts in the area. 2. In addition, The Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan identifies a large housing development in this area, and there appears to be no consideration of cumulative traffic impacts on the local road network, especially through the built up areas of Barrack Road, Bargates, Fairmile and Highcliffe. 3. If progressed, then consideration should be given to a rail connection for haulage of minerals, so that HGVs do not have to be used. 4. There should be no concurrent working with the Hampshire Roeshot site. 	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 217	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mr Sam Coleman		<p>I feel the site proposal at Roeshot to be unjustified and unlawful on the following grounds. The site lies adjacent to the main river and tributaries of the Hampshire avon which has been designated SSSI and SAC therefore has special conservation objectives which are sensitive to growth and development. Site operation during the quarrying process is bound to increase run off from site into watercourses and groundwater in the form of diffuse and point source pollution of which the Hampshire avon already suffers and has attracted many initiatives from stakeholders to tackle this long term man made problem. The quarrying site will add to the problem. The quarry site operation will also require abstraction and the Hampshire avon has been deemed as an over abstracted a Waterbody of which further development will fly in the face of initiatives to reduce permitting pressures caused through over abstraction. Other environmental effects form in the guise of noise, dust, increased traffic and visual detriment in a rural location sited next to the new forest national park. This is evidence of the development creep right up to the borders of special designations where large landowners can gain opportunity from over development. The site also lies immediately adjacent to the hampshire nominated Site so local residents may suffer detriment by being subjected to in fact two quarrying site activities. It could double the length of the life cycle of the site. The social environmental effects are bound to ruin the attractiveness of the area as a place to live which is of concern as an attraction for tourism and the economic value this brings to the area. Residents are only 200 metres from the site and will suffer the full visual impact prof operation from every window, plus noise dust and traffic in a rural area. I strongly object to this development as insensitive to the surrounding protective designations, impact on residents and obstacles it will cause to environmental stakeholders already struggling with resource restrictions to combat the detriment created by over and insensitive development Sites such as this.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 219	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mr Sam Coleman		<p>I feel the site proposal at Roeshot to be unjustified and unlawful on the following grounds. The site lies adjacent to the main river and tributaries of the Hampshire avon which has been designated SSSI and SAC therefore has special conservation objectives which are sensitive to growth and development. Site operation during the quarrying process is bound to increase run off from site into watercourses and groundwater in the form of diffuse and point source pollution of which the Hampshire avon already suffers and has attracted many initiatives from stakeholders to tackle this long term man made problem. The quarrying site will add to the problem. The quarry site operation will also require abstraction and the Hampshire avon has been deemed as an over abstracted a Waterbody of which further development will fly in the face of initiatives to reduce permitting pressures caused through over abstraction. Other environmental effects form in the guise of noise, dust, increased traffic and visual detriment in a rural location sited next to the new forest national park. This is evidence of the development creep right up to the borders of special designations where large landowners can gain opportunity from over development. The site also lies immediately adjacent to the hampshire nominated Site so local residents may suffer detriment by being subjected to in fact two quarrying site activities. It could double the length of the life cycle of the site. The social environmental effects are bound to ruin the attractiveness of the area as a place to live which is of concern as an attraction for tourism and the economic value this brings to the area. Residents are only 200 metres from the site and will suffer the full visual impact prof operation from every window, plus noise dust and traffic in a rural area. I strongly object to this development as insensitive to the surrounding protective designations, impact on residents and obstacles it will cause to environmental stakeholders already struggling with resource restrictions to combat the detriment created by over and insensitive development Sites such as this.</p>	
PSD - MSP 253	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mr Conor O'Luby		<p>It will not result in a net gain in biodiversity and is thus contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	

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 There are parts of this site that fall within Flood Zone 3 & 2, same as the adjacent site (Land at Roeshot). Therefore a Sequential Test may be needed to determine whether there are any other sites with lower flood risk. We highlight that only water compatible uses (this does include sand and gravel extraction) as defined by the NPPF are permitted in principle within the Functional Floodplain (FZ3b). No processing works, compounds, buildings etc. would be permitted within FZ3b. The Local Authority Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) may be used as a guide for allocation however this is Level 1 so is not a detailed assessment. The approach taken within Level 1 SFRA was to assume FZ3b to be the same as FZ3 if no detailed assessment was available. A more detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment may therefore be required to determine the FZ3 and FZ3b outlines, should it be proposed to carry it forward to the next stage. Mindful of the concerns we have expressed when providing comments in respect of the application for the adjacent site we strongly advise a sequential approach be adopted within the site boundary to ensure only water compatible development is permitted within the floodplain, and all other development is restricted to that part of the site that falls within Flood Zone 1. A detailed site specific FRA to look at the impact of the proposals on local flood risk would also be required. Please note that if the intention is to allow development within the floodplain, for example bunding or any other works resulting in a loss of floodplain storage, then compensatory floodplain storage will be required. Any scheme for compensatory floodplain storage will be a direct or level for level scheme, which will provide a direct replacement for the lost storage volume. Indirect methods rely on water entering a storage area which then releases water at a slower rate, akin to a surface water attenuation scheme. We generally oppose indirect schemes because they do not truly offer floodplain compensatory storage on a level for level and volume for volume basis. In addition to any other permission(s) that may have already been obtained, e.g. planning permission, an environmental permit for flood risk activities (formerly known as Flood Defence Consent prior to 6 April 2016) may be required to carry out work: in, under, over or near a main river (including where the river is in a culvert) on or near a flood defence on a main river in the floodplain of a main river on or near a sea defence For further information and to check whether a permit is required please visit: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits> For any further advice, please contact your local Environment Agency FRA Permitting Officer, daniel.griffin@environment-agency.gov.uk / yvonne.wiacek@environment-agency.gov.uk The prior written Land Drainage Consent is required from the LLFA (DCC) for works that could affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse.

Fisheries and Biodiversity We are satisfied with the development guidelines outlined in Appendix 1: Site Allocations and the safeguards set out in the HRA to protect the European sites and associated species. In particular, we are pleased a wide buffer strip will be insisted upon to protect the River Mude and the southern damselfly. The required width of the buffer zone will need to be determined subject to the provision of further site information. No activities associated with any stage of the mineral extraction must occur in this buffer zone, including light spill. We note in the HRA that discussion about this site has been held between the operator, Natural England and the Dorset County Council Mineral Planning. We would therefore defer to NEs advice in reference to the HRA. Groundwater and contaminated land We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for each site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. The restoration plans for this site must be well developed, and must consider groundwater issues. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study Protect and enhance water features in site. Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment, as appropriate

PSD
-
MSP
332

Figure
13

Roeshot

Ms
Helen
Patton

New
Forest
National
Park
Authority

The Authority previously raised concerns that the following impacts had been omitted from the Plan;

- Impacts on nearby internationally designated sites located within the National Park.
- Traffic impacts on the National Park, in particular impacts on Lyndhurst which is identified as an Air Quality Management Area.
- Impacts on the biodiversity of the National Park, in particular impacts on nearby Burton Common SSSI, the New Forest Special Protection Area, New Forest Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar Sites.
- Impact on the special quality of the landscape of the National Park.

The Authority is concerned and disappointed to note that our previous comments in relation to the requirement for an assessment of the impacts on the biodiversity of the nearby internationally and nationally designated sites has not been taken on board. The Pre-Submission document still only refers to an assessment being required for the designated sites within Dorset only. The Authority considers this to be a serious omission as it fails to reflect the Councils Duty to Co-operate and also the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and one which requires amendment in the final Submission document.

While the Authority is pleased to note that traffic impacts will be assessed through a Transport Assessment, it seems to suggest in the Pre-Submission draft document (page 120) that a Transport Assessment would only consider the more localised traffic in combination with proposed nearby housing development rather than an assessment of the more wider traffic impacts extending through the National Park and in particular through Lyndhurst. The Authority therefore requests that this should be amended in the final Submission document.

The following is for your information regarding the access. The accompanying site assessment for Roeshot incorrectly states that Hampshire County Council will be determining the access for the Hampshire site " the access is actually located within the National Park and planning permission (planning application reference 16/00277) was granted by the Authority on 31 August 2016.

The Authority is pleased to note that potential impacts on the special quality of the landscape and the setting of the National Park have been included in this document in line with our previous request.

On a general point, in relation to the comments made on the potential impacts on the National Park as set out above, the Authority is concerned to note that an assessment of these potential impacts will be delayed and considered as part of any planning application subsequently submitted for the site. It is assumed that leaving the potential impacts to be assessed as part of the planning application stage as opposed to the plan making stage, Dorset County Council and partner authorities are confident that the potential impacts can be addressed and overcome, as failure to overcome any significant constraints will obviously mean that the site will be undeliverable within the Plan period.

The following comment is made in relation to the proposed Suitable Area of Natural Greenspace (SANG) for the housing to be built south of the railway. As stated previously, the Authority considers it essential that the working of the minerals for this proposed site mirror those of the eastern part of the site contained within the adopted Hampshire Mineral Plan, whereby SANG provision is co-ordinated with the operational working of the mineral. The Authority would like to take this opportunity to reiterate that cross-boundary liaison between the planning authorities concerned is clearly essential if the SANG is indeed going to provide attractive, useable greenspace to address the recreational needs of the urban extension, and the National Park Authority would be wish to be involved in any future discussions regarding mineral development of this site.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 315	Figure 13	Roeshot	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>DWT welcomes the requirement for mitigation against direct and indirect impacts on the Southern Damselfly and its habitat along the Mude Stream. It is important that any mitigation measures include wider aspects of mitigation such as measures to prevent changes in flow rates or any run-off which might damage downstream habitats including the Mude Valley SNCI as well as the Southern Damselfly habitat itself.</p> <p>The measures included within the HRA screening report which specifies wide buffer strips down either side of the Mude Stream, and the provision that both sides cannot be worked at once will be very important, and specific habitat improvement work along the river is also supported.</p>	
PSD - MSP 537	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mr George Meyrick	Bodorgan Properties (CI) Ltd	<p>The reference to the presence of the Southern Damselfly is correct. However, the application for the adjacent site in Hampshire has addressed this impact and mitigation is agreed as well as enhancement of adjacent/nearby suitable habitat. The habitat is the River Mude and the side streams in Hampshire (there are no side streams in Dorset).</p> <p>The site specific comments should recognise that this 'impact' has been addressed and the development of AS13 should give this greater weight. Also, the site is not close to either the Dorset Heaths or Studland Dunes SAC so the proposals will have no effect on those designated areas.</p>	<p>Amend the Natural Environment paragraph to remove reference to the Dorset Heaths and Studland Dunes SAC, and recognise that mitigation and enhancement for the Southern Damselfly are in place and will be implemented through the Hampshire permission.</p> <p>Other : Full assessment of ecological impacts, particularly direct and indirect impacts on the Southern Damselfly and its habitat will be required and appropriate mitigation identified and implemented noting that this impact has been addressed and mitigation and enhancement agreed as part of the adjacent mineral development proposals in Hampshire.</p> <p>(Delete reference to Dorset Heaths and Studland Dunes SAC).</p>

PSD - MSP 584	Figure 13	Roeshot	Mr George Whalley	Christchurch Borough Council	<p>The proposed allocation for the extraction of sand and gravel is located on land to the east of Burton, and north of the A35 at Christchurch. The site is located directly to the north of the Core Strategy allocation (Policy CN1) and is effectively an extension of the Hampshire sand and gravel site which is already allocated in the Hampshire Minerals Plan. The site covers an area of 74ha and is estimated to yield approximately 3.5 million tonnes. The Council maintains its objection to this proposed allocation and this representation deals with the following issues:</p> <p>Conflict with the provision of SANG to serve the North Christchurch Urban Extension</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Transport Impact</p> <p>Rail Link</p> <p>Airport Aerodrome Safety</p> <p>Flood Risk / Pollution of water courses and ingress to Christchurch Harbour</p> <p>SSSI</p> <p>BP Oil Line</p> <p>Extent of the Site / Disturbance to Residents</p> <p>Landscape Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict with the provision of SANG to serve the North Christchurch Urban Extension: The adopted Core Strategy (2014) allocates land to the south of the railway line to the east of Salisbury Road for 950 homes (Policy CN1). The allocation includes the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) and an application has been approved for SANG located north of the railway line at Roeshot Hill in Christchurch, adjoining land within the New Forest District and the New Forest National Park. The proposed allocation AS -13 in Christchurch includes land that forms part of the SANG for Policy CN1 North Christchurch Urban Extension and which is required to satisfy the Habitats Regulations for the implementation of the policy. It is proposed that the Dorset site will share the same access / haul road route from the A35 Lyndhurst Road (Hampshire), as identified to serve the Hampshire minerals site at Roeshot. There is a potential conflict here with the provision of the Eastern SANG to serve the Christchurch Urban Extension. Through the proposed allocation AS -13, it will need to be demonstrated that this will not prejudice the timely implementation of the eastern, central and western elements of the SANG serving Policy CN1 which must be provided in perpetuity. In order to be effective and deliverable the allocation needs to refer to minerals working consistent with the SANG management plan approved with the Roeshot Hill SANG application. The Restoration Vision refers to restoration with significant space restored for informal public open space linked to footpath / cycle networks and to existing and future built development. The Council interprets this as potential for restoration for SANG and will need to be undertaken in accordance with the SANG management plan approved with the Roeshot Hill SANG application. • Ecology: As part the preparation of the Councils Core Strategy the presence of Southern Damselfly has been identified on the River Mude. Policy CN1 of the Core Strategy makes provision for a suitable buffer zone to avoid any adverse impacts on this protected species. Proposed areas for minerals working would need to avoid this buffer zone and areas proposed for SANG. It is welcomed that the Development Guidelines take account of the need to provide a buffer along the River Mude and a full assessment of ecological impacts to be undertaken to avoid any adverse impacts. • Transport Impact: The site will generate estimated traffic movements of 50 in, 50 out per day (mineral); 30 in, 30 out per day (recycling). At this stage a detailed transport assessment has not been undertaken to assess the cumulative impact of the proposed minerals working in combination with planned development in the adopted Core Strategy. It needs to be demonstrated as part of a
---------------	-----------	---------	-------------------	------------------------------	--

transport assessment and in liaison with Hampshire County Council and Dorset County Council that cumulative impacts have been assessed and appropriate mitigation measures identified. At this stage it is uncertain whether the proposed allocation is effective and deliverable as no TA has been undertaken and it is not been established whether the transport impact can be mitigated. Should this site be progressed, it needs to be made clear whether the proposed site at Roeshot is intended to be worked post completion of the adjoining site allocated for minerals extraction in Hampshire. The Council is very concerned if there is concurrent working of the Dorset and Hampshire sides of this minerals site this will further increase levels of congestion and impact on residential amenity. As part of the consultation, there is no direct link to the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Local Transport Plan 3 or work undertaken through the A35 Route Management Study. It is also not clear what the relationship is towards planned improvements to the A35 identified in the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. The Council is already concerned that the transport strategy for the A35 is not a sustainable solution in the longer term, and continues to lobby for the development of a Christchurch relief road, as set out in the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy vision. Heavy goods traffic is likely to have very serious impacts on the surrounding road network, especially along the A35 at Stony Lane Roundabout, Fountain Way, Barrack Road and the junction with Ringwood Road. These routes are already heavily congested and pass private dwellings and shopping cores. There is a concern that the proposed access onto the A35 will cause additional hazard to traffic, along a stretch of road which already experiences a high accident rate. Lorries travelling south and west access sites across the South East Dorset conurbation and are likely to use routes which are unsuitable for HGVs. The Council objects to any HGV traffic using the A337 through Highcliffe, the B3073 Bargates or routes through residential areas. These roads in particular should form part of an HGV ban and routing agreement for the site should it be allocated. The level of developer contributions needs to be agreed between Dorset and Hampshire County Councils, particularly as the majority of lorry movements are expected to travel westwards. There also needs to be agreement on operating restrictions at times of peak traffic flows to mitigate the impact on the A35.

- Rail Link: In view of the Councils concerns about the transport impact of HGV movements it is requested that consideration is given to the potential for local rail sidings to facilitate the transportation of aggregates from Roeshot. Such facilities are known to exist at Hamworthy (Furzebrook), Wareham and Wool, or using facilities at Totton, the Fawley branch line, or even Brockenhurst " all of which have siding and road access facilities. It is acknowledged that major works would be required to create level siding and loading facilities alongside the embankment on the main railway line passing the site, and it is clear that this would be needed on the northern side of the embankment. The Council considers that detailed analysis of rail potential from the site should be undertaken using specialist consultants and supported by a costed viability appraisal. Without such an assessment, the impact of road traffic to and from the site has not been adequately mitigated. Subject to the feasibility and viability of providing a railway siding, it is requested that Dorset County Council and Hampshire county Council should negotiate a financial contribution towards the delivery of a railway siding to allow the transportation of aggregates away from the site and minimise the impact of HGV movements on the transport network.
- Airport Aerodrome Safety: This site is located approximately 6km from Bournemouth Airport and is within the 13km safeguarding consultation zone and will also be subject to Policy DM9 of the Minerals Core Strategy and Site Selection Criterion C20. The allocation of this site would give rise to an increase in bird-strike hazard in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport. Policy DM9 of the Minerals Core Strategy recognises that proposals that do not recognise this risk should not be permitted. An assessment will need to be submitted which fully assesses the impact on aerodrome safety during the working of the site as well as through its restoration. This issue is mentioned in passing within the development guidelines but will need to be addressed in detail to ensure the allocation is effective and deliverable.
- Flood Risk / Pollution of water courses and ingress to Christchurch Harbour SSSI: The eastern edge of the proposed allocation is adjacent to the River Mude and is within Flood zones 2, 3a and 3b (as identified in the Councils Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Level 2). Ground and surface water will drain from the site into the River Mude which runs along the eastern boundary of the site. The water table is only 2 metres below the surface, excavations would be dewatered and the water subsequently used in the

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>processing of minerals and then discharged into adjoining watercourses. The Council is concerned that sediments transported away from the Roeshot site via watercourses and natural drainage will impact negatively on river ecology and habitats and on the natural circulation processes of Christchurch Harbour. Of particular concern are sand and other sediments carried down the River Mude which supports species dependant on the gravel river bed. The Mude empties into Christchurch Harbour SSSI which is self-cleaning managing its own existing levels of sediment. Should the Roeshot site be progressed, the Council would expect full ecological, hydrological and environmental impact assessments on the site, River Mude and Christchurch Harbour to be undertaken in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Council. It is welcomed that the Development Guidelines identify the need for a hydrological / hydrogeological assessment and evaluation as part of the development of the site. A flood risk assessment will also be required and application of the sequential approach to the location of processing plant and any storage. It will need to be demonstrated that harmful impacts are capable of mitigation in order for the allocation to be effective and deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BP Oil Line: The Council is aware of an underground oil pipe line which crosses the nominated site AS13 at Roeshot. The pipe line is believed to cross the site from the south western corner diagonally towards Burton Rough on the Hampshire side. The oil line would sterilise part of the site, unless a developer paid to relocate it. Dorset County Council should have access to the original planning application and route of the pipeline. This issue is picked up within the development guidelines and will need to be addressed to ensure that the allocation is effective and deliverable. • Extent of the Site / Disturbance to Residents: The area nominated for consideration extends to the railway embankment. The railway line does not provide adequate screening for visual, noise and dust , light and odour impacts from residents south of the railway line (Within the Christchurch Urban Extension, directly to the south) and for Burton and Highcliffe residents. A strategy needs to be put forward which demonstrates how adequate screening / attenuation measures will be put in place. • Landscape Impact: The site will have an adverse visual impact on the landscape viewed from Burton in the west, Waterditch Road to the north and from residents of the Christchurch Urban Extension to the south. The development guidelines for proposed allocation AS13 refer to the requirement to mitigate landscape / visual impacts on residential development in the vicinity of Burton Conservation Area. To ensure that the allocation is effective and deliverable it will need to be demonstrated that the plan making stage that such impacts are capable of mitigation. 	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 89	Figure 14	Tatchells Quarry extension	Mr John Williamson		<p>Being a resident living by the C7 (Bere Regis to Wareham Rd.), I find it quite alarming that we are going to have to put up with up to five sand and gravel reliant operations, including a clay pit along this road, All the extra HGVs or LGVs are going to finish destroying the road surface and in particular the road edges and verges, this is an increasing danger to other road users which has caused some of them to leave the road completely by accident.</p> <p>In my opinion the only sensible option is to upgrade the whole length of the road to accommodate this influx of large vehicles. I appreciate that these materials can only be won from the areas where they lay but something needs to improve for the safety of the local populace and the many visitors (campers) that use this road.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 232	Figure 14	Tatchell's Quarry extension	Mrs Joanne Baker	Aggregate Industries UK Limited	<p>These representations refer solely to Tatchell's Quarry, Wareham. Separate representations will be made with regard to Chard Junction Quarry, also operated by Aggregate Industries UK Limited (AI).</p> <p>Chapter 1: Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites Draft Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel AI support the inclusion of an extension to Tatchell's Quarry (AS15) within part 3 of this policy as a site allocated to contribute to the adequate and steady supply of sand. It is considered that any adverse impacts resulting from the development of this site allocation can be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA). AI propose to submit a planning application for the development of this allocated site and to this end the company has requested a screening opinion from Dorset County Council regarding the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>Chapter 5: Safeguarding Draft Policy MS-9: Preventing land-use conflict AI supports the aims of the Policy MS-9. However, this must be supported by the MPA ensuring that the list of mineral sites and infrastructure safeguarded under this policy and Policy SG3 of the Minerals Strategy is updated regularly.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.9 Whilst AI supports the move to reduce bureaucracy, the company wishes to see point x. of the list of development exempt from consultation is strengthened as follows: x. Applications for temporary permission of up to five years other than Classes C1, C2, C2a, C3, C4, or D1 .</p> <p>The company also seeks confirmation from the MPA that point vi. within the aforementioned list includes applications for prior approval where these relate to Classes C1, C2, C2a, C3, C4, or D1. If this is not the case, the appropriate text should be instated.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 589	Figure 14	Tatchell's Quarry extension	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England	<p>Tatchell's Extension AS15 and Philliols Farm AS12 As stated in our previous comments, we note that you expect that there will be a transport assessment submitted by the developers of the Tatchell's extension, although it is unclear at what stage of the planning process this would be submitted.</p> <p>Our previous response commented that in order to comply with the NPPF and DfT circular 02/2013, a sufficient transport evidence base needs to be provided at the plan making stage, and further information should therefore be submitted so that we can establish whether there is likely to be a significant impact upon the SRN as a result of this site. Whilst the estimate of 40 vehicle movements per day in relation to the Tatchells extension is sufficiently low that it is unlikely that the development would impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, the cumulative impact of Philliols Farm and Tatchells extension should be investigated. We note that the Trigon extension is not expected to result in any traffic intensification. However, there does not appear to be any trip estimation given in relation to Philliols Farm.</p> <p>In order to establish the potential impact on the SRN, a cumulative assessment of these three sites should be undertaken, and this should be provided at the plan making stage, for us to be able to determine whether mitigation is required in order for us to support allocation of these sites. We note and welcome that the transport assessments will accompany forthcoming planning applications for development of these sites, and this should include a more detailed assessment of the potential cumulative impacts.</p>	

PSD - MSP 351	Figure 14	Tatchell's Quarry extension	Laura Cox	PRO Vision Plannin g	<p>Pro Vision has been instructed by the Charborough Estate to submit representations to the above consultation. These representations should be considered along with the comments made on behalf of the Charborough Estate to the Draft Mineral Sites Plan Update 2016 and the Draft Mineral Sites Plan 2015.</p> <p>The representations are made in respect of the tests of legal compliance and soundness, considering the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Policy MS-1 The continued allocation of Tatchell's Quarry Extension (Reference: AS-15); * Policy MS-2 The aggregates area of search; * Policy MS-9 Preventing land use conflict. <p>The Charborough Estate supports the continued inclusion of Tatchell's Quarry Extension, Wareham (Reference: AS-15) as a site for the provision of sand. The site is owned by the Estate. The allocation of an extension to Tatchell's Quarry is legally compliant, as the sustainability of the site is supported by the comprehensive sustainability appraisal prepared by Dorset County Council. Proposals for the effective mitigation of the constraints identified within the sustainability appraisal will be set out within a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, and a Transport Assessment, in support of any future planning application.</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal demonstrates that the allocation of Tatchell's Quarry is the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, and therefore that the plan is justified, as defined in Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The allocation of the site is supported by both the landowner and Aggregate Industries UK Limited. Aggregates Industries UK Limited proposes to submit a planning application for sand extraction and has requested a Screening Opinion from Dorset County Council to determine whether an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required. Therefore, Policy MS-1 is effective, as set out in Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework, as the proposed sand extraction at Tatchell's Quarry Extension is deliverable over the plan period.</p> <p>The allocation of Tatchell's Quarry Extension is consistent with National Policy, as it will contribute to securing a sufficient supply of material to support sustainable economic growth and quality of life, in line with paragraph 142 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 27-001-20140306).</p> <p>Policy MS-1 complies with paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 27-007-20140306), which state that, in preparing Local Plans, Local Planning Authorities should identify and include policies for the extraction of mineral resources.</p> <p>Policy MS-1 is also in keeping with paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which identifies that Minerals Planning Authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. The Planning Practice Guidance states that specific sites should be designated to plan for the steady supply of minerals (Reference ID: 27-008-20140306).</p>
------------------------	--------------	-----------------------------	--------------	-------------------------------	---

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 550	Figure 14	Tatchells Quarry extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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 EIA/Restoration proposals should incorporate gain of wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the England Biodiversity Strategy. Groundwater and Contaminated Land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for the site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrological Assessment Protect and enhance any water features in and near site. Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment, as appropriate</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
235

Figure
15

Woodford Quarry extension

Mr
Simon
Gudge
on

I am the owner of Sculpture by the Lakes which is on the boundary of the proposed site for mineral extraction at Woodsford, AS19, and strongly object to it. Having read the site assessment I feel it is seriously flawed on many counts, these are: The assessment from the report prepared by the Council states 'Amenity; no significant impacts expected, site is relatively remote This is a seriously flawed report, Sculpture by the Lakes is a cultural heritage site, We are a cultural heritage site ; one of the leading arts venues in Dorset and in the top ten visitor attractions in the county. We are rapidly becoming one of the major centres for the arts in the South of England. This relies on the peace and tranquility of the surroundings for its success and that would be shattered by having a quarry 300 metres from our boundary. We have three art galleries on site, a restaurant/café and 26 acres of grounds. We currently employ 14 full time and part time staff and will continue to grow. This is long term employment, not just for the 10 year life of the quarry. In addition, we attract over 12,000 visitors a year, both national and international, and they contribute significantly to the economy of the area. That would be destroyed for the short term employment generated from a quarry. We manage Sculpture by the Lakes for the wildlife just as much as the visitors, creating habitat that attracts a large number of different species. We have 98 species of birds and many mammals. Through careful management we now have a substantial population of the endangered water vole, four species of bats, kingfishers, otters and many more. Working closely with Dorset Wildlife Trust and the Environment Agency we have created habitat for the smallest invertebrate to larger birds and mammals to create a balanced ecosystem. This would be severely damaged by quarrying so close to this delicate environment. In addition, this area is one of only 12 sites designated Nature Improvement Areas administered by Natural England and, supposedly, the Council! the Hydrology report does not anticipate any significant problems - what is the basis of this assessment? We are 300 metres away and have springs which generate 500,000 gallons of water a day. This would pose two problems, firstly what would the quarry do with that quantity of water. Secondly it would affect the springs on our property which feed the lakes. Woodsford Quarry. I have visited Woodsford and spoken to some of the residents there. I have also listened to the noise created by the quarry. It would appear that the quarry is in breach of a number of its planning conditions including stockpiles of sand and land not being reinstated and the Council has been somewhat lax in enforcing these. In addition the noise impact of the quarry is significant with little being done to alleviate it, this comes from bleeping reversing alarms, digger buckets, and the large scale removal of topsoil from a shallow site. If Sculpture by the Lakes was in Woodsford we would have been unable to survive and would have closed down by now. Question 1 No, the plan is not legally compliant. Question 2 No, the plan is not sound. Question 3 No, it is not positively prepared. No, it is not justified. No, it is not effective. No, it is not consistent with national policy. Question 4 (details of why not legally compliant or unsound) Background AS26 is a proposed site bounded in the west by the B3390 and in the north by the River Frome and its SSSI. Hurst Heath sits on the southern boundary with an SNCI site within it. Hurst Cottages (Hurst Dene) sit on the north eastern corner as well as Hurst Bridge over the River Frome. Hurst (South) Bridge is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as Grade 2 (List entry Number: 1425777), it was built in 1834 to designs by Dorset's County Surveyor, William Evans. Hurst Farm main house lies over the B3390 midpoint on the east with a view directly over AS26. Hurst Farm Dairy (a collection of farm buildings with dairy equipment within sits roughly in the centre of AS26 which is large active dairy serving the country with milk. The old Hurst Dairy House and Barn are listed Buildings, they lie over the B3390 but in close proximity to AS26. Moreton Conservation Area lies 250m to the SE. Today the surrounding fields are arable to support the dairy cattle, they were once extensive water meadows. The farm is managed under a DEFRA Environmental Stewardship scheme. AS26 forms part of the River Frome valley featured in Thomas Hardy's novel Tess of the D'Urbervilles. Thomas Hardy refers to the valley as "The Great Valley of Dairies". Sculpture by the Lakes is an international tourist venue immediately adjacent to AS26 on the other side of the River and is renowned for its

exquisite sculptures and tranquil gardens. Pallington Farmhouse (a Grade 2 Listed Building) also approx. 450m north of AS26 across the River Frome. AS26 sits within what remains of Hardys Egdon Heath which is part of the proposed Dorset National Park. Natural Environment Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA): The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening exercise, undertaken for the Pre-submission Minerals Plan for AS26 & As19, appears to be cursory at best and fails to adequately assess the impacts to nearby EU designated sites. This is a serious omission in the emerging Plan and, as such, would leave the PLAN in contravention of the EC Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora). Moreover, the Plan is likely to be found unsound and not legally compliant at the later examination stage. Failure to revise the Plan (or strengthen the environmental evidence base in the context of the Habitats Directive) will leave Dorset County Council (DCC) open to legal challenge. We note the 2017 version of the HRA Screening seems to presume that the DCC need to amend their policy to reduce the possibility of a significant impact. This is totally unacceptable. In the HRAs words there is a "conflict pathway" between AS26 and the designated EU site (River Frome SSSI). AS19 immediately adjacent to The River Frome SSSI on the northern boundary and adjacent to Hurst Heath on the southern boundary that has an SNCI site within it. Soundness and Legal Compliance: The approach employed in the Plan, back-loading the assessment of impact upon the EU sites, makes the Plan clearly unsound and certainly not legally compliant. Planning Inspectorate guidance is clear on testing these principles. The Plan will clearly be found unsound as it fails to answer the fundamental questions below: Has the plan been positively prepared, ie based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed requirements? Is the Plan justified? Is it based on robust and credible evidence? Is it the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternatives? Is the document effective? Is it deliverable? Is it flexible? Is it consistent with national policy? On the body of evidence available to date the answer to many of the above questions must be a resounding No. As such the Plan must be found to be unsound. Of more concern is the test of legal compliance. The Plan is not contributing to the development and sustainability appraisal of alternatives and, as such, fails to accord with section19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and regulations 12 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633. The Plan is unsound in all of the following areas:- Impact on European/International designations, Impact on areas used by Annex 1 bird species, Impact on protected species, Impact on local recognitions/designations, including ancient woodland and veteran trees, Impact on geodiversity For details please refer to FRAME 2018 response. Historic/Cultural Environment Impact on designated landscapes The plan for AS26 fails to recognise the valley landscape and the River Frome SSSI on the northern boundary. Both Concept One and Oxford Archaeology note the landscape being of importance as post medieval water meadows and the aesthetic significance of Moreton Conservation Area alongside. The significance derives from the contribution of the designated and non-designated assets and other features in combination with a quiet, rural and frequently wooded location. Quarrying is incompatible with maintaining this landscape. The plan pays scant regard to the unique River Frome Valley described in Thomas Hardys books and the value to tourism giving a marking of C. It notes the temporary nature of quarrying and restoration. Restoration cannot achieve the required result (ie to restore the valley to the state described in Thomas Hardys literature) and DCCs ability to manage restoration in a timely fashion is extremely poor. Mineral Strategy paragraph 3.20 states that "Achieving high quality restoration, at the earliest possible opportunity, as an integral part of all minerals development" is Key Issue 8. The Woodsford Hills quarry has failed to meet its planning condition restoration obligations. This makes a mockery of claims frequently made by DCC of rolling programmes of restoration with minimal disturbance. It also fails Key Issue 8 for quarrying at AS19 and AS26 as the quarries will be visible from across the valley. Impact on historic buildings: The Sustainability Appraisal mentions two historic buildings (actually listed cottages) as looking away from the site. The assessment fails to mention the proximity to

Hurst (South) Bridge which is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as Grade 2 (List entry Number: 1425777 also Scheduled Monument 1002422). Neither does it mention Hurst Farm (main house lies over the B3390 midpoint on the east at a distance of 70m) or significant historic cottages directly on the north eastern boundary that overlook the site. Clyffe House, Pallington is a Grade 2 listed building and has views across AS26 which would be marred destroying the vista designed by gothic revivalist Benjamin Ferry (student of Pugin). The Applicant has not provided any information concerning the historic and cultural setting of AS26 despite the obvious historic setting of the area, contrary to DCC policy. FRAME commissioned an in-depth study by Oxford Archaeology in 2015 and subsequently the DCC has commissioned a desk-based study by Context One in 2017 which states that "it is not possible to establish setting using desk-based sources alone. The Sustainability Appraisal does not reflect the impact on landscape, historic buildings and leaves the marking as uncertain. The plan is therefore unsound and illegal. Impact on archaeology: The Sustainability Assessment text mentions a Dorset Historic Environment Record in the site, so there is evidence that there are archaeological features so why does it say its uncertain? Studies by Dr S N Collcutt of Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd (commissioned by FRAME) also states that there are features and finds are to be expected in the geology. Concept One Study mentions prehistoric finds in the centre of AS26. The Assessment for AS26 marks this as anywhere from Red A to Negligible impact D where study evidence clearly suggests impact as A. The plan is therefore unsound. Water Impact on hydrogeology or groundwater: There is a complex relationship of the hydraulic connectivity between aquifers, groundwater and surface water flows. AS26 is adjacent to the River Frome valley and any disturbance of ground water flows will impact on the hydraulic mechanisms of the River Frome itself which is an SSSI. AS26 has been farmed in excess of 200 years and features an extensive land drainage scheme from that time. This has essentially meant the land is drained to allow farming and, indeed, stop the low lying houses from flooding. Destroying this ancient drainage system will impact heavily on the whole area, increasing the risk of flooding and disturbing the habitats of the sites. Material Assets (Economic development) Impact on Economic Development: The National Park submission and an associated DCC report states that the environment is Dorsets greatest economic asset " worth some £1.5 billion per year. DCCs Dorset Statistics website Topics/Natural and Historic Environment page states - "Dorsets natural and historic environment makes a huge contribution to health and personal wellbeing." "Dorsets natural systems provide a wide range of essential goods (food, fuel, productive soil, clean air and water) and beneficial services (pollination, flood alleviation, climate regulation and tranquillity). These are taken for granted, but they need a combination of public, private and voluntary action to maintain them." "Dorsets environmental economy is worth between £0.9bn and £2.5bn per annum, about 8-10% of Dorsets overall economy. It also supports between 17,000 and 61,000 jobs in the economy" "90% of Dorset residents surveyed said the environment was an important, very important or crucial factor in their decision to live in Dorset." By comparison on the same website employment by sector for the Mining & Quarrying industry in Purbeck is; "112 = 0.52%", in West Dorset is " 82 = 0.18%", And overall for Dorset is given as "407 = 0.21%". Sculpture by the Lakes is a valuable tourist attraction for Dorset and there is no mention of an economic impact on this material asset. "Para 6 of the NPPF advises that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Para 7 sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development, namely, economic, social and environmental. Case law has established that each of these elements should be afforded equal weight and that, in order to constitute sustainable development, each dimension must be met." In the DCC Minerals Strategy 2014 one criteria (Appendix 1 paragraph 48) is given as:- "In order to assess the economic contribution of a minerals proposal consideration should be made to issues such as: the level of employment that would be created or maintained both directly and indirectly; how important the site may be to the delivery of a steady and adequate supply of minerals; the wider contribution the site may make to the economy; the rarity of the mineral and its potential markets; and

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>any economic impacts (both negative and positive) that the proposal may have such as on tourism." Digging up vast swathes of River Frome valley runs contrary to this. Nowhere in the SA commentary is the negative impact on the local economy mentioned. The plan contravenes DCCs own policy and the assessment is therefore unsound. Question 5 The DCC need to adhere to their own policy drawn up to satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Many of the assessments are inaccurate (merely desktop derived), unsound and in some cases illegal. DCC must address their own failings and protect the valuable River Frome, Moreton, Hurst, Pallington and surrounding villages. Allocating more accurate markings to each assessment criteria clearly shows the high level of impact which completely outweighs the economic benefit of quarry this site. AS26 should be withdrawn from the plan now.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 274	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry extension	Mrs Jennifer Meade		<p>AS19 is very near to the River Frome, a SSSI. There is also an SNCI within a 100 m. In addition there are nationally and internationally protected species within the site. No proper assessment of the impact of AS19 on these has been made .</p> <p>Impact on local tourism has not been properly accounted for in the plan. The popular tourist attraction, Sculpture by the Lakes, will be adversely affected. This is Thomas Hardy's Valley of the Great Dairies, lovingly depicted in Tess of the D'urbervilles and The Return of the Native, which provides the reason for many visitors to the area.</p> <p>Given the size of the current River Terrace Gravel land bank, this site is not needed.</p>	Remove this site from the plan.

PSD
-
MSP
243

Figure
15

Woodford Quarry extension

Mr
John
Wicken
den

Background AS19 is a proposed site bounded to the north by the River Frome and its SSSI. Hurst Heath sits on the south-east boundary with an SNCI site within it. The bridge over the River Frome 140m to the north is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as Grade 2. Hurst Lower Dairy Farm house and dairy lies within the site and although not listed is shown on the 1776 estate map. Today fields are arable but there were once extensive water meadows. AS19 sits within what remains of Hardys Egdon Heath with the River Frome valley, Hardys "The Great Valley of Dairies", at its heart. The River Frome valley featured in Thomas Hardy's novel Tess of the D'Urbervilles and Return of the Native.

Sculpture by the Lakes is an international tourist venue on the other side of the River from AS19. It is renowned for its exquisite sculptures and tranquil gardens.

Egdon Heath is part of the proposed Dorset National Park. The assessments do not reflect the impact on the River Frome SSSI and downstream Poole Harbour SSSI. The DCC and the EA cannot deny that there are "pathways" from these sites to the River. The Plan therefore contravenes the EC Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora) whilst broadly ignoring the well established precautionary principle which is firmly supported in both European and UK case law.

Please refer to the FRAME submission for details of unsoundness. The Plan is unsound and not legally compliant. Impact on designated landscapes: The plan for AS19 fails to recognise the full importance of the River Frome SSSI adjacent to the northern boundary. Oxford Archaeology (FRAME commissioned study) note the landscape being of importance as post medieval water meadows. The significance derives from the contribution of the designated and non-designated assets and other features in combination with a quiet, rural and frequently wooded location. Quarrying is incompatible with maintaining this landscape.

The plan pays scant regard to the unique River Frome Valley described in Thomas Hardy's books and the value to tourism. It inexplicably claims that "the restoration proposals are sufficient to conform with literary associations of this part of Dorset particularly the Valley of the Dairies created by Thomas Hardy." It is clearly nonsense to equate restoration to ponds with dairy land". The Sustainability Appraisal mentions water meadow landscape. The DCC Heritage Assessment shows an 1825 map where 40Ha of the 90Ha site is shown as water meadow. It goes on to say the "...[water] meadows, along with others in Affpuddle and Briantspuddle, represent some of the earliest in the County" (Bett 1977, 37-38). There are historic hedgerows across AS19 as shown on the Tithe and estate maps with associations to lower dairy farm within the site (shown on the 1776 estate map), and grade 2 listed Woodford Manor 400m to the west. Imposing lakes/ponds or removal of hedgerows & veteran trees would degrade historic landscape and would sever the historic buildings from their proper context. The Applicant has not provided any information concerning the historic and cultural setting of AS19 despite the obvious historic setting of the area, contrary to DCC policy. The Sustainability Appraisal does not reflect the impact on landscape, historic buildings and even claims that the historic environment can be enhanced. The SA inexplicably grades the effect as Negligible or No Impact. Concept One Study HER map show considerable areas of archaeological interest on the site including Bronze age barrows, pre-historic to Roman field systems, trackways and settlements, post medieval water meadows. It should also be noted that the 1825 maps show the water meadow system extending beyond the HER designated area for water meadows. There is clearly evidence from multiple sources that there are archaeological features which would be destroyed in the quarrying process so why does the SA grade effects as minor negative impact of negligible or no effect? The site appraisal for AS19 marks this as anywhere from Red A to Negligible impact D where study evidence above clearly suggests impact as A. The plan is therefore unsound.

The landscape of AS19 to AS26 is a totally open & pastoral vista which is clearly evident from the roads and footpaths. Putting bunds and tree screening will ruin the current vista for decades and restoration can never bring this back.

Apply the law and
adhere to DCC's own
policies.

Water: AS19 has been farmed in excess of 200 years and feature an extensive land drainage scheme from that time. This has essentially meant the land is drained to allow farming. Destroying this ancient drainage system will impact heavily on the whole area, increasing the risk of flooding and disturbing the habitats of the sites. Operations likely to damage SSSIs are defined and include:- * the introduction of drainage (including moor-gripping and the installation of mole, tile, tunnel or other artificial drains); * the modification of the structure of watercourses (eg rivers, streams, springs, ditches, dykes, drains), including their banks and beds, by re-alignment, infilling, damming, re-grading, revetment, sheet piling and narrowing; * dredging and damage or disturbance of the river bed; * water impoundment, storage and alterations to water levels and tables, abstraction from surface and ground water bodies and water utilisation, including irrigation and the introduction of meadow flooding; * excavation, widening or infilling of drains, ditches, ponds, pools, marshes and pits. It is well known that quarrying disturbs the groundwater flow and releases sediments, impacting on water courses. DCC state that its plan would be to restore AS19 to wetland. Any restoration to lakes is highly likely to disturb flows to the River Frome and disturb the chemistry and hence habitats of the SSSI. These will be shallow lakes and suffer from "blinding", which will have effects on groundwater flow to the River Frome. The SA comments that "Assessment is required to determine possible impacts..." Then proceeds to grade the effect as positive. The assessment is unsound. Extracting sand and gravel on the agricultural land of AS19 will destroy the ancient drainage arrangement for the valley, will result in increased risk of flooding. A small part of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 which the SA commentary does not recognise. We do not agree with the statement "Sand and Gravel extraction is compatible with the functional flood plain". Interfering with the water table, creating settlement lagoons and releasing silt and iron does not constitute "compatibility". The Environmental Agency and Natural England's report on rehabilitating the River Frome SSSI also states that water run-off is responsible for increasing silt damage in the river as well as releasing "fine leached iron (Fe+) particles" from the flood plain; a known pollutant affecting the river habitat. Local knowledge supports the view that iron is present in the flood plain in adjacent site AS26 (visible in ditches and streams). The report also notes that floodplain connectivity is currently generally good (and a good thing). The BGS also recognise the danger of silt, release of dissolved or suspended minerals and the potential for increased flooding (reference: BGS Minerals UK " Centre for sustainable mineral development). The BGS, in turn, reference the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) which addresses many issues associated with water management for the Minerals Industry. Whilst individual quarry sites might argue the areas involved are small compared to the overall floodplain area, taking all 3 sites (AS19, AS25 and AS26) plus existing quarries into account (approx 1000 acres) this is no longer a valid argument. The cumulative impact will be great on the catchment area of the river between Woodsford and Moreton. (Reference: "A hydrological investigation at Woodsford, Dorset and an assessment of the potential impact of proposed sand and gravel quarry upon local water environment, Hafren Water 2005). Mineral processing needs vast quantities of water to wash the sand/gravels to remove unwanted clays etc. Hafren Water Ltd themselves highlight that a water source for this operation in areas sensitive to water balance needs very specific consideration, which includes getting water from deep water wells. The National Planning and Policy Framework (Mineral Working Close to Communities) states that Planning Authorities are expected to ensure proposals do not have unacceptable adverse effects on the natural or historic environment or human health. It is clear that DCC has not taken this policy seriously and it has not conducted sufficient investigations to be able to accurately mark this section of its assessment and the marking does not stand up to proper scrutiny. References "Frome and Piddle Catchment Flood Management Plan, Managing Flood Risk"; The Environmental Agency 2012. "Rehabilitating the River Frome SSSI", Environmental Agency & Natural England, Technical Report 2010. "A hydrological investigation at Woodsford, Dorset and an assessment of the potential impact of proposed sand and gravel quarry upon local water environment", Hafren Water 2005. BGS Minerals UK " Centre for sustainable mineral development The SA grades the effect as Strong Positive Impact. How and why?. The plan is unsound and contravenes DCCs own policy.

Economic: "Para 6 of the NPPF advises that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Para 7 sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development, namely, economic, social and

environmental. Case law has established that each of these elements should be afforded equal weight and that, in order to constitute sustainable development, each dimension must be met." How can the destruction of a dairy farm for all time benefit the local economy? The NPPF policy has clearly not been applied to the AS19 appraisal. The Plan is therefore unsound and contravenes DCC's own policy.

Impact on existing settlements: Experience at the Woodsford quarry shows that the operator does not and cannot erect baffle mounds, strip topsoil and carry out restoration within eight weeks in a year. This will be the same at AS19. It will result in the significant tonal noise associated with these activities, eg clanking digger buckets, caterpillar tracks and dumper truck beds, reversing alarms, etc, being audible for longer than 8 weeks a year, in contravention of Planning Practice Guidance. NPPF paragraph 123 states: "Planning policies and decisions should aim to identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason." Dorset's highest rated tourist attraction, the nationally and internationally renowned Sculptures by the Lakes is 350m north of this site. It is undisturbed by noise and prized for its tranquil recreational and amenity value, so should be identified and protected as described above. The current in-field quarrying activity at the Woodsford quarry makes noise with significant tonal elements during day to day operations and during higher noise shorter term activities like soil stripping and restoration. These are noises from screeners (machine used at the quarry face to remove oversized flints), clanking digger buckets, caterpillar tracks and dumper truck beds, reversing alarms, etc. The thrumming and clanking are clearly audible over a kilometre away. If AS19 goes ahead, in-field quarry noise will be heard at Sculptures by the Lakes due to the valley topography and ineffectiveness of bunds and trees, particularly when the wind is from the south. Sculptures by the Lakes' prized tranquillity will be adversely affected in clear breach of NPPF policy 123. The quarrying operation starts at 07.00 in the morning until 19:00 week days. It is apparent that a proper assessment has not been carried out so contravenes DCC's own policy, the assessment is therefore unsound.

Cumulative Impact: DCC's own documentation on the subject is contradictory. The Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Local Transport Plan 3 Strategy Document 2011-2026 states that: "Dorset has some of the finest natural and most attractive built environment in England, including significant areas of environmental designations. Many people see these features as especially important to their quality of life and choose to live in, or visit the area, because of them. They are also a central consideration in fulfilling aspirations for economic growth. Local public opinion surveys and community planning processes consistently confirm the importance of quality of life to local people." To reiterate, how does that tally with 2,000 proposed houses, 2,000 extra cars on the B3390, one 36-ton truck every minute and 781 acres of quarry? The Plan contravenes DCC's own policies and is therefore unsound.

In Summary: Para 1 of the Assessment Criteria, Appendix 1 to DCC Minerals Strategy 2014 states: "the criteria have been developed in order to ensure a standardised approach and provide consistency and a clear audit trail to demonstrate assessments have been undertaken". The plan is to be robust and defensible. The assessments conducted to date are of the desktop variety which fails to recognise real issues on the ground.

The DCC need to listen to the community who will be affected. Desktop assessments are insufficient (and in many cases inaccurate) to make decisions concerning AS19. Most assessments are incorrectly marked as "no significant impact" when evidence on the ground suggests they should be "very significant" or "significant". The assessment is therefore misleading and if the marks were correctly apportioned the overall marking would clearly show that AS19 should not be included in the Minerals Plan. In summary, on balance on the basis of evidence on the ground that impacts identified in the appraisals are not outweighed by the benefits of including the site in the Minerals Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 210	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry extension	Mrs Marjorie Brewer		<p>For my comments I would refer you to the content of the very detailed responses to the pre-submission draft Minerals Site Plan which you have already received from the FRAME residents action group and Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd, which I fully endorse and support and would urge that you fully investigate the many points they have raised detailing the reasons why the inclusion of the three sites, AS19, AS25 and AS26 is unsound and why they should be deleted from the Minerals Site Plan.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
267

Figure
15

Woodsford Quarry extension

Mr
Tony
Meade
r

Knightsford
parish
council

Background AS19 is bounded to the north by the River Frome. The rivers SSSI is 50m away. Watercourses in the site drain into the river. Hurst Heath sits on the south-east boundary with an SNCI site within it. The grade 2 listed bridge over the River Frome is 140m to the north. Hurst Lower Dairy Farm house lies within the site and although not listed pre-dates the 1842 tithe map. Today fields are arable but there were once extensive water meadows as shown on maps from 1825. AS19 sits within what remains of Hardys Egdon Heath with the River Frome valley, Hardys "The Great Valley of Dairies", at its heart. The River Frome valley featured in Thomas Hardy's novel Tess of the D'Urbervilles and Return of the Native. Sculpture by the Lakes is an international tourist attraction, on the other side of the river, is renowned for its exquisite sculptures and tranquil gardens. Grade 1 Listed Woodsford Castle is 900m to the west. Egdon Heath is part of the proposed Dorset National Park which is expected to be approved in the next 5-6 years. Conclusion The plan and supporting documents use Mineral Strategy assessments and Sustainability Appraisal assessments that are frequently contradictory, inaccurate or even dishonest. The individual site assessment within the plan variously (or randomly?) uses commentary from either or both assessments. The plan has not been prepared positively "demanding that comments should only concern legality and compliance effectively discourages most people from commenting. The plan is unsound and in many areas illegal. Comment by category Our comments by 2014 Mineral Strategy and 2017 Sustainability Appraisal are given below; Site appraisal criteria C1&C3 - Impact on European/International/national designations: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 2) AS19 is within 50m of the River Frome SSSI. There are watercourses in the site that drain through the SSSI into the river and on into Poole Harbour SPA. The site assessment Criteria C1 assesses the impact as "E-Positive" claiming that it will result in loss of Nitrates from the land. It must therefore be possible for other detrimental contaminants such as silt, iron, and chemical flocculants from quarrying operations to use this pathway. The site cannot therefore meet the criteria of category D which states "Site has no possible pathway to international nature conservation designations". It should automatically be put into category A. The SA Sustainability Objective claims there to be a strong positive impact without carrying out a Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment of the site. At best the Effect should be scored as Uncertain at such an early stage and without an Appropriate Assessment. The plan does not recognise anywhere that higher than expected silt levels in Woodsford quarry can only be managed using flocculents in silt lagoons. The plan does not indicate how this silt will be managed in watercourses crossing the site. The Planning Inspectorate interpretation of the Habitat directive (below) is that any project is to be subject to an Appropriate Assessment if it cannot be proven, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no significant effect on that site (a precautionary approach). This has not been done. The Dorset Mineral Strategy 7.44 (below) requires a detailed assessment of ecological and hydrological implications for sites close to SSSIs before they are taken forward into the Mineral Sites Plan. This has not been done. The HRA screening document used in support of the plan (below) says that AS19 was previously assessed as having likely significant effects "which requires it to have an Appropriate Assessment. But then goes on to say that following discussions with Natural England it was deemed that there should not be significant effects. A discussion does not constitute an Appropriate Assessment. No Appropriate Assessments have been carried out to determine, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there are no significant effects. Allocation of this site fails to meet the requirements of law and local policy. The plan is illegal and unsound. Additional supporting references and arguments Natural England's SSSI notification describes the River Frome as; "The most westerly example of a major chalk stream in Great Britain. The SSSI section (Dorchester to Wareham) supports an aquatic and bank side vegetation which shows a downstream transition from a purely chalk stream community type to a lowland, mixed geology community in the lowermost reaches. These plant communities are species-rich compared with like communities on other rivers. The site also supports rare and scarce aquatic invertebrates, a characteristic assemblage of breeding riverside birds and a range of fish species which includes some of particular importance in a European context." The Government's Planning Inspectorate HRA web site states; (our bold emphasis) "Under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, an Appropriate Assessment is required where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect upon a European site, either individually or in combination with other projects. "Any plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the sites conservation objectives" Article 6(3) This Article has been interpreted as meaning that any project is to be subject to an appropriate assessment if it cannot be

The site assessment should be reassessed in compliance with local and national policy.

proven, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that there is no significant effect on that site (a precautionary approach) , either alone or in combination with other plans or projects” Dorset Mineral Strategy states; (our bold emphasis) “ 7.44 - No sites will be brought forward for sand and gravel which fall within and/or are likely to affect European or internationally designated nature conservation sites. Nationally designated SSSIs are also afforded statutory protection. Detailed assessment of the ecological and hydrological implications of sand and gravel working in the resource blocks close to European or international sites will be necessary to support sites to be taken forward into the Mineral Sites Plan . Where significant doubts remain over possible effects on European sites, a precautionary approach to avoid inclusion of such sites will be taken. DCCs Nov 2017 Habitats Regulation Assessment screening exercise in support of the Draft Mineral Site Plan states; (our bold emphasis) 7.4 Sites previously assessed as having likely significant effects Four sites were previously assessed as having the potential to cause likely significant effects. However, site visits, provision of further information and discussions with Natural England resulted in the conclusion that allocation of the sites would not lead to likely significant effect on the relevant European sites, a conclusion reflected in earlier iterations of this HRA. The text below provides information on how this conclusion was reached. 7.4.1 AS-19 Woodsford Quarry Extension, Woodsford and AS-26 Hurst Farm, Moreton These allocations lie adjacent to and south of the river Frome. The proximity of the sites to a river which flows into the Poole Harbour SPA and RAMSAR sites led to concerns that pollutants (silt and disturbed nutrients such as nitrate and phosphates) from activities associated with the mineral permissions would affect the European sites. However, discussions with Natural England resulted in the agreement that standard pollution controls, required via environmental permitting and the conditions of the mineral permission should ensure that these impacts never rise above the threshold of significance . A safeguard was put in place by including wording in the relevant policy (MS-1) stating that development must not adversely affect the integrity of the European sites (see Sect 8 below). In addition, the development guidelines for these sites refer to the potential for restoration to large scale wetlands once mineral extraction is complete. This would contribute towards overall reduction in phosphate, nitrate and sediment load in the river, and would therefore have a positive impact on the Poole Harbour SPA and RAMSAR. Dorset Mineral Strategy Assessment Criteria C1: “Very Significant Adverse Impact - Site would have indirect impacts on an SPA, SAC or Ramsar site, or is functionally linked to such a designated habitat.” Whereas the assessment has been marked as “ Negligible impact - Site has no possible pathway to international nature conservations designations”. Site Appraisal Criteria C2 “ Impact on areas used by Annex 1 bird species: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 2) The site assessment Criteria C2 assesses the impact as “D-Negligible/no impact” The SA marks as negligible or no Effect . Neither mark can be defended given that it is not clear from any of the documentation whether ancient hedgerows including mature trees will be retained. The plan is unsound. Site Appraisal Criteria C4 “ Impact on protected species: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 2) Criteria C4 assesses the impact as “D-Negligible/no impact” . It makes no comment on what species might possibly be affected. This is completely at odds with the SA. The SA Sustainability has been marked as negligible or no Effect . It mentions water voles (Nationally protected) and otters (European protected) in the water courses but fails to mention other protected species for example birds, bats (European protected), dormice (European protected), Heath Lobelia (Nationally protected) In the adjacent SNCI. The SA dismisses impact on water voles as ..mitigation should not be difficult. Neither assessment can be defended given that the site & adjacent area contains some if not all of the protected species above and that waterways will be destroyed and hydrology altered. It is not clear from any of the documentation whether ancient hedgerows including mature trees will be retained. Given the site is known to support European protected species it should be marked as having a very significant adverse impact/strong negative impac The plan is unsound and possibly illegal. Site Appraisal Criteria C5 “ Impact on local recognitions/designations, including ancient woodland and veteran trees: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 2) The Hurst Heath SNCI is within 150m. The site contains hedges and trees that are shown on the 1776 estate maps and parish boundary hedges that go back much further. The site assessment Criteria C5 assesses the impact as “D-Not significant or negligible ” Site contains no local significant features of importance for wildlife “ The SA Sustainability has been marked as negligible or no Effect . There is no indication anywhere in the site specific documents of whether the important or ancient hedgerows and veteran trees will be removed or retained As in C1&C3 above. DCC have assessed there is a pathway that can reduce nitrates entering the river ” so a pathway exists. This pathway is a route by which contaminants associated with quarrying can enter the river. Saying that the site contains no

significant features of importance to wildlife is clearly nonsense. The assessment at this stage must therefore be a category A - "Very Significant Adverse Impact - Site contains or has potential for direct or indirect impacts on a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR); or other features of importance for wildlife and geology " The plan is Unsound. Site Appraisal Criteria C6 " Impact on geodiversity: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 3) The site assessment Criteria C6 assesses the impact as "D- Not significant or negligible " Site contains known features of interest that may be modified but not damaged or lost by the proposals. This is patently untrue given the intent to remove 2.1 mt of gravel. The SA Sustainability has been marked as minor positive effect even though quarrying will destroy the existing topography. This site should be classified as category C until assessed by the Quaternary Research Association. The plan is unsound Site Appraisal Criteria C8 " What is landscape capacity to accommodate proposed development: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 7) The site assessment Criteria C8 assesses the impact as C " minor negative . The SA Sustainability has been marked as restoration/after use as negligible/no effect. This is complete nonsense given given the proposed complete change of landscape from fields to ponds . Mineral Strategy paragraph 3.20 states that "Achieving high quality restoration, at the earliest possible opportunity , is an integral part of all minerals development." The existing Woodsford quarry has failed to meet its planning condition restoration obligations since quarrying operations started 9 years ago despite being within the setting of Grade 1 listed Woodsford Castle. This makes a mockery of claims frequently made by DCC of rolling programmes of restoration with minimal disturbance. The plan is unsound Site Appraisal Criteria C9,10,11 " Impact on historic landscapes, buildings & archaeology (Sustainability Appraisal objective 6) The site is part of Hardys "Valley of the great dairies". The larger area of Hardys "Egdon Heath" will become part of the Dorset National Park in 5-6 years. The site assessment Criteria C9,10&11 assesses the impact as impact from " A-D - very significant adverse to negligible impact . The supporting commentary even refers to a different site. The SA Sustainability has been variously marked as from negligible to no effect to uncertain. Nowhere does it recognize the destruction of an 18 th century water meadow landscape and archaeology. This should be assessed as a strong negative impact. The plan and the supporting heritage assessment do not correctly identify historic buildings. Gravel from this site will be processed at the processing plant which is close to grade 1 Woodsford Castle. There is no assessment of the additional requirement for silt settling lagoons which will be in the historic setting of The Castle. It inexplicably claims that "the restoration proposals are sufficient to conform with literary associations of this part of Dorset particularly the Valley of the Dairies created by Thomas Hardy." It is clearly nonsense to equate restoration to ponds with dairy land. The plan does not make clear whether ancient hedges and trees will be kept or removed. There is no recognition that the site will be part of the Dorset National Park so does not take into account the impact of NPPF 115 &116 on the plan. The assessments and commentary are inaccurate and contradictory. The plan is unsound. Supporting documents Please refer to Oxford Archaeology Associates 2015 and January 2018 consultation response. Site Appraisal Criteria C12 " Impact on hydrogeology or groundwater: Sustainability Appraisal objective 4 The site assessment Criteria C5 assesses the impact as C " minor negative . Commenting that Site is "within 250m of licensed water supplies. Overlies secondary aquifer. Does not affect any SPZ." According to the criteria definition in the Mineral Strategy being within 250m of a water supply is an impact B "Significant adverse impact" The SA Sustainability has been marked as as negligible/no effect but then comments "Assessment is required to determine possible impacts..." Quarrying disturbs groundwater flow and releases sediments, impacting on water courses. Despite this no hydrogeological study has been carried out to support any of the assessments. The plan is unsound. Site Appraisal Criteria C13 " Impact on surface water: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 4) AS19 sits in the valley of the River Frome and surface water drainage is accomplished by a series of ditches and streams which run with water throughout all seasons. The whole system of land drains, ditches and streams drain to the River Frome SSSI. The site assessment Criteria C13 correctly assesses that as there will be surface water within the site the impact as "A - Very significant adverse impact ." The SA on the other hand completely fails to recognise the very significant adverse impact and even says there could be a strong positive impact. The marking is inconsistent and misleading. The plan is unsound. Site Appraisal Criteria C14 " Impact on flooding or coastal stability: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 5) The site assessment Criteria C13 assesses the impact as "E " positive impact ." but then goes on to comment that " Small amount of northern part of site is covered by FRZ 2+3." According to policy this should be a level D criteria " negligible impact. The SA recognises that parts of the site are in a FRZ2+3 and marks the

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>impact as negligible. DCCs December 2017 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Appendix A correctly identifies that parts of the site are in FRZ2+3. Then in the individual site assessment section the lead local flood authority comments that; "the site falls entirely within flood Zone 1." Which is incorrect. The plans assessments are inconsistent and misleading. The plan is unsound. Site Appraisal Criteria C15 " Impact on existing soils or land type (including BMV land) (Sustainability Appraisal objective 9) Summary The site assessment Criteria C15 assesses the impact as "B>C " Significant to less significant adverse impact ." The SA states there will be no effect and comments that "restoration will return land to original ground levels and will restore the quality of the land." This implies that the site will become an inert landfill site which is completely at odds with other parts of the plan that say BMV agricultural land will be lost to wetland. The 2014 mineral strategy states for Extensive permanent loss and/or destruction of soil and/or permanent loss should be marked as "A " serious adverse impact" The plans assessment is contradictory and misleading. The plan is unsound. Site Appraisal Criteria C17 - Impact on Economic Development: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 13) The site assessment Criteria C17 assesses the impact as "C>D " less to no significant adverse impact ." The SA marks the impact from minor positive to minor negative impact. There is no acknowledgment in the plan to the Dorset National Park which will encompass this site and is expected to happen in 5-6 years so takes no account of NPPF paras 115&116 on the plan. There is no proper assessment of the impact on local businesses like "Sculptures by the Lake". The plan is unsound Site Appraisal Criteria C18 - Impact on sensitive human receptors: (Sustainability Appraisal objective 17) The site assessment Criteria C18 assesses the impact as "C " less significant adverse impact ." And comments that there are two residents within the site. This according to the 2015 Mineral Strategy should be assessed as " A " significant adverse impact - Site proposal is adjacent to/upwind of a sensitive receptor, with no natural screening". The SA marks the impact from minor negative impact. It fails to identify that there are houses inside the site. The assessment is inaccurate. The plan is unsound . Site Appraisal Criteria C21 - Effects on Cumulative Impacts and amenity (Sustainability Appraisal objective 15?) The site assessment Criteria C18 assesses the impact as "B " significant adverse impact ." Proposed site is a new site or an extension to an existing site, in an area where there is other mineral working OR other large scale built development within 5 km The SA marks the impact as negligible or no effect. The assessments are contradictory. The plan is unsound</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 551	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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 Predominantly Flood Zone 1, but very small part of site shown to lie within Flood 3 and 2. Therefore a Sequential Test may be needed to determine whether there are any other sites with lower flood risk. We highlight that only water compatible uses (this does include sand and gravel extraction) as defined by the NPPF are permitted within the Functional Floodplain (FZ3b). No processing works, compounds, buildings etc. would be permitted within FZ3b. The Local Authority SFRA may be used as a guide for allocation however this is Level 1 so is not a detailed assessment. The approach taken within Level 1 SFRA's was to assume FZ3b to be the same as FZ3 if no detailed assessment was available. A more detailed strategic Flood Risk Assessment may therefore be required to determine the FZ3 and FZ3b outlines, should it be proposed to carry it forward to the next stage. A detailed site specific FRA to look at the impact of the proposals on local flood risk would also be required. It would be the most efficient use of resource to undertake this at the same time as determining the Flood Zones. Our prior written Flood Defence Consent is required under the Water Resources Act and Land Drainage Bylaws for all works in, under, over or within 8m of the Main River. The prior written Land Drainage Consent is required from the LLFA (DCC) for works that could affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse. Fisheries and Biodiversity Ecological survey would be required. Groundwater, water quality and abstraction It needs to be ensured that there are no impacts from this development and no increased sedimentation on the River Frome or any other waterbodies in the vicinity. We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. Hydrogeological assessment required to assess any possible impact on groundwater recharge, flows and levels as well as to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for the site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Flood Risk Assessment Protect and enhance water features in site. Ecological study Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment, as appropriate</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 338	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry extension	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	<p>We have commented previously that the risk of pollution to the River Frome SSSI is a significant issue. We are satisfied that the issue is adequately covered but would recommend that the specific technical advice of the Environment Agency is closely followed.</p> <p>The potential for significant public benefits from a wetland restoration is explained in the restoration vision but in our view this text does not fully capture the significance of the multiple public benefits that could be achieved.</p> <p>Thus recent work has shown that a reduction of some 1000 tonnes of nitrogen annually to Poole Harbour is required but only about half of this is likely to be achieved through agricultural measures and most of these will not begin to reduce nitrogen for upwards of 30 years (because of nitrogen already in the chalk aquifer). Wetland restorations at Woodford, Hurst Farm and Philliols Farm, with the wetlands hydrologically linked to the nearby rivers, together could reduce nitrogen inputs to Poole Harbour by some 150 tonnes annually which in this context is highly significant. Other benefits would include flood alleviation and biodiversity gain as well as recreational opportunities.</p> <p>We would recommend that these restoration opportunities are better reflected and encouraged by the Plan through the addition to Policy MS-1 suggested below. Any proposal for the development of any of these allocations must address the development considerations set out for each site in Appendix A and work towards achieving public benefits within the restoration vision, as well as addressing any other matters relevant to the development of each proposed allocation, and demonstrating.</p>	
PSD - MSP 375	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry extension	Mrs Clarice Wicken den	FRAME (Frome Residents Against Mineral Extraction)	Please see report attached to this representation.	
PSD - MSP 379	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry	Mr Spencer Jefferies	National Grid	Please see report attached to this representation.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 316	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry extension	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	DWT is pleased to see that the restoration vision for both these sites includes the possibility of a large scale wetland restoration scheme which would help with flood alleviation, contribute towards overall reduction in Phosphate, Nitrogen and sediment downstream on the River Frome and in Poole Harbour and create habitats which would benefit protected species such as otter and water vole as well as wetland birds.	
PSD - MSP 370	Figure 15	Woodford Quarry	Mr Simon Collcutt	Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd	Please see report attached to this representation.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 538	Figure 15	Woodsford Quarry extension	Paul Wyatt	Woodsford Farms Ltd	<p>The identification of this site is supported. It is recognised that the southern and western fields (outside the flood plain) are potentially best and most versatile (BMV) land, much of the northern low lying fields are not, due to the regular flooding.</p> <p>The Restoration Vision is acceptable, but as part of the viability of the future of the farm holding, the BMV land needs to be restored to agriculture, and this needs to be reflected.</p> <p>Of importance is the potential for cumulative impact. As this site is identified as the next principal 'phase' of Woodsford Quarry, it is important that it is developed ahead of the adjoining site AS26. This would avoid any cumulative impacts as well as provide the alternative of the minerals from AS26 being removed by conveyor to Woodsford Quarry. This alternative would have noticeably less impact, particularly in light of the access comments relating to the B3390.</p> <p>Other: Suggested amendment to the second sentence in italics below: <i>The southern and western half of the site is BMV agricultural land and protection and appropriate management of soils is required to enable the land to be restored to agriculture to retain its longer term capability.</i></p> <p>Suggested amendment to the fourth sentence in italics below: <i>In order to avoid cumulative impacts with other mineral working in this area, this site should be developed before the Hurst Farm site AS26 in order to maintain a steady supply from Woodsford Quarry. The mineral in the Hurst Farm site will be developed after completion of the site, ideally with the Hurst Farm mineral being taken by conveyor to Woodsford Quarry, as this will avoid any traffic impacts on the B3390. Impacts on existing/proposed housing must be taken into consideration.</i></p> <p>Restoration vision Suggested amendments to both paragraphs in italics below: The site is within the Pasture Valley Landscape Type of the Frome Valley, a predominantly flat landform creating a multifunctional landscape, <i>which includes</i> recreation and amenity <i>as well as</i> agriculture, <i>nature conservation and flood water management.</i></p> <p>Post mineral working, <i>the land will be returned to agriculture with the capability of returning to BMV with the northern lower lying area providing the opportunity to create multifunctional green infrastructure links across and along the valley linking to adjacent centres of population.</i> This could include grazing pasture and/or a large scale wetland restoration scheme with significant recreational opportunities, which would contribute to flood alleviation, contribute towards overall reduction in Phosphate, Nitrogen and sediment load in the lower reaches of River Frome and Poole Harbour to create habitat for the conservation of protected species such as otter and water vole as well as many species of wetland bird.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 7	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr A P Read		<p>Criterion C10 " Impact on historic buildings. Is not factually correct and states; Station Road is lined on both sides with an informal avenue of trees and shrubs. The two closest listed buildings are sited to face along the road rather than across it at the site therefore provided that the avenue of trees is retained there will be no significant impact on these buildings or their settings.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Moreton Conservation Area. In fact the two closest properties within the conservation area lie less than 100mtrs from the proposed development and face the development across the Road with hardly any natural screening as the majority of trees are immature and of less than 20cm dia. Thus the development will not only have a significant impact on health and quality of life, but also total loss of day to day visual amenity.</p>	A full visual survey giving thought to ground plane sight of view, from standing and horse back, from all areas surrounding the proposed development should be undertaken including views from the nearby Fir Hill and Moreton Obelisk(currently on Historic Englands at risk register.
PSD - MSP 93	Figure 16	Station Road	Mrs Rita Palmer		I wish to object to the plan to extract sand and gravel from AS25 Station Road and AS26 Hurst Farm. I have been a resident in this exceptional village for 60 years and my late husband worked for the Moreton Estate under previous generations of the Frampton Family. I know AS25 as Bramble Field and in those days, the landowning family were passionate about maintaining its pastoral qualities. They will be turning in their graves if they knew what was being proposed by the current custodian of the Estate.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 58	Figure 16	Station Road	M Rendal I Blythe		<p>I wanted to make a comment re. the consultation into the mineral quarrying particularly in relation to Moreton, and Lawrence of Arabia grave. Plus the further consideration of Employ My Ability, I don't know whether I can make comment here.. perhaps someone can advise, I did not know about this potential plan until mentioned on the news today.. . I must admit I am somewhat taken aback... this area is a jewel in the crown.... Lawrence is very important to the area, to Dorset visitors are attracted to the area because of him. .. and then to the beautiful church, with the famous Whistler windows... very important too, should be considered the impact on Employ My Ability, who are based just next to the graveyard.. you will be aware they are a college, that offers education and work experience to young people with learning disabilities. The operation runs on community ethos lines.. people visit the grounds, Moreton walled gardens etc.. the dovecot cafe, they are served by the young people who work in the grounds.. etc.. if people are put off visiting the area, because it is effectively trashed, or rather the surroundings are insensitively impacted, the college might very well lose revenue.. the young people will lose work experience. Plus it must be stressed that some of these young folk are hyper sensitive to sounds, being on the Autistic spectrum in some cases.. what level of damage could be done to them.. how intolerable could the noise be to them. In some cases, some of the young people may have to leave, in the worst case scenario. People do not appreciate how intolerable some sounds can be to some people. I fear that the extraction, the noise could damage the college, could damage the trade that nearby local businesses have with visitors attracted by the loveliness and tranquillity of the area, it will damage what is of historical importance, lessen the likelihood of people visiting Moreton full stop. It could damage the college, lessen the money coming into the college, money that they acquire from people having weddings in the venue and other parties, damage the college etc.. extracting minerals might be important, but the impact, on humans, individuals, young peoples whose lives are already challenging in some cases, and are harder than many... would be so utterly sad.. I really really hope that this quarrying is not allowed in Moreton, because the impact would be so very damaging to a beautiful area, a real jewel in the crown of Dorset. thank you for your time.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 209	Figure 16	Station Road	Mrs Marjorie Brewer		<p>For my comments I would refer you to the content of the very detailed responses to the pre-submission draft Minerals Site Plan which you have already received from the FRAME residents action group and Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd, which I fully endorse and support and would urge that you fully investigate the many points they have raised detailing the reasons why the inclusion of the three sites, AS19, AS25 and AS26 is unsound and why they should be deleted from the Minerals Site Plan.</p> <p>As someone whose property lies in very close proximity to the proposed site, AS25 Station Road, Moreton, I wish to object to the inclusion of this site in the draft Minerals Site Plan and do not believe that proper investigation has been made into the damaging effects of the cumulative impacts of the proposed quarry, and the adjacent AS19 Woodsford extension and AS26 Hurst Farm quarries, on the natural environment of the Frome valley, quality of life for local residents, traffic levels and the local area generally for many years to come.</p> <p>The statement that AS25 and AS26 will not be worked together is misleading as, if the quarried material from AS25 is to be processed at AS26, then during the life of AS25 work with its associated noise, dust, other pollution and lorry movements will be on-going at both locations. I would also query the number of lorry movements as for both sites the number is assessed at 40 in and 40 out movements per day but, if these figures are for the lorries transporting material between the sites (which would be the same), then where are the figures for the lorries transporting material from AS26 Hurst Quarry to the wider county and beyond? The danger posed by these lorry movements on the totally unsuitable B3390 must not be under-estimated.</p>	<p>For my comments I would refer you to the content of the very detailed responses to the pre-submission draft Minerals Site Plan which you have already received from the FRAME residents action group and Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd, which I fully endorse and support and would urge that you fully investigate the many points they have raised detailing the reasons why the inclusion of the three sites, AS19, AS25 and AS26 is unsound and why they should be deleted from the Minerals Site Plan.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
284

Figure
16

Station Road

Mr
John
Evans

Criterion C21 Cumulative Effects The Sustainability Assessment says in respect of AS25 and AS26: "There are no sites allocated for major development in the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 (adopted Nov 2012) within 5 km of the proposal. The emerging Purbeck District Council Plan has considered housing development in the vicinity, as has the emerging West Dorset District Council plan."

The Site Assessments for AS25, AS26 and AS19 says something slightly different, although pointing to a potentially higher number of houses: The proposal is within 5Km of a site to the south of Crossways village with permission for up to 99 houses, with some 400 to follow along with associated employment. Permission for 84 homes has been granted north-west of Crossways, for up to 1,000 homes at Silverlake (on the former Warmwell quarry site) and further development is under consideration for the area (at both Crossways and Moreton). As regards Purbeck DC, both are not entirely clear as to the real position. In January 2018 Purbeck DC issued a postal consultation on new Homes which contains 3 options: Option A: includes around 440 homes on the site of Moreton Pit quarry i.e close to AS25 Option B: includes around 500 homes on the site of Moreton Pit quarry i.e close to AS25 Option C: includes around 500 homes on the site of Moreton Pit quarry AND around 100 homes almost directly opposite what would be the entrance to AS25. Purbeck DC There are no options that do not include at least 440 new homes in Moreton. In addition to the 99 + 84 + 1000 homes already approved by West Dorset DC (and noted in the site assessments), the Dorset Echo reported on 16/11/2017 (as did the BBC on 17/11/2017): "A huge development of 500 homes and employment land which will transform a community is set to take a major step forward today. The vast development, earmarked for farmland at Crossways, also includes a new village hall and village green, doctor's surgery, car parking, allotments, two pumping stations, landscaping features and large areas of managed open space. The scheme covers a total area of 44 hectares " the size of the Vatican City in Rome " and would effectively create another 'half' of Crossways" This means the prospect of over between 2,150 and 2,500 new homes very close to the B3390; and this ignores the long-term aspirations of Woodsford Farms to erect housing on the site of the existing Woodsford Quarry.

This makes the cumulative impacts in relation to noise, dust, traffic, pollution, tranquillity, loss of farmland and the environment even more important.

As regards traffic, most travel-to-work traffic from these 2,200+ new homes will go north along the B3390, an aspect NOT considered by DCC's Transport Assessment in December 2016. I have commented elsewhere on the incompatibility of quarry HGVs with the northern section of the B3390. In addition it makes a mockery of restoration 'promises' given for new quarries - almost certainly, when Moreton Pit (and Woodsford Quarry) was given permission it, it is unlikely that the proposed restoration was to build a housing estate! These proposal just serve to create mistrust of ALL so-called restoration plans and 'promises'

The Dorset Echo article also states: "Like many areas in Crossways, the site sits on sand and gravel deposits so there is a separate plan to extract up to 131,000 tonnes from part of the land. Dorset County Council is asking for this to be done before the site is "sterilised" by the development." The site is reported to be 'south of the Warmwell Road. THERE IS NO PROPOSED QUARRY IN THE MINERALS SITE PLAN IN THIS PART OF CROSSWAYS SO THIS 131,000 TONNES IS IN ADDITION TO THAT PROVIDED FOR BY THAT PLAN.

In light of these emerging housing development plans, AS25 should be dropped from the Sites Plan

PSD
-
MSP
230

Figure
16

Station Road

Mrs
Clarice
Wickenden

FRAME
(Frome
Residents
Against
Mineral
Extraction)

Question 3 " Do you consider this section of the document is sound/unsound because it is/is not: (please select either Yes or No) ; the grammar uses double negatives in this question this is very ambiguous. The way it is constructed is confusing and gives rise to misleading answers; perhaps this is so that Dorset County Council (DCC) can use the answers as being in favour of the Plan? This is a serious flaw repeated throughout the consultation and therefore the consultation itself is unsound, so not legally compliant. I am a member of Frome Residents Against Minerals Extraction (FRAME) and refer you to their submission for a more in depth response. I support all of the assertions in that submission pertaining to AS-19, AS-25 + AS-26. Also please refer to FRAMEs previous consultation response to the Draft Plan 2015. There is a well publicised proposal to make Dorset a National Park (NP); the area includes all three proposed minerals extraction sites (AS-25, AS-26 + AS-19). DEFRA have stated that a Dorset NP could be in place within the next 5-6 years, well within the time-line of the Minerals Plan. NP status recognises that the key virtues for Dorset are the environment, tourism, landscape and heritage, such a designation strives to promote the safeguarding of all of these assets as well as attracting investment, jobs, truly affordable housing and Agri-environment funding. The Plan does not reflect the legal obligation to consider the impact of minerals extraction in a Dorset NP designated area, the Plan is unsound. The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Pre-Submission Plan (the Plan) has a Plan period end date of 2033. The Plan states that sites AS-19, AS-26 and AS-25 will not be worked simultaneously and that extraction will progress from the current Woodsford site eastwards, taking approximately 17 years (to 2036) to exhaust AS-26. Therefore operations at AS-25 will not begin until beyond the time-line of the Plan. AS-25 is not justified to be included in the Plan. The applicant is legally obliged to undertake appropriate assessments. Of the assessments that have been done for AS-25 and AS-26 the vast majority have been commissioned by DCC, at the tax payers expense. There is insufficient evidence of these sites for anyone to make an informed opinion. The applicant has not followed obligations of due legal process, therefore these sites can not be justified and the Plan is not legally compliant. Natural Environment AS-25 is situated 750 metres of an EU designated heath land site (Winfrith and Tadnoll), (and within close proximity to Hurst Heath). There has not been a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) which is in contravention of the EC Habitats Directive. Also, AS-25 drains into the River Frome, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)(900 metres downstream) which in turn flows into the internationally Ramsar designated Poole Harbour (also a SSSI, SPA and SAC). Therefore it is impossible to ascertain what the impact of extracting 3.1 million tons of minerals at this site will have on EU designated sites. The Plan is unsound and not legally compliant. There are 2km of ancient tithe hedgerows within AS-25, with numerous 200 year old oak trees. It is well known that these wildlife corridors provide food and shelter for various species to commute from one habitat to another. If these are fragmented or scrubbed out there is always an inevitable decline in wildlife species. This is an area known for natural wildlife habitats for flora and fauna, of note are: Bats, owls, nightingales, stoats, butterflies, and nightjars in neighbouring heath land. Heath Lobelia (a rare bog plant) is on the adjacent Hurst Heath (AS-26). There is anecdotal evidence of Heath Lobelia (Nationally rare, threat of extinction: very high, main threats are changes in habitat management , habitat loss) on AS-25. It is Schedule 8 Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) protected, NERC Act (2006) listed and a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) Priority Species. Without a HRA Assessment the Plan is not legally compliant. Historical/Cultural Environment Conservation Area (CA): Moreton is one of Dorsets historic estates made up of Moreton Park (the landscaped setting for Moreton House (Grade 1 Listed)), vernacular buildings (41 Listed Buildings/Recorded Monuments within 1km of AS-25). Many are in the planned extension to the settlement laid out during the eighteenth century (15 Listed and 7 Recorded Monuments within 500metres of AS-25). The CA includes the burial place of T.E Lawrence and the world famous Whistler etched windows in St Nicholas church (both Grade 11 Listed). Quarrying operations would adversely alter the elements of the CAs setting, its character, interest, integrity, the health and vitality of the landscape and heritage assets (these being of local, national and international

significance). Extracting minerals within the settings of Moreton CA will cause direct, indirect and cumulative harmful impacts. The objectives of this plan are unsustainable and do not present any opportunities for the historic environment ; there would be no contribution to the significant asset, no heritage value either to present or future generations. The proximity of AS-25 to residential buildings will be detrimental to the surroundings, giving rise to ugly views, exposure to noise, dust, vibration and light pollution. There would be a permanent change to the general character of the landscape, context and viability of the CA. Minerals extraction would contravene the CA status which gives a high priority to securing high quality design both within the CA and their settings; having particular regard for the areas character. Destroying the present landscape, vistas, flora and fauna will permanently change all of these assets; restoration to the areas present form will be unattainable. The levels of assessments to date are inadequate and inconsistent; it is impossible for anyone to make an informed opinion based on the current Plan. The return on minerals extraction from AS-25 is disproportionate to the adverse impact on the assets and non-designated assets ; the group value of Listed Buildings, Recorded Monuments and historical relationships within the village. Quarrying operations will cause maximum harm to this CA, an area of the highest significance. The special nature of the area is of rural features with Listed Buildings, Recorded Monuments, ancient trees and hedgerows, landscape and environment, all of which amounts to a tranquil amenity. If this is compromised then the current tourist, equestrian, cycling and, importantly, farming economy will be destroyed, along with its special character. These loses will be high, any gains will be for a few (the applicant/landowner and developer). Within the Context One Heritage Assessment, November 2017, the extent of the Area of Search (AoS) (500 metres) has been determined without due regard for the whole CA. The Plan therefore is unsound and introduces the presumption in favour of development that will adversely impact the tranquillity and amenity of the whole designated CA. Hydrology/Flood Risk AS-25 has a network of 6 deep drainage channels that maintain ground water levels. However, every winter there is significant rainfall that causes surface water pools. These pools remain for 2-6 weeks before groundwater levels drop enough for water to drain into the water courses that lead into the River Frome. The Plan states that " there is some theoretical risk of surface water flooding..." , It is a fact that surface water regularly occurs and that extraction operations would destroy the drains. The removal of land drains will cause increased flooding and put the many cob cottages at risk of collapse. The Plan has ignored these facts and is unsound by introducing a presumption in favour of development that will adversely impact the ground and surface water levels. Transport/Access The Traffic Impact Assessment carried out in 2016 is not accurate; it does not demonstrate traffic flows at peak times or the cumulative impact of lorries associated with aggregates recycling and building developments (eg Silverlakes 1000 dwellings). This is an inadequate basis on which to form any highways related evaluation and so is unsound. Access to both AS-25 and AS-26 will be directly onto the B3390. Increased lorry movements on the B3390 will cause other road users frustration and lead to an increased risk of accidents. Accidents on this stretch have a high risk of fatality as there is no footpath from Moreton station to Moreton village, where many people walk or cycle to visit tourist attractions. A reduction in visitors will adversely affect the local economy. Slowing lorries turning into the site assess will cause other drivers to overtake, this will be the case twice on a short stretch of the B3390 due to additional lorry movements back and forth for aggregate processing on AS-26 (Hurst Farm). Lorries will be travelling in both directions at the same time on the same stretch of road. It is assumed in the Plan that lorries will travel south from AS-25, this will not be obligatory and ignores the narrow bends in Affpuddle and Warmwell and narrow bridges north of AS-25. Vehicle accidents are a regular occurrence on the B3390 and the Waddock Cross to Bovington road (leading to the A35 and A31). The Waddock Cross junction is notoriously dangerous with poor visibility and Hurst Bridges constantly have to be repaired. There are three narrow bridges within a 100 metre stretch of road; large heavily loaded lorries straddle the white line to pass through, Hurst Bridge is single file traffic only, forcing other road users into crumbling road edges. Station Road is a

popular National cycleway (Sustrans route 2), horse riding and walking/running route. Hundreds of people cycle this route regularly for travel to work, leisure and organised competitive events. The crossing junction of Station Road with the B3390 will be far more dangerous as heavy lorries reduce/increase their speed on the approaches to AS-25 and AS-26. The additional lorry movements on this section will increase the risk of other road users overtaking and subsequently increase the dangers to walkers, cyclists and horse riders negotiating this junction. An adequate traffic assessment must properly evaluate accident blackspots, narrow bridges and all types of heavy vehicles on the bridges and winding roads through the villages of Warmwell and Affpuddle. In addition the assessment must accurately reflect peak travel to work/home, seasonal tourist traffic (including caravans/motorhomes) levels and the cumulative impact of all proposed developments. Landscape/Visual The Plan states that there will be significant adverse impact on the boundary hedges and trees. This "significant impact" will be the destruction of approximately 2km of ancient hedgerows and hundreds of 200 year old trees, important landscape features that contribute to the settings of the CA and Moreton parkland. Station road (known locally as The Avenue) is an avenue of old oak trees and is situated within the CA, a vista of mineral extraction operations through these trees would be totally out of keeping with the area. A number of residential buildings have direct visual line of sight across AS-25, deciduous trees do not afford screening, particularly in winter when there are no leaves on the trees. Buffer zones will not mitigate against noise, dust, vibration and light pollution. Bunding is not appropriate adjacent to a CA. The standard used to manage mineral site noise (BS5228) acknowledges that bunds are not effective at distances over 350metres. With prevailing westerly winds recorded most days sensitive receptors in Moreton will be constantly subjected to noise and dust from both AS-25 and AS-26, compromising the amenity of the CA. The newly built Moreton village hall is situated within the playing field facing south towards AS-25. This very active community centre was built in 2014 funded by the Big Lottery and various other funders; it is a thriving hall and a popular venue for yoga, social gatherings, meetings, dance classes, wedding receptions, musical events and much more. Apart from the excellent facilities within the hall its main assets are the wonderful vista south across the playing field and on through to AS-25 (the wall of windows/bifolding doors were designed to take full advantage of this natural landscape), and the tranquil environment. AS-25 is just 100m from the hall; any mineral extraction operations would totally compromise the setting and viability of this community centre. The Plan is unsound in that does not give due regard for the Conservation Area status, and the sensitive nature of the visual aspect of the landscape or the tranquil amenity. Other Good quality agricultural land will be destroyed during extraction operations. Research evidence shows that the quality of managed soil (top soil removed and stored for use in restoration) deteriorates within just 12 months. The land would be agriculturally unproductive during extraction operations (10+ years) and then a further period of restoration (10 years). The destruction of the land drains will make the possibility of long-term restoration to good productive agricultural land highly questionable. The Plan does not reflect due regard for good agricultural land, therefore the Plan is unsound, by introducing a presumption in favour of development that will adversely impact the nature, quality of the land and current economic value. The cumulative impact of current and additional mineral extraction sites combined with extensive housing proposals within the Moreton/Crossways area has been downgraded in favour of presumed development of both. Both the Minerals and Housing Plans over estimate requirements and would saturate the area, in combination they are incompatible. The current appraisals do not give due regard to the cumulative impact of the combined developments, therefore an informed opinion cannot be made, rendering the Plan unsound. Restoration Restoration, meaning: The action of restoring to its former condition The term restoration, although commonly used in minerals plans, is a misnomer as there has never been any example of true restoration to its former condition . Exhausted quarry sites are commonly used to recycle aggregates and/or for energy production, thus extending the life of industrial operations beyond the time-line of the Plan. If and when a site is, so called, restored

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>the site has permanently changed its structure and landscape and has been redeveloped into a new environment. Returning such sites to good productive agricultural land will take decades and a lot of investment, AS-25 has been farmed for 200 years. The claim in the Plan to restore the site to agricultural use and water features is an inaccurate claim, rendering the Plan unsound. The Plan is : Unsound Not positively prepared Ineffective Inconsistent with DCC policy Inconstant with national policy To make the Plan legally compliant and sound there must be: Accurate assessments (desk top assessments are not sufficient for anyone to make evaluations and informed opinions) Detailed assessments of the impacts on the highways and hydrology, with particular reference to risks of flooding The removal of the presumption in favour of development Recognition and due consideration of the Conservation Area, the proposed Dorset National Park designation, designated Heath-land and protected flora and fauna Conclusion The return on minerals extraction from AS-25 is disproportionate to the adverse impact on the assets and non-designated assets. AS-25 will not come into operation until beyond the time-line of the Plan. There is no justification for AS-25 to be retained in the Plan; I therefore request that this site is withdrawn.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
239

Figure
16

Station Road

Mr
John
Wicken
den

AS25 Station Road Site, Moreton abuts the Moreton Conservation Area and forms part of the gateway to the historic and tranquil village of Moreton. It is an important part of the Moreton Estate landscape leading to the historic village of Moreton, home of the Frampton Hobbs family, tearooms, church (famed for Whistler windows), TE Lawrences Grave (international significance), historic gardens (provides work for disadvantaged people), River Frome ford, woodland walks, national cycleway and horse riding. The whole area is pastoral, dominated by parkland, arable & dairy farming, very Thomas Hardy-esque. James Frampton in 1751 laid out much of the roads including the very picturesque avenue of mature Trees lining Station Road (locally known as The Avenue).

On the north side of Station Road are listed cottages and other significant cottages that directly look over the AS25 site. The new Moreton Village Hall (£0.5M investment) lies at the north eastern corner and its playing field is 50m from AS25. The hall and field is frequently used for social events and wedding receptions. In the western corner close to Moreton Station and the Frampton Arms (listed) lies Moreford Hall (a non-designated heritage asset) and another historic cottage directly on the AS25 border. A picturesque stream (runoff from AS25) runs along Station Road through Moreton gardens and enters the River Frome close to the Church and Moreton Ford (all Moreton Conservation Area).

The River Frome is an SSSI. Within a 500m radius of AS25 are 15 listed buildings, 7 recorded monuments (one within AS25). In addition there are another 17 listed buildings within 1km. AS25 lies on the East of the B3390 and is not contiguous with the huge super pits comprising the permitted Woodsford quarries and the proposed AS19 and AS26 sites.

AS25 has very different landscape qualities from that of AS19 and AS26 arising from its historic tithe field layout. The River Frome is an SSSI and the assessments have failed to recognise this adequately. Quarrying for 3 million tonnes of aggregate in a water logged area will create pollution and sediment which will affect the River Frome. The assessments (main plan, AS25 assessment and Sustainability Appraisal) do not follow the correct procedure for impacts on SSSIs and the down-stream Poole Harbour Ramsar site. The DCC marking bizarrely is green "minor positive benefit". The assessment is therefore not sound or legal (EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora). The assessments also fail to recognise the proximity of Dorset Heathland (Tadnoll Heath and Winfrith Heath) lie east at a distance of 950m and 1.5km respectively). Hurst Heath which contains the protected Heath Lobelia lies on the western edge and traverses into AS25. Heath Lobelia is classified as nationally rare, at high risk of extinction and hence protected under Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981).The DCC marking bizarrely is green "minor positive benefit". The assessment is therefore not sound or legal (EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora).

The Plan for AS25 will destroy 2km of ancient hedges which cross the site and contain ancient oak trees. The hedges and trees are all part of the ancient tithe field structure and provide important habitat corridors to surrounding woodland and heathland. Again the DCC marking bizarrely is green "minor positive benefit". The assessment is therefore not sound or legal (EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora).

Landscape: The Sustainability Appraisal does not reflect on the impact on the historic landscape or recognise the legal significance of the Moreton Conservation Area:- (1) It is a statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for Local Planning Authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Case law (see commentary in Forge Fields Society v Sevenoaks DC 2014) has confirmed that section 72 provides a strong

The assessments are consistently erroneous, lacking substance and generally unsound. The lack of adherence to law regarding Conservation Areas is particularly serious making many of the assessments for AS25 not legally compliant. AS25 was submitted late and with virtually no Applicant investigations on the issues as required by DCC's own policy. The DCC, using tax payers money, have filled in some gaps with studies commissioned since the 2015 consultation, but these state categorically that desk-based studies are insufficient to properly assess impact. The fact that the plan for AS25 is ill constructed and illegal means the site should be withdrawn now.

statutory presumption in favour of preservation (i.e. doing no harm). Section 72(1) is amplified in policy terms by the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular paragraphs 132 and 137) with reference to the overlapping concept of significance (heritage value), and setting. Policies LHH and D within the Purbeck Local Plan are material considerations. Conservation Area Appraisals form a key point of reference.

(2) Non-designated heritage assets Paragraph 135 of the NPPF directs that account should be taken of the impact of proposed works on any non-designated heritage asset. These are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which are not formally designated heritage assets. Conservation of non-designated heritage assets is also supported by Policy LHH in the Local Plan.

(3) Setting of listed buildings It is a statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. Case law (see commentary in Forge Fields Society v Sevenoaks DC 2014) has confirmed section 66(1) provides a strong statutory presumption in favour of preservation (i.e. doing no harm). Section 66(1) is amplified in policy terms by the National Planning Policy Framework (in particular paragraphs 132 and 137) with regard to the overlapping concept of significance (heritage value). Historic England advice note GPA3 provides guidance on assessment. Policies LHH and D within the Purbeck Local Plan are also material considerations.

(4) Public benefits Paragraphs 133 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require broad mitigating public benefits either directly or not directly related to conservation to be balanced against this (with reference to the definition provided within National Planning Practice Guidance). Case law (see commentary in Forge Fields Society v Sevenoaks DC 2014 case in particular) has confirmed that regardless of the degree of harm this balancing exercise must be carried out in light of a statutory presumption in favour of preservation of conservation areas or setting of listed buildings under Sections 72 and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended " or conversely, the strong statutory presumption against granting permission for any development that gives rise to harm.

(5) The following comments are also informed by Historic England Guide GPA3, which in para 12 sets out the following methodology: Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected; Step 2: assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s); Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance; Step 4: explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm; Step 5: make and document the decision and monitor outcomes. The DCC have not acted within the law and therefore the Plan for AS25 is not legally compliant.

Water : AS25 is traversed by ancient land drains at a depth of 6ft which drains the fields into a stream running in the direction of the village, through Moreton gardens and into the River Frome (SSSI) at a distance of 950m from the site. The assessment is correctly given a Red A marking for impact on surface waters but a mere C for Groundwater. There is no mention of these ancient land drains across the site which would be destroyed by quarrying and would not be restored. The AS25 fields, the adjacent horse fields and The Common frequently flood in winter. The assessment is unsound and requires a proper assessment now not at the planning stage. Many of the cottages are of cob construction which cannot survive prolonged flood conditions. The impact on the River Frome SSSI has not been adequately studied as required by EU Directives and the fact that AS25 drains into the picturesque stream running alongside Station Road and into Moreton gardens has been completely ignored (it is known iron contaminates the water courses around the village - red stains).

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>Economic : "Para 6 of the NPPF advises that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Para 7 sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development, namely, economic, social and environmental. Case law has established that each of these elements should be afforded equal weight and that, in order to constitute sustainable development, each dimension must be met." This policy has not been applied to AS25 and the impact on the economy of the village & farm. The assessment is therefore unsound and not legally compliant.</p> <p>Social impact : A number of residences are on the boundary of AS25. The natural screening is not effective in winter and it is known that bunding is not an effective mitigation against noise (grading machines). Moreford Hall is elevated and cannot be screened nor can Redbridge Road as it descends into the Estate. Experience from quarries at Woodsford shows that noise carries 1km and therefore will impact on the historic village, TE Lawrence Grave and the church thus compromising the tranquillity of the area. Noise will impact on Moreton Village Hall at a distance of 100m and disrupt mid-week weddings (yes some do occur mid-week). The Plan fails to assessment these issues so is unsound.</p> <p>Cumulative Impact : Moreton & Crossways are due to be developed for housing during the period of the Plan. The impact of traffic from housing, housing construction and quarries on the B3390, Waddock Cross (properties on the roadside), Hurst Bridge (monument status), Affpuddle (very constricted roads), Bere Regis and access through the accident black-spot to the A35/A31 has not been properly studied. New larger tonnage lorries have not been considered with respect to the structure of the ancient Hurst Bridge (monument status). The Plan is therefore unsound.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 296	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Simon Hargreaves	Halletc Environmental Ltd	<p>Item 1 " information In order to avoid a potential charge that it may be found unsound on the grounds of heritage impacts with particular respect to the proposed allocations of sites AS25 and AS26, we request that the attention of the Inspector is drawn to a Heritage Assessment undertaken 2016 by the Historic Environment Consultancy (Comprised in two reports entitled: Heritage Audit Proposed Gravel Extraction at Moreton Dorset; No: 2016/1303 Version 1, dated 4/5/2016; and Review of the Impact on the Historic Environment from Proposed Gravel Extraction at Moreton Dorset, Ref No: 2016/1298 V1 dated 16/1298) as part of reapplication environmental assessment work for these sites in recognition of the presence of a number of heritage assets within close proximity to both Allocation sites.</p> <p>Item 2 - Objection With regard to the Heritage Assessments undertaken by Context One on behalf of Dorset County Council for each of the Allocation sites, Historic Environment Consultancy has reviewed these documents and prepared a short report entitled, Review of the Context One Reports on Proposed Gravel Extraction, a copy of which is attached. It is considered that as published the findings contained in these documents in relation to AS25 and AS26 could be found unsound. Key findings are summarised as follows: The proposals for sand and gravel extraction within AS25 and AS26 would be consistent with the requirements of Para 134 of the NPPF. The presence of woodland and tall hedges around the extraction area for AS25 means there is little adverse visual impact on listed buildings. This is limited to Houses listed at grade II, and primarily views from the upper floors.</p> <p>Subject to being informed by the results of further surveys it is expected that the existing heritage assets bordering AS26 " Station Road will be unaffected by the proposal to extract sand and gravel in the vicinity. The significance of certain historic features such as for example, ancient water meadows and ancient mineral workings is overstated. The 2016 Assessment included a combination of LIDAR and ground based surveys.</p> <p>Item 3 - Objection With regard to Allocation site AS26 - Station Road, we object to the revision of the red lined site boundary along the edge of Station Road and opposite the conservation area. The arbitrary redrawing of this boundary to increase the stand off against the conservation area could result in the unnecessary sterilisation of workable mineral. The red lined allocation area is intended to identify the approximate extent of a known mineral resource. Within that red lined area the extraction of the underlying minerals will be subjected to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in accordance with the Regulations that will determine appropriate safe working limits designed to safeguard sensitive features including heritage assets that are known to exist in this location. Accordingly the proper place for determining appropriate safeguards to protect these feature is once all the EIA surveys have been conducted that will enable informed mitigation measures to be applied. The arbitrary imposition of an amended red lined site boundary in this location without the benefit of this information risks usurping the EIA process and accordingly rendering this particular element of AS26 unsound.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 138	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Philip Neale	TE Lawrence Society	<p>I write as Chairman of the International TE Lawrence Society and on behalf of our many members both here in the UK and abroad. I have received several representations from members over the past few weeks and like myself, we are all horrified at the plans proposed for quarry work in the immediate vicinity of the village of Moreton, Dorset.</p> <p>We all know this small part of Dorset very well through our many visits and ceremonies taking place to celebrate TE Lawrence and his important association with Dorset. The quarry plans proposed would have such a deleterious effect on the local environment through heavy traffic on the adjoining roads, noise and dust pollution. The whole environment around Moreton church and particularly the small cemetery area where one of the UKs national heroes, TE Lawrence is buried, would be totally spoiled and changed forever.</p> <p>I particularly refer to sites AS25 and AS26 which are so close to the Moreton village conservation area and its associated attractions. Many people travel far and wide to come to Moreton to visit Lawrence's grave and the Society maintains the grave and its environment for these people to come and pay their respects and homage to a great man. It is viewed by the Society that these plans would cause 'substantial harm' to this important heritage area of Dorset. The environment around the cemetery and church together with the peaceful surroundings would be lost forever, with the quarry plans proposed and I urge the relevant Council Committees and whoever else involved in assessment of the plans, to reject these plans as unworkable for the area in question.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
256

Figure
16

Station Road

Mrs
Joanna
Foote

Historical and cultural environment. There is no information regarding assessment of the historical and cultural setting of AS25. The Sustainability Appraisal does not reflect the impact on the landscape despite the Moreton Conservation Area Report Oct 2015. S.72 of Listed building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 states "It is the duty of the local authorities to consider the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas."

Whilst approximately 500m to the south west of the conservation area, Moreford Hall is a substantial 19th C property built by the Framptons and at one time part of the Moreton Estate. The adjacent property, The Coach House which was formerly part of Moreford Hall, lies only metres from the proposed AS25 site.

Bunds will be ineffective in providing adequate screening. The view from the northern elevation of Moreford Hall looks out entirely over the proposed site. No visual screening would be effective due to the relative height of the building. The Settlement of houses adjacent to Station Road (The Avenue) holds "significant interest" s.90 MCAR "Recognised in 1984 by the listing of seven buildings here. The relationship of buildings to open space and boundaries are particularly important aspects of the layout (Moreton) which also includes many notable trees".

The Appraisal document however, fails to recognise this stating; C7 Impact on designated landscapes, Category D No impact on designated landscapes or setting. C8 medium adverse impact on the openness of the river valley pasture. Category C. Both these should be category A. Therefore the plan is unsound.

The desecration of the area earmarked for the AS25 site will further reduce the "open green spaces," (MCAR) and removal of ancient hedgerows will diminish the "planned character" (MCAR) of Moreton irrecoverably. Station Road (The Avenue) being of significant importance to the approach lines of the conservation area. The plan fails to show understanding of the unique setting and how AS25 relates to the historic village, The Common and the Conservation Area.

Impact on existing settlements & C25 Are the access proposals acceptable: Rating D. The plan fails to show any consideration for the users of the B3390, The National Cycle Route or patrons of the (Grade II listed) Frampton Arms, or the railway station due to the planned entrance lying off the B3390 adjacent to the 60 MPH limit. The 60 MPH limit drops to 40 MPH at the end of our driveway, meaning many vehicles fail to slow down until they reach the level crossing. Conversely, traffic increases speed well before the 60 limit. It is a dangerous, fast, busy stretch with no pavement and pedestrians are required to walk into fast and often heavy oncoming traffic, which includes at present many HGV from other quarry sites in the vicinity. My children navigate this un-lit and unpaved piece of road to reach the bus stop every day. The addition of another 80 plus HGV movements a day will make this narrow country road and our drive way entrance lethal. Therefore this impact rating should be A/B The Traffic Impact assessment carried out in 2016 is not accurate; it does not demonstrate traffic flows at peak times or the cumulative impact of lorries and HGV associated with aggregate transportation. Therefore the plan is unsound.

C19 Impact on existing settlements rated B/C suggests effective screening using existing trees. This does not take into consideration the residents whom reside on the immediate perimeter of AS25, especially during winter when there is little or no visual screening offered by trees. Furthermore the Mitigation of "visual and noise attenuation bunds" will be entirely useless to those properties due to their close proximity. The rating should be an A. The impact has not been thoroughly assessed and as such the plan is unsound.

The plan does not include either a sensible buffer zone nor adequate recognition of sensitive receptors adjacent to the site. Included in the proposed AS25 site is a 19 th C land drainage system that runs adjacent to The Coach house and Moreford Hall. There is a watercourse that traverses the AS25 site, and these drains carry water into the river Frome (SSSI) situated less than 1 kilometre from the site. The flood risk assessment regarding this is non existent. There is also a significant 19th C septic tank that serves Moreford Hall, located adjacent to the proposed AS25 site boundary. Servicing of this tank requires regular access across the site. Without this Moreford Hall's entire drainage system would be compromised.

The plan does not adhere to the NPPF, many of the assessments are inaccurate, unsound and in some cases illegal. The level of impact is not accurately reflected due to this under assessment. More accurate markings to each assessment criteria are required. The plan requires proper understanding and further assessment of the flood risks associated with destroying the 19th century drains traversing the AS25 site. Along with the impact on the SSSI and Poole Harbour Ramsar. AS25 is not a viable, sustainable or practical suggestion for the Minerals Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 586	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England	<p>Our previous letter dated 22 Dec 2016 gave comments on several sites in relation to Building Stone, Purbeck Stone, and Aggregates. Some clarification on these comments was provided by Trevor Badley, Dorset County Council, on 14 Dec 2017.</p> <p>Aggregates - In line with our previous response, and dealing with each site in turn, we have commented below in relation to sites that have the potential to impact on the SRN (Strategic Road Network). Station Road AS25 and Hurst Farm AS26 Our previous comments highlighted that the methodology behind the calculation of 80 HGV movements was unclear. Whilst at this stage that figure is an estimate, Highways England reiterates that applications for development of the site will need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base through a Transport Assessment, and mitigation to address any severe impacts on the SRN.</p> <p>As stated in our previous response, in terms of traffic impacting on the SRN, it would appear that this would be via a number of junctions on the A35 eastwards from the A352 junction at Dorchester. All of these junctions appear to be suitable for carrying HGV traffic. Clarifications regarding the temporal distribution of trips would be required alongside any forthcoming application for development on the site, in order to establish the potential impact on the SRN.</p> <p>A condition restricting lorry movements at peak times would also be welcomed, in order to help reduce any negative impact on the SRN.</p>	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 206	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Peter Harraway		<p>Many of the assessments made for this site are inaccurate and unsound The impact of noise and dust from the proposed pit workings and additional road traffic on the local community will be "Very Significant" and no amount of physical barriers "mitigation" will completely reduce the background effect.</p> <p>With additional traffic generated by the quarry, both heavy lorries and cars, plus traffic from the proposed new housing at Crossways, the safety of road users will be significantly compromised.</p> <p>The junctions at Station Road, The Common, and Waddock Cross and Hurst Bridge are of particular concern but a full safety audit of the B3390 and the Waddock Cross to the A35 at Bere Regis should be carried out before this site is included in the Plan.</p>	Removal of this site from the Plan

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 286	Figure 16	Station Road	Tobi Walker		Please keep Moreton as quiet as possible for as long as possible. Please don't designate it as a site for gravel pit. Surely there are other places more suitable than a village to which thousands of people come annually, paying their respects to a man buried there in 1935. Please honour T E Lawrence with a legacy of peace and quiet as best as you are able.	
PSD - MSP 369	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Simon Collcutt	Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd	Please see report attached to this representation.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 552	Figure 16	Station Road	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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 study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (e.g. from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Flood Risk Assessment Protect and enhance water features in site. Ecological study Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment, as appropriate</p>	
PSD - MSP 542	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Douglas Symes	D.K. Symes Associates	<p>Concern is expressed on the true mineral yield from this site, where the submitted figure is 3.1 million tonnes within a site area of 58.5ha gives an average thickness of 5.3m. The comments for site AS26 equally apply and are not repeated. If the Woodsford mineral thickness average is applied, this suggests a recoverable reserve of nearer 1.3 million tonnes.</p>	<p>Clarification is needed on the thickness of recoverable mineral to qualify that the reserve assessment is soundly based.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 376	Figure 16	Station Road	Mrs Clarice Wicken	FRAME (Frome Residents Against Mineral Extraction)	Please see report attached to this representation.	
PSD - MSP 536	Figure 16	Station Road	Mr Nigel Hill	Moreton Parish Council	Please see documents attached to this representation.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 567	Figure 16	Station Road	Mrs Joanna Vaughan		<p>Why is AS25 not included in this list of sites with potential effects on RAMSAR and protected sites? If AS25 goes ahead it will destroy some 2km of ancient hedgerows and trees that traverse the site, providing important habitat corridors to woodland on the southern and western boundaries.</p> <p>Moreford Hall (formerly called Frampton Woods House, and then the New House) has a long recorded (1988-present) bat roost of Serotine, Long eared, and Pipistrelle bats. These are European protected species, sensitive to disturbance and protected under UK and European legislation. "Making planning decisions without the due consideration of priority species is contrary to the National Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006". s.50 states: "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity." Under s.41 bats are listed by DEFRA as a priority species for the conservation of biodiversity. AS25 is also situated within 750m of an EU designated heath, there has been no Habitat Regulations assessment.</p> <p>The site assessment document for AS25 considers there to be a level 'D' (No significant impact) on biodiversity. Therefore the current assessment is neither sound nor legal. Furthermore, the plan does not take into consideration the effects of mineral extraction on the River Frome SSSI less than 1km from the site, which will be subject to direct water run off from the site due to the location of both a tributary of the river and land drainage systems that traverse the site (EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and wild fauna and flora.)</p>	<p>A full HRA according to EC Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on conservation of natural habitats and of wild flora and fauna needs to be carried out in regards to AS25 site.</p> <p>Legally assess proximity of River Frome SSSI and Poole harbour Ramsar.</p> <p>A full and detailed bat survey of the site to reflect the accurate proximity to established and protected roosts.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
568

Figure
16

Station Road

Mrs
Joanna
Vaughan

Historical and cultural environment. There is no information regarding assessment of the historical and cultural setting of AS25. The Sustainability Appraisal does not reflect the impact on the landscape despite the Moreton Conservation Area Report Oct 2015.

s.72 of Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 states "It is the duty of the local authorities to consider the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas." Whilst approximately 500m to the south west of the conservation area, Moreford Hall is a substantial 19th century property built by the Frampton's and at one time part of the Moreton Estate. The adjacent property, The Coach House, which was formerly part of Moreford Hall, lies only metres from the proposed AS25 site.

Bunds will be ineffective in providing adequate screening. The view from the northern elevation of Moreford Hall looks out entirely over the proposed site. No visual screening would be effective due to the relative height of the building.

The Settlement of houses adjacent to Station Road (The Avenue) holds 'significant interest' s.90 MCAR 'Recognised in 1984 by the listing of seven buildings here. The relationship of buildings to open space and boundaries are particularly important aspects of the layout (Moreton) which also includes many notable trees.' The Appraisal Document however fails to recognise this stating 'C7 impact on designated landscape, Category D - no impact on designated landscapes or setting. C8 medium adverse impact on the openness of the river valley pasture. Category C. Both these should be Category A. Therefore the plan is unsound.

The desecration of the area earmarked for the AS25 site will further reduce the 'open green spaces' (MCAR) and removal of ancient hedgerows will diminish the 'planned character' (MCAR) of Moreton irrecoverably. Station Road (The Avenue) being of significant importance to the approach lines of the conservation area. The plan fails to show understanding of the unique setting and how AS25 relates to the historic village, The Common and the Conservation Area. Impact on existing settlements and C25: Are the access proposals acceptable: Rating D. The plan fails to show any consideration for the users of the B3390, The National Cycle Route or patrons of the (Grade 2 listed) Frampton Arms, or the railway station due to the planned entrance lying off the B3390 adjacent to the 60mph limit. The 60mph limit drops to 40mph at the end of our driveway, meaning many vehicles fail to slow down until they reach the level crossing. Conversely, traffic increases speed well before the 60mph limit. It is a dangerous, fast, busy stretch with no pavement and pedestrians are required to walk into fast and often heavy oncoming traffic, which includes at present many HGV from other quarry sites in the vicinity. My children navigate this unlit and unpaved piece of road to reach the bus stop every day. The addition of another 80 plus HGV movements a day will make this narrow country road and our drive way entrance lethal. Therefore this impact rating should A/B. The traffic impact assessment carried out in 2016 is not accurate; it does not demonstrate traffic flows at peak times or the cumulative impact of lorries and HGV associated with aggregate transportation. Therefore the plan is unsound.

C19 impact on existing settlements rated B/C suggests effective screening using existing trees. This does not take into consideration the residents who reside on the immediate perimeter of AS25, especially during winter when there is little or no visual screening offered by the trees. Furthermore, the mitigation of 'visual and noise attenuation bunds' will be entirely useless to those properties due to their close proximity. The rating should be an A. The impact has not been thoroughly assessed and as such the plan is unsound. The plan does not include either a sensible buffer zone nor adequate recognition of sensitive receptors adjacent to the site. Included in the proposed AS25 site is a 19th century land drainage system that runs adjacent to the Coach House and Moreford Hall. There is a watercourse that traverses the AS25 site, and these drains carry water into the River Frome (SSSI) situated less than 1 kilometre from the site. The flood risk assessment regarding this is non-existent. There is also a significant 19th century septic tank that serves Moreford Hall, located adjacent to the proposed AS25 site boundary. Servicing of this tank requires regular access across the site. Without this, Moreford Hall's entire drainage system would be compromised.

The plan does not adhere to the NPPF. Many of the assessments are inaccurate, unsound and in some cases illegal. The level of impact is not accurately reflected due to this under-assessment. More accurate markings to each assessment criteria are required. The plan requires proper understanding and further assessments of the flood risks associated with destroying the 19th century drains traversing the AS25 site. Along with the impact on the SSSI and Poole Harbour Ramsar. AS25 is not a viable, sustainable or practical suggestion for the Minerals Plan.

PSD
-
MSP
160

Figure
17

Hurst Farm

Mr
John
Evans

Criterion C1 - Impact on European/international designations; Criterion C3 - Impact on national designations and Criterion C7 " Impact on designated landscapes.

Although the land with the proposed sites (AS19, AS25 & AS26) has no protection afforded by a local or national 'designation', the following ought to be relevant and taken fully into account:

Although the area falls outside the Dorset AONB, it all falls within what remains of Thomas Hardy's 'Egdon Heath' which it is proposed should form part of the proposed Dorset National Park. 'The proposed area includes the Dorset AONB and East Devon AONB, which together cover the World Heritage Jurassic Coast. 'The proposed area offers uniquely varied and internationally important landscapes, geology, habitats and biodiversity, and includes an area of additional heathland habitat in east and central Dorset (what remains of Thomas Hardy's 'Egdon Heath'). Other areas of Dorset are pressing to be included'

If the National Park is created it is likely to be soon after AS26 could come 'on stream' and well before AS19 and AS26 The River Frome is an SSSI itself and flows into Poole Harbour (a RAMSAR) The Moreton Conservation Area lies approx 250m east of AS26 Without an Environmental Impact Assessment (delayed until planning application stage) it is impossible for the assessment under C1, C3 and C7 to reach a conclusion that AS26 will have 'No significant IMPACT' (C1); 'No significant impact' (C3) and 'No impact on designated landscapes or their setting' (C7). In any event AS26 and AS19 were initially assessed as potentially having a Significant impact on designated sites, but this was downgraded after 'discussions' with Natural England. 'Discussions' are not an appropriate assessment as required under National Planning guidance and it has not been proven, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that these proposal will NOT have a significant impact i.e. the precautionary principle has not been applied. See my comment to section 2 (Comment ID PSD-MSP132)

Criterion C8 " What is landscape capacity to accommodate proposed development. The plan pays scant regard to the unique River Frome Valley described in Thomas Hardy's books and the value to tourism, giving a marking of C. It notes the temporary nature of quarrying and restoration. Restoration cannot achieve the required result and DCC's ability to manage restoration in a timely fashion is extremely poor. Mineral Strategy paragraph 3.20 states that "Achieving high quality restoration, at the earliest possible opportunity, as an integral part of all minerals development" is Key Issue 8. The Woodsford Hills quarry has failed to meet its planning condition restoration obligations. This makes a mockery of claims frequently made by DCC of rolling programmes of restoration with minimal disturbance.

The Sustainability Appraisal marks the impact as 'unknown' whereas the text in the Site Appraisal under this criterion says ' Development will create a medium adverse impact on the openness of the river valley pasture landscape and a significant adverse impact on the pattern of field boundary hedgerows'. Why isn't this given a RED A marking? The assessment completely ignores the visual impact from Watery Lane which separates AS19 and AS26. The views to both east and west from Watery Lane are stunning and 'lift the heart' when driving or walking along the Lane. If this is taken into account an assessment of ' medium adverse impact on the openness of the river valley pasture landscape' is perverse. The impact is 'High adverse' (B) or even Highly significantly Adverse (A). particularly if the impact is assessed as cumulative with AS19. The 'temporary' adverse impact is likely to persist beyond 2040 taking both sites into consideration.

Criterion C9 "Impact on historic landscapes. If, for conservation reasons, Little Hurst Coppice is excluded from AS26, there is no logic to including Hurst Copse within the boundaries of AS26 Dorset Explorer (with Monuments layer set) clearly shows extensive Post Medieval (1540-1900) Watermeadows to the north and south of the River Frome in the Pallington and Tincton area and recorded on Dorset County Council's own Heritage Gateway Site where it is summarised as An extensive system of post medieval water meadows is visible as earthworks on aerial photographs of the 1940s to the north of Woodsford and south of Ilington, extending between the B3390 in the east and Watery Lane in the west. Large areas of these heritage assets lie within the proposed AS26 site to the west and south of Hurst Copse and within the proposed AS19 site to the west of Watery lane. The

I do not believe that it can be made sound - there are too many objections (and unknowns) to make AS26 (and AS19/AS25) to make justifiable.

latter are included in DCCs own Historical Record. Older OS maps clearly show drains, ditches and a spring across these watermeadows, all part of the heritage assets and historical record. The Sustainability Appraisal mentions water meadow landscape and The Heritage Assessment says the "...[water] meadows, along with others in Affpuddle and Briantspuddle, represent some of the earliest in the County" (Bett 1977, 37-38).

The assessment under Criterion C11 notes 'the possible presence of a watermeadow system on part of the site' and the assessment under Criterion C9 notes 'On the flat lands close to the river itself, extensive systems of watermeadows were constructed from the 18th century onwards and that there may well be remains of a watermeadow system on the northern part of this site. This is wrong on two counts: firstly the evidence is clear from information freely available to the public that there are (not may well be) historic watermeadows within AS26 and AS19 and 'not only on the flat lands close to the river itself; these are listed as Heritage monuments as shown on the Heritage Gateway. Secondly these historic watermeadows lie within the centre of AS26, not only to the north. The C9 Assessment goes on to say 'The impact on the watermeadow systems in particular needs to be assessed and evaluated (see criterion C11). Only when this has happened would the impact on the historic landscape be understood ' at present it could be anywhere from category A (Very Significant Adverse Impact) to category D (No Significant or Negligible Impact).

Even based on desk research it seems easy to say that extraction of the underlying sand and gravel from a watermeadow will have a Category A impact on these heritage and historical assets, since it is impossible to restore the drainage characteristics of the watermeadows if the sand and gravel has been removed. Based on the evidence available to it, it is impossible to understand how DCC can be so equivocal about the impact grading, and certainly that it considers that it is possible that it might be evaluated as C or D. Under Possible Mitigation under the C9 assessment is 'Full assessment, including Environmental Impact Assessment, will be carried out as part of any planning application. It is noted that impacts of working will be temporary and restoration of an agreed landscape/landform will be agreed and implemented as part of any planning permission granted.

The impact will, however, be permanent since, as noted above, it will be impossible to restore the land to have the watermeadow characteristics. In any event the proposed restoration is not to restore the land to watermeadow or even farmland - it is to create a wetland area. Therefore these historic features will be lost forever. It makes no sense to delay such an assessment to the Planning Stage " this full assessment should have been carried out to determine whether AS26 and AS19 were suitable to be included in the Sites Plan in the first place. There are historic hedgerows across AS26 associated with Hurst Farm and removal of these hedgerows would degrade historic landscape and would sever the Hurst Farm group from its proper context.

Criterion C10 " Impact on historic buildings. The Sustainability Appraisal mentions two historic buildings (actually listed cottages) as looking away from the site. It fails to mention Pallington Farmhouse, Cliffe House, Fishers Tenement (listed as "Bwthyn"), Waddock Farmhouse and its Granary and Hurst Green (a cottage) all Grade II Listed buildings. Cliffe House has views across AS26 which would be marred, destroying the vista designed by gothic revivalist Benjamin Ferry (student of Pugin). The assessment may be correct in relation to visual impact, but ignores the impact from noise and dust & dirt. Mrs Webb (owner of Pallington Farmhouse) made pertinent comments to the 2015 consultation (Comment ID: DMSP1297). The Current Woodsford Quarry is audible from Pallington Farmhouse.

AS26 will significantly increase the noise and have a negative adverse impact on the tranquility of the area Although not a 'building' there will be potential significant impact on the listed Hurst Bridge on the B3390 due to the cumulative impact of AS26, AS25 and proposed housing development in Crossways and Moreton. The traffic assessment in December 2016 focused on the B3390 south of AS26 and AS25, not to the north. The full impact on the B3390 has not been assessed.

Criterion C12 -Impact on hydrogeology or groundwater; Criterion C13 " Impact on surface water and Criterion C14 " Impact on flooding or coastal stability AS26 sits in the valley of the River Frome and surface water drainage is accomplished by a series of ditches and streams which run with water throughout all seasons and drain surface water into the River Frome, an SSSI. They are

kept clear by the farmers and/or land agents. The water table is generally high and in wet winters reaches the surface. In general it only drains as well as it does due to the underlying sand & gravel, in combination with the drains and ditches. Removing the sand and gravel and the drains/ditches is bound to adversely affect the hydrology and surface water, with the greater potential therefore for local flooding, including to the dwellings closest to AS26. This seems to be acknowledged is a grading of A for Criterion 13; and the whole uncertainty and lack of study must make the gradings for Criteria 12 and 14 problematic. Given the importance of these criteria and the obvious risks, why has not a full hydrology/surface water/flooding assessment been undertaken as part of this Plan, rather than leaving it to a later planning stage?

Transport/Access 'There is already an existing access onto the B3390 and modelling capacity checks have shown this to be acceptable, though peak hours should preferably be avoided'. Experience along the Puddletown Rd suggests that peak hours are also peak hours for quarry movements; and suggestions of restricting peak hour movement (particularly am) will be ignored. On transport/traffic the draft says: 'consideration (should be given) given to routing particularly to the north due to the constraints at Affpuddle and Briantspuddle. Adequate visibility appears to be available but hedging may need cutting back and management. A National Cycle Network route crosses the B3390 to the south of this site.' 'Visibility' may be adequate at the access point; but is NOT adequate along routes to the north along the B3390. The Cycle Network route does indeed cross to the south of the site; but it is arguable that more cyclists use the route from Tingleton, across Waddock Cross towards Bovington, a route used for many cycle races.

A Transport Assessment will be required, to assess possible impacts and identify appropriate mitigation.

Cumulative impacts, taking into account existing and proposed housing development and other mineral sites, is a key issue to be addressed' A detailed traffic assessment (taking account of the cumulative effect) was done as part of this Planning Exercise in December 2016, and is published as a supporting document to the Draft Plan, but it was completely inadequate in that it ONLY focused on traffic volumes to the south of AS25 and AS26. However it seems obvious that a significant proportion of the travel-to-work traffic from new housing will be to Bovington, Wareham, Swanage, Poole & Bournemouth i.e. travelling north along the B3390, not south. Similarly, quarry HGVs (which are getting bigger!) seeking the A35 or A31 trunk roads will use the northern routes through Affpuddle or Bere Regis. Affpuddle & Briantspuddle PC responded extremely negatively in the 2016/17 Consultation and I understand will be doing so again. Yet the northern routes have been completely ignored in the traffic assessment. The B3390 north (and, indeed, south through Warmwell) is self-evidently unsuitable for the modern quarry HGVs. The listed Hurst Bridge is single lane traffic and is already in need of regular rebuilding/repairs; Waddock Cross is a road safety 'cluster site' due in large part to the dips in the road to the north and the 'blind' bend to the south; the 60mph speed limit is totally unsuitable for the road layout and conditions and quarry HGV drivers almost always drive at the limit not within it as anyone using the Puddletown Rd will attest; Bere Regis already 'suffers' from a large volume of traffic from the Puddletown Rd quarries and AS25 & AS26 will be additional volume, particularly it routes through Affpuddle are to be discouraged/prevented - why has this not been assessed?; the road bends north of Affpuddle, the single lane section around a sharp bend, the severe bends near the church and two small bridges over the River Piddle make the Affpuddle route completely unsuitable and we know that drivers will ignore recommended or suggested routes to avoid Affpuddle.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 211	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mrs Marjorie Brewer		<p>For my comments I would refer you to the content of the very detailed responses to the pre-submission draft Minerals Site Plan which you have already received from the FRAME residents action group and Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd, which I fully endorse and support and would urge that you fully investigate the many points they have raised detailing the reasons why the inclusion of the three sites, AS19, AS25 and AS26 is unsound and should be deleted from the Minerals Site Plan.</p> <p>The statement that AS25 and AS26 will not be worked together is misleading as, if the quarried material from AS25 is to be processed at AS26, then during the life of AS25 work with its associated noise, dust, other pollution and lorry movements will be on-going at both locations.</p> <p>I would also query the number of lorry movements as for both sites the number is assessed at 40 in and 40 out movements per day but, if these figures are for the lorries transporting material between the sites (which would be the same), then where are the figures for the lorries transporting material from AS26 Hurst Quarry to the wider county and beyond? The danger posed by these lorry movements on the totally unsuitable B3390 must not be under-estimated.</p>	<p>For my comments I would refer you to the content of the very detailed responses to the pre-submission draft Minerals Site Plan which you have already received from the FRAME residents action group and Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd, which I fully endorse and support and would urge that you fully investigate the many points they have raised detailing the reasons why the inclusion of the three sites, AS19, AS25 and AS26 is unsound and should be deleted from the Minerals Site Plan.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
245

Figure
17

Hurst Farm

Mr
John
Wicken
den

Background: AS26 is a proposed site bounded in the west by the B3390 and in the north by the River Frome and its SSSI. Hurst Heath sits on the southern boundary with an SNCI site within it. Hurst Cottages (Hurst Dene) sit on the north eastern corner as well as Hurst Bridge over the River Frome. Hurst (South) Bridge is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as Grade 2 (List entry Number: 1425777), it was built in 1834 to designs by Dorset's County Surveyor, William Evans.

Hurst Farm main house lies over the B3390 midpoint on the east with a view directly over AS26. Hurst Farm Dairy (a collection of farm buildings with dairy equipment within sits roughly in the centre of AS26 which is large active dairy serving the country with milk. The old Hurst Dairy House and Barn are listed Buildings, they lie over the B3390 but in close proximity to AS26. Moreton Conservation Area lies 250m to the SE. Today the surrounding fields are arable to support the dairy cattle, they were once extensive water meadows (recorded in the Historic Environment Record). The farm is managed under a DEFRA Environmental Stewardship scheme.

AS26 forms part of the River Frome valley featured in Thomas Hardy's novel Tess of the D'Urbervilles. Thomas Hardy refers to the valley as "The Great Valley of Dairies". Sculpture by the Lakes is an international tourist venue immediately adjacent to AS26 on the other side of the River and is renowned for its exquisite sculptures and tranquil gardens. Pallington Farmhouse (a Grade 2 Listed Building) also approx. 450m north of AS26 across the River Frome. AS26 sits within what remains of Hardy's Egdon Heath which is part of the proposed Dorset National Park. Please refer to FRAME's submission for details of unsoundness.

Habitat: The Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening exercise, undertaken for the Pre-submission Minerals Plan for AS26 Hurst Farm, appears to be cursory at best and fails to adequately assess the impacts to nearby EU designated sites. This is a serious omission and contravenes the EC Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora). The fields within AS26 and the dairy operation are being farmed under a DEFRA Environmental Stewardship Scheme and there is no evidence to say that nitrates are polluting the River Frome from the Dairy at AS26. A well at Hurst Cottages is used for drinking water and hence analysed in detail shows no nitrates whatsoever.

It is known the River Frome is being polluted by up-stream developments such as Poundbury and the EA are keen to mitigate this problem. AS26 should not be used to mitigate someone else's problem. The DCC acceptance that there may be significant reductions in nitrates getting into the river must implicitly accept that there is a pathway from the site to the SSSI River Frome. It must, therefore, be possible for other detrimental contaminants such as silt, iron, and chemical flocculants from quarrying operations to use this pathway. The site cannot, therefore, meet the criteria of category D which states "Site has no possible pathway to international nature conservation designations" and so should automatically be put into category A.

Heritage: The hedgerow trees between AS19 and AS26, which served as the boundary between the historic parishes of Moreton and Woodsford, are significantly old, potentially inherited from the land holdings dating back to the middle Saxon period or older still and there are likely to have remnants of Ancient Woodland. On that subject the RSPB note "The first Bronze Age farmers had to clear woodland to make fields. On occasions, strips of woodland were left to mark the boundaries. These are our oldest hedgerows and they are often on today's parish boundaries. These are irreplaceable pieces of living history and are often the best hedgerows for wildlife." None of this detail is evident in the assessments.

Impact on archaeology : The Sustainability Assessment text mentions a Dorset Historic Environment Record in the site, so there is evidence that there are archaeological features so why does it say it's uncertain? Studies by Dr S N Collcutt of Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd (commissioned by FRAME) also states that there are features and finds are to be expected in the geology. Concept One Study mentions prehistoric finds in the centre of AS26. The Assessment for AS26 marks this as anywhere from Red A to Negligible impact D where study evidence clearly suggests impact as A. The plan is therefore unsound.

The DCC should
apply the law and
adhere to their
own policies.

Water: The Environmental Agency and Natural England report on rehabilitating the River Frome SSSI also states that water run-off is responsible for increasing silt damage in the river as well as releasing "fine leached iron (Fe+) particles" from the flood plain; a known pollutant affecting the river habitat. Local knowledge supports the view that iron is present in the flood plain across AS26 (visible in ditches and streams). The report also notes that floodplain connectivity is generally good (and a good thing), taking large areas of flood plain out for quarrying and associated settlement lakes will impact badly on this prized connectivity. The BGS also recognise the danger of silt, release of dissolved or suspended minerals and the potential for increased flooding (reference: BGS Minerals UK " Centre for sustainable mineral development). The BGS, in turn, reference the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) which addresses many issues associated with water management for the Minerals Industry. Whilst individual quarry sites might argue the areas involved are small compared to the overall floodplain area, taking all 3 sites (AS19, AS25 and AS26) plus existing quarries into account (approx 1000 acres) this is no longer a valid argument. The cumulative impact will be great on the catchment area of the river between Woodsford and Moreton. (Reference: "A hydrological investigation at Woodsford, Dorset and an assessment of the potential impact of proposed sand and gravel quarry upon local water environment, Hafren Water 2005). Mineral processing needs vast quantities of water to wash the sand/gravels to remove unwanted clays etc. Hafren Water Ltd themselves highlight that a water source for this operation in areas sensitive to water balance needs very specific consideration, which includes getting water from deep water wells. Discharge of additional water into the River Frome can only increase the risk of flooding downstream.

The National Planning and Policy Framework (Mineral Working Close to Communities) states that Planning Authorities are expected to ensure proposals do not have unacceptable adverse effects on the natural or historic environment or human health. It is clear that DCC has not taken this policy seriously and it has not conducted sufficient investigations to be able to accurately mark this section of its assessment and the marking does not stand up to proper scrutiny. References "Frome and Piddle Catchment Flood Management Plan, Managing Flood Risk"; The Environmental Agency 2012. "Rehabilitating the River Frome SSSI", Environmental Agency & Natural England, Technical Report 2010. "A hydrological investigation at Woodsford, Dorset and an assessment of the potential impact of proposed sand and gravel quarry upon local water environment", Hafren Water 2005. BGS Minerals UK " Centre for sustainable mineral development The assessment for AS26 marks the impact as B to D, again the DCC have no idea. The plan is unsound and contravenes DCCs own policy.

Material Assets (Economic development): Why does the plan fail to analyse the loss of a significant dairy farm and its buildings? The loss of the farm will impact the wider Moreton Estate and thereby ruin the pastoral landscape and its economy. Where's the analysis for this in the assessments? The Plan is unsound.

Impact on existing settlements: NPPF paragraph 123 states: "Planning policies and decisions should aim to identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason." Dorset's highest rated tourist attraction, the nationally and internationally renowned Sculptures by the Lakes is 250m north of this site. It is undisturbed by noise and prized for its recreational and amenity value, so should be identified and protected as described above. The current in-field quarrying activity at the Woodsford quarry makes noise with significant tonal elements during day to day operations and during higher noise shorter term activities like soil stripping and restoration. These are noises from screeners (machine used at the quarry face to remove oversized flints), clanking digger buckets, caterpillar tracks and dumper truck beds, reversing alarms, etc. The thrumming and clanking are clearly audible over a kilometre away. If AS26 goes ahead, in-field quarry noise will be heard at Sculptures by the Lakes due to the valley topography and ineffectiveness of bunds and trees, particularly when the wind is from the south. Sculptures by the Lakes' prized tranquillity will be adversely affected in clear breach of NPPF policy. The quarrying operation starts at 07.00 in the morning until 19:00 week days. It is apparent that a proper assessment has not been carried out so contravenes DCCs own policy, the assessment is therefore unsound.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>Cottages at Hurst bridge cannot be protected from AS26. Why hasn't the impact of this not been assessed?</p> <p>Cumulative Impact: Housing developments, quarry traffic, Silverlakes development will all impact on the B3390 and the routes to the A35/A31. Hurst Bridge is old and has been damaged 4 times in 2017 resulting in tax payers money being used to mend it each time. Increased traffic and the new huge lorries will further damage the structure; where's the analysis for this and the cost implications? At Waddock Cross the cottages are on the road, again where's recognition of the impact to these properties? The Plan is unsound and in places illegal. AS26 assessments are clearly immature and the site should be withdrawn.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 139	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mr Philip Neale	TE Lawrence Society	<p>I write as Chairman of the International TE Lawrence Society and on behalf of our many members both here in the UK and abroad. I have received several representations from members over the past few weeks and like myself, we are all horrified at the plans proposed for quarry work in the immediate vicinity of the village of Moreton, Dorset. We all know this small part of Dorset very well through our many visits and ceremonies taking place to celebrate TE Lawrence and his important association with Dorset. The quarry plans proposed would have such a deleterious effect on the local environment through heavy traffic on the adjoining roads, noise and dust pollution. The whole environment around Moreton church and particularly the small cemetery area where one of the UKs national heroes, TE Lawrence is buried, would be totally spoiled and changed forever. I particularly refer to sites AS25 and AS26 which are so close to the Moreton village conservation area and its associated attractions. Many people travel far and wide to come to Moreton to visit Lawrence's grave and the Society maintains the grave and its environment for these people to come and pay their respects and homage to a great man. It is viewed by the Society that these plans would cause 'substantial harm' to this important heritage area of Dorset. The environment around the cemetery and church together with the peaceful surroundings would be lost forever, with the quarry plans proposed and I urge the relevant Council Committees and whoever else involved in assessment of the plans, to reject these plans as unworkable for the area in question.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 207	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mr Peter Harraway		<p>Many of the assessments made for this site are inaccurate and unsound The impact of noise and dust from the proposed pit workings and additional road traffic on the local community will be "Very Significant" and no amount of physical barriers "mitigation" will completely reduce the background effect.</p> <p>With additional traffic generated by the quarry, both heavy lorries and cars, plus traffic from the proposed new housing at Crossways, the safety of road users will be significantly compromised.</p> <p>The junctions at Station Road, The Common, and Waddock Cross and Hurst Bridge are of particular concern but a full safety audit of the B3390 and the Waddock Cross to the A35 at Bere Regis should be carried out before this site is included in the Plan.</p>	This site to be removed from the Plan
PSD - MSP 587	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mr Steve Hellier	Highways England	<p>Our previous letter dated 22 Dec 2016 gave comments on several sites in relation to Building Stone, Purbeck Stone, and Aggregates. Some clarification on these comments was provided by Trevor Badley, Dorset County Council, on 14 Dec 2017.</p> <p>Aggregates In line with our previous response, and dealing with each site in turn, we have commented below in relation to sites that have the potential to impact on the SRN (Strategic Road Network).</p> <p>Station Road AS25 and Hurst Farm AS26 Our previous comments highlighted that the methodology behind the calculation of 80 HGV movements was unclear. Whilst at this stage that figure is an estimate, Highways England reiterates that applications for development of the site will need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base through a Transport Assessment, and mitigation to address any severe impacts on the SRN. As stated in our previous response, in terms of traffic impacting on the SRN, it would appear that this would be via a number of junctions on the A35 eastwards from the A352 junction at Dorchester. All of these junctions appear to be suitable for carrying HGV traffic.</p> <p>Clarifications regarding the temporal distribution of trips would be required alongside any forthcoming application for development on the site, in order to establish the potential impact on the SRN. A condition restricting lorry movements at peak times would also be welcomed, in order to help reduce any negative impact on the SRN.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 339	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Dr Andrew Nicholson	Natural England	<p>We have commented previously that the risk of pollution to the River Frome SSSI is a significant issue. We are satisfied that the issue is adequately covered but would recommend that the specific technical advice of the Environment Agency is closely followed.</p> <p>The potential for significant public benefits from a wetland restoration is explained in the restoration vision but in our view this text does not fully capture the significance of the multiple public benefits that could be achieved.</p> <p>Thus recent work has shown that a reduction of some 1000 tonnes of nitrogen annually to Poole Harbour is required but only about half of this is likely to be achieved through agricultural measures and most of these will not begin to reduce nitrogen for upwards of 30 years (because of nitrogen already in the chalk aquifer).</p> <p>Wetland restorations at Woodsford, Hurst Farm and Philliols Farm, with the wetlands hydrologically linked to the nearby rivers, together could reduce nitrogen inputs to Poole Harbour by some 150 tonnes annually which in this context is highly significant. Other benefits would include flood alleviation and biodiversity gain as well as recreational opportunities. We would recommend that these restoration opportunities are better reflected and encouraged by the Plan through the addition to Policy MS-1 suggested below.</p> <p><i>Any proposal for the development of any of these allocations must address the development considerations set out for each site in Appendix A and work towards achieving public benefits within the restoration vision, as well as addressing any other matters relevant to the development of each proposed allocation, and demonstrating that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</i></p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 553	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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 Predominantly Flood Zone 1, but small part of site shown to lie within Flood 3 and 2, hence demonstration of the Sequential Test will be required. We advise sequential approach within the site whereby all development is positioned within Flood Zone 1 only, hence avoid Flood Zones 3 & 2. Flood Risk Assessment required. Fisheries and Biodiversity Ecological study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Flood Risk Assessment Protect and enhance water features in site. Ecological study Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment, as appropriate</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 543	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mr Douglas Symes	D.K. Symes Associates	<p>The estimate mineral of 3.3 million tonnes within a site area of 77.6ha gives an average thickness of recoverable mineral of 4.25 meters. This average thickness is almost twice that found at the adjoining Woodsford Quarry, which is situated within the same geological sequence.</p> <p>As referred to in the representations on Policy MS-1, for the plan to be sound it needs to be based on reliable evidence. The concern that the reserve has been incorrectly assessed is further supported by the Mineral Assessment Report for the locality which shows this site to be in Resource Block C where the mean thickness is 2.9 meters. In the absence of any available/reliable site specific investigation data, the reserve at this site (and AS25) is questioned. If a recoverable thickness similar to that found at Woodsford is used, the reserve would be closer to 1.7 million tonnes (1.3 mt for AS25). This has a material impact on the timescale of development which in turn affects cumulative impacts.</p> <p>In view of my comments under AS19, it is considered that this site is worked after AS19 to avoid cumulative impacts, and further, the alternative of this mineral being taken to Woodsford Quarry, should also be encouraged.</p>	<p>Clarification is needed on the thickness of recoverable mineral to qualify that the reserve assessment is soundly based.</p> <p>Other: Suggested amendment to the second paragraph in italics below:</p> <p>In order to avoid cumulative impact with other mineral working in this area, the site will be developed after the Woodsford Extension site (AS19). In order to reduce any highway impacts, the option to convey mineral to Woodsford Quarry should be fully explored. Impacts on existing/proposed housing must be taken into consideration.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 306	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	DR Domini Stubbing	Frome, Piddle and West Dorset Fisheries Association	<p>Regarding sites AS12 and AS26: Gravel workings over the whole country and in our river catchment have a long history being unable to contain washings. This can lead to sediment particles in the river. If its raining and relentlessly, that its does often in the Dorset, water will have to leave the workings somehow and end in the river. The sediment will be carried in that water. Some particles take two weeks to settle and so they will be carried in the water and even in intra gravel flows to the river (Theurer et al. 1998). The problem point of this is that it smothers many fish eggs, and river bed spawning fish are very venerable to this, and it causes survival values down to zero. The Frome SSSI is protected for what it is and that means its species. Salmon (riverbed spawners) stocks in the River Frome are at level from which it is about to collapse. Sedimentation of eggs from pollution is looking like it will almost certainly be the main culprit. Other species like grayling, trout, bullheads, Dace and minnows will suffer badly (Greig et al. 2005). Similar problems have happened at AS19 and so extensions here are not justifiable. References Greig, S.M., Sear, D.A., & Carling, P.A. (2005) The impact of fine sediment accumulation on the survival of incubating salmon progeny: Implications for sediment management. Science of the Total Environment 344, 241-258. Theurer, F. D., Harrod, T. R., & Theurer, M. (1998) Sedimentation and Salmonids in England and Wales. P194. Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Regarding sites AS12 and AS26 The close proximity to the river of proposed pits in the plan definitely means sedimentation will be a big problem. If there was a distance of 500m or more from the river with normal silt collection procedures in place, things could be slightly less problematic.</p>
PSD - MSP 317	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>DWT is pleased to see that the restoration vision for both these sites includes the possibility of a large scale wetland restoration scheme which would help with flood alleviation, contribute towards overall reduction in Phosphate, Nitrogen and sediment downstream on the River Frome and in Poole Harbour and create habitats which would benefit protected species such as otter and water vole as well as wetland birds.</p>	
PSD - MSP 371	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mr Simon Collcutt	Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd	<p>Please see report attached to this representation.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 377	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mrs Clarice Wicken	FRAME (Frome Residents Against Mineral Extraction)	Please see report attached to this representation.	
PSD - MSP 380	Figure 17	Hurst Farm	Mr Spencer Jefferies	National Grid	Please see report attached to this representation.	
PSD - MSP 35	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Peter Bell		My wife and I run/own a self catering holiday barn operation half way up Kingston Hill. We provide jobs for 4 local people and we provide business for local shops/pubs etc. We have guests staying all year round. Our guests come to Purbeck because it is an outstanding AONB. The Swanworth Quarry extension can only be bad for the tourist business - in particular the traffic of heavy duty lorries and cranes etc. Please please do not allow the quarry extension.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 103	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr James Grocott		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies.</p> <p>The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014.</p> <p>With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.</p> <p>There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down.</p> <p>*There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved.</p> <p>*This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain.</p> <p>*Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction.</p> <p>Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 40	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Alan Fry		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed 'extension' as it's not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB.</p> <p>My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>There is ample aggregate available in other parts of the county, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place.</p> <p>In addition, it is not an 'extension', it is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor quality aggregate.</p> <p>The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible.</p> <p>Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill.</p> <p>Tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain.</p> <p>The private water supply to Kingston could be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs, and the local economy.</p> <p>No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 52	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Rupert Hardy		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place.</p> <p>There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB.</p> <p>This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. I should add that although I live some fifteen miles away I much enjoy walking around Kingston and Worth Matravers, and it would be a tragedy for this beautiful landscape to be desecrated to create this quarry. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain.</p> <p>This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB.</p> <p>The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible.</p> <p>This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands.</p> <p>Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 569	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Simon Cooke		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	
PSD - MSP 350	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Frank Spooner		<p>I would like to register my objection to the above proposal. I can see no difference in principle between this proposal and the previous one (1988), to which I also objected, and which was turned down. The gross destruction of the countryside; the obvious inconsistency with the protected status of the area; the massive increase in lorry traffic through the area, with concomitant damage to historic buildings; all combine to make the proposal wholly unacceptable.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 46	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr James Pembroke		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	I don't believe any change will make this sound

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 105	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sophy Robinson		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 100	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Lawrence Fowler		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 87	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sue Western		<p>I am writing to strongly object to policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16, and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. It is not legally compliant because it has failed to secure the involvement of the community. Information has been misleading and what is the entire proposal has been poorly explained to stakeholders.</p> <p>Sustainability reports show the project to be inadequate, and it is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. The plan ignores issues of local infrastructure and of development needs. The extra heavy traffic will be running along narrow country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and sections which are only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with increasing numbers of cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by large/wide vehicles. The economy of the area relies on tourism; any industrialization of the landscape threatens this economy. The plans are not justifiable. This is a beautiful natural environment, right next to Sites of Special Scientific Interest, and threatens the integrity of the Jurassic Coast - a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The Purbeck Way heritage walk runs right past the proposed site. The road materials to be extracted are low grade, and it is inappropriate to risk damaging such a precious area of countryside. The drainage/run-off from the site would run through an SSSI and down to an almost pristine beach (Chapman's Pool). This area of coast is close to the Kimmeridge ledges and its Marine Nature Reserve. The plans risk long-term ecological damage. It is not an effective plan. There are numerous alternative sites in the UK from which low grade road materials could be extracted without threatening such a sensitive environment. The plan is not consistent with national policy. It will damage the tranquility of historic villages. Larger numbers of heavy lorries will threaten the fabric of listed buildings and cottages. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. Any employment generated by the plans is unlikely to be locally sourced. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment. It is an unsustainable use of minerals.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 55	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr & Mrs Nick Whitwell		<p>I live in Worth Matravers and it seems bonkers that a project such as this is even being considered in this area of outstanding beauty. I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound.</p> <p>Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment.</p> <p>Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles.</p> <p>Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments</p> <p>Effective? No.</p> <p>Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 126	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Sam Mathison		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in Somerset, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, in Poole and other rail links to the coast, so there would be extra haulage lorries involved. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. In addition, it is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands and could deter visitors which could have a knock on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and no amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation, and may also affect the World Heritage status. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 47	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Dr Julia Farley		<p>I have written previously to oppose the Swanworth Quarry Mineral Extension - Site PK16. I would like to re-iterate my concerns. It does not seem to me that this proposed extension is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no exceptional circumstances which would, in my opinion, support the case for aggregate extraction in an AONB. The area in question sits alongside several ancient burial sites and a Bronze Age settlement, and is part of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site. To allow quarrying here would seem to be setting a dangerous precedent. I am somewhat confused that this is being referred to as an extension, since as I understand it the proposal really represents a new 35 acre quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way. This is the route which connects Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast, and is extremely popular with walkers and tourists. The impact of the quarrying and associated infrastructure would be highly visible and devastating both to important archaeological remains and to the landscape. Given the importance of tourism as the biggest employment sector in Purbeck, it seems to me that this plan could have an extremely detrimental effect not only on the AONB but also on the local economy. I call on the DCC to reject this proposal.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 123	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs M Lloyd-Jones		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 113	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Michael Feben Smith		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>This site should not be included in the plan at all: it is illegal.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 121	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Barbara Darlington		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 426	Figure 18		Mrs Rosemary Gledhill		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed. I think the rail link would be ideal and save Corfe Castle from all the quarry stone lorries.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 77	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sally Dubuis		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of intrusive haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting an unwelcome precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	
PSD - MSP 51	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ragnhild Nordhagen		<p>As a frequent visitor to Corfe Castle and Purbeck I am horrified to hear that there is a proposal to expand quarrying for road materials in this beautiful natural environment. I come to the area for the excellent hospitality of the people, the food, the local public houses and the walking. You are putting my holiday retreat in jeopardy and risking the loss of hundreds of thousands of people like me who look forward to coming every year. I can't believe such short-sighted profiteering and destruction of natural beauty can be allowed in such a precious place.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 57	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Ceridwen Sooke		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of intrusive haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting an unwelcome precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

The AONB Team is opposed to this allocation. It is considered that the allocation would be contrary to the primary purpose of the AONB, this being the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the designated area.

The Dorset AONB Team considers that the proposed extension is unlikely to be justified, due to the policy context and the foreseeable harm to the natural beauty of the AONB. In addition to section 144 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advising local authorities to, as far as practically possible, provide for landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside AONBs, NPPF provides other relevant statements regarding AONBs and the Heritage Coasts.

NPPF section 115 states 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..." Furthermore, NPPF section 116 states 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. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated."

It is considered that the proposed extension would be classified as major development in the context of NPPF 116, although this would ultimately be a decision for the planning authority. If this premise is accepted, the presumption against development and exceptional circumstances test within NPPF 116 would apply. I note that the planning authority has calculated that no new sites are required during the life of the Plan and that there is scope for provision from outside of the AONB.

Nonetheless the issue of sustainability of supply, in terms of transportation, and the sites contribution to the local economy are relevant. However, these benefits must be weighed against detrimental effects on the AONB and great weight should be apportioned to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of the designated area. In coming to a view on the likely effects of the proposed extension I have considered information provided within the draft Plan, as well as material submitted by the applicant during the promotion of the site. I have had the opportunity to undertake accompanied and unaccompanied visits, including to the existing quarry, the extension site, Worth Matravers, local roads and public rights of way, including the Purbeck Way.

Overall the proposed extension would foreseeably produce significant long-term adverse effects on the landscape and scenic beauty of both the site and the surrounding area. The extension site incorporates land to the west of a coombe, which separates the extension area from the existing quarry.

The promoted Purbeck Way footpath follows the coombe for the most part, although the route also rises out of Coombe Bottom, northwest of the existing quarry, where particularly close experience of the extension area would occur. Furthermore, there would be close views of the extension area from open access land associated with the coombe.

Overall it can be foreseen that the proposal to connect the existing site with the extension area by bridging the coombe and then conducting operations on its either side would be highly likely to have a major effect on the coombe itself and users of the Purbeck Way, due to both visual impact and noise. The coombe, as well as physically separating the existing site and the extension area, also marks a topographic break. Landform to the west, containing the extension site, is broadly orientated towards the east. The area to the east of the coombe,

where the existing site is located, would have been orientated to the west. This factor, along with the physical separation of the sites and the degree to which the extension projects into open countryside, is likely to produce wider significant adverse effects on the character of the AONB.

Such effects would be experienced in areas where the existing site already has an adverse impact and further areas where the proposed extension would generate additional significant effects on its own.

The entire extension site is also located within the Purbeck Heritage Coast, which is a highly valued component of Dorset AONB. NPPF defines Heritage Coasts as: "Areas of undeveloped coastline which are managed to conserve their natural beauty and, where appropriate, to improve accessibility for visitors." NPPF section 114 states that: "Local planning authorities should maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and improve public access to and enjoyment of the coast."

The exceptional value of the Purbeck Heritage Coast is recognised through the Council of Europe's Diploma for the Conservation of Protected Areas, awarded in 1984. The Purbeck Heritage Coast is one of only three areas within England holding the Diploma, which has been renewed as recently as 2009.

The on-going retention of the Diploma is subject to the satisfaction of conditions. Condition 2 is particularly relevant, as it states that we should ensure that: "The extension of existing quarries or the opening of new quarries conforms to the 'exceptions' principle that they should not be permitted unless they do not impair the character of the Heritage Coast as a result of any one or a combination of the following: their scale and length their negative impact on the landscape, wildlife, the enjoyment of the area by the public or local communities the practical impossibility of achieving satisfactory restoration and aftercare within a period of five years following the cessation of work."

The proposed extension would be considered against objectives and policies within Dorset AONBs Management Plan. This document provides a framework to help guide authorities in fulfilling their statutory duty of regard to the AONB. The Management Plan 2014-19 includes the following policies, which are considered relevant to this proposal:

L1a: Conserve and enhance landscape character and quality and promote the use of landscape and seascape character assessment to shape decisions affecting the AONB

L1c: Conserve and enhance the Special Qualities of the AONB such as tranquillity and remoteness, wildness and dark skies

L2b: Reduce noise and light pollution

L2c: Remove, avoid and reduce intrusive and degrading features to restore and enhance landscape character and quality

CS3b: Conserve tranquil areas along the coast

CS3c: Conserve the undeveloped nature of the coast

PH1a: Ensure that any necessary development affecting the AONB is sensitively sited and designed and conserves and enhances local character

PH1g: Conserve and enhance the AONBs undeveloped rural character, panoramic views, tranquillity, remoteness and wildness

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>PH2a: Protect the AONB from inappropriate development and land use</p> <p>PH2b: Protect the quality of uninterrupted panoramic views into, within and out of the AONB</p>	
PSD - MSP 61	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Jon Phillips		<p>It fails to take into account local authorities' own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) says 'there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan'. Not consistent with principles of an AONB. Ample aggregate in the county and Mendips. No changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down.</p>	<p>This site should not be included in the Plan at all.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 67	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Gerard O'Brien		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed 'extension' as it's not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbecks as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35 acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage Status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 69	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Huw Davies		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site). It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 71	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Helen Turner		<p>I'm writing regarding the proposed expansion of Purbeck's quarry in an area of outstanding beauty amongst quiet and narrow roads and rolling peaceful countryside. I have been a visitor to this area over many years and seeing the exquisite landscape destroyed for building materials, and having to cope with meeting regular large lorries on narrow roads would affect my experience as a visitor and would make it a much less desirable place to visit. With regards to policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 I wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound; it has failed to secure community involvement. Sustainability reports show the project is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site). It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments. I am concerned that it would affect the status of local UNESCO and SSSIs and affect the viability of the local tourist economy. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment. It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals. Thank you, I hope this proposal will be turned down.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 79	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr D Wolton		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 81	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	David & Wendy Langdon		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of intrusive haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 95	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Ian White		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 98	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Johanna Fisher		<p>I'm writing regarding the proposed Swanworth Quarry expansion, in an area of outstanding beauty amongst quiet and narrow roads and rolling peaceful countryside. I have been coming to this area for many years, since I was born actually with my parents and now with my children. I am alarmed to think that this expansion would be considered in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, where you find rare orchids and the eco system is fragile. The traffic between Kingston and Corfe Castle would inevitably increase endangering the narrow roads, not to mention the impact it will have on the environment. The World Heritage status of the area will be compromised and the views across the beautiful rolling fields ruined. I hope that you will consider all these objections to the proposal and it will be turned down.</p> <p>Please also consider: With regards to policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 I wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound; it has failed to secure community involvement. Sustainability reports show the project is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments. I am concerned that it would affect the status of local UNESCO and SSSIs and affect the viability of the local tourist economy. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment. It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals. Thank you, I hope this proposal will be turned down.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 101	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Richard Burdett		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 107	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Phillipa Knight		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 109	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Jeremy Williams		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 111	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Sarah Lawrence		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 115	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr David Ralls		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

PSD
-
MSP
117

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Miss
Emma
Barker

I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not consistent with national policy and therefore not legally compliant nor is it sound. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs. Unless there are exceptional circumstances. In this instance, there are NO exceptional circumstances.

Also re a sustainability appraisal, there is ample aggregate available in other parts of the south west, namely Portland and the Mendips with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. I therefore believe that this plan, when considered against reasonable alternative option, based on proportionate evidence, to be unjustified.

As National Planning Policy framework requires exceptional circumstances to lift the AONB status, I believe this document to be neither legally compliant nor sound as it fails to take into account the local authority's own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which states there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan.

A proposal that an AONB should suffer a permanent scar for short term benefit for one company is not acceptable. The face of this AONB would change forever. The proposal states there is no anticipated shortage of supply of crushed rock sites during the Plan period and the National Planning Policy Framework requires that mineral planning authorities should provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from Outside |.. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage sites |.. Therefore, the issue of provision of a sustainable supply of crushed rock does not outweigh the presumption against location within the AONB and hence is unjustified. It was due to this lack of exceptional circumstances that the planning application for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 and nothing has changed since then. There is still a plentiful supply of aggregate close by and it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB and this is still the case. Therefore I believe the plan is definitely not justified and therefore unsound.

This is most certainly not an extension. This is a new quarry requiring an industrial bridge being constructed over the Purbeck Way (a spectacular walk to quote DCC), connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. This 35 acre new quarry proposal will be the size of 17 football pitches shifting stone over a scenic footpath in thousands of lorry movements. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but also on tourism, hence employment and even possibly affecting the status of the World Heritage site and the money this brings to the area. The effects of these increased lorry movements through the small village of Corfe Castle must not be underestimated. With a current average of 70 lorry movements daily, the stone lorry traffic is already heavy and the potential of more lorries shows the plan has not been positively prepared as it does not take into account the infrastructure needs therefore is unsound. There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy to Poole and other rail links to the coast, surely this is the most environmental option, with no more lorry movements involved?

A factor that is often but MUST NOT be overlooked is the private water supply to Kingston Village which is always a sensitive issue as its source is in the Coombe where this expansion is proposed, The owner of Encombe Estate is responsible for providing water to the village and as such has taken his responsibilities seriously. Having drilled a bore hole to try and provide more water, he has stated that this cannot supply the village solely, so it does rely on the supply from the Coombe. It is a fragile water supply and can be compromised easily therefore yet again I do not believe the plan to be sound as it has not been positively prepared due to its lack of understanding of the infrastructure needs, ie the local water supply and its fragility.

In conclusion, I feel the council is being pushed into recommending a plan that is unsound and not legally compliant for the benefit of one company to make more money. There is a healthy supply of aggregate in the Mendips, and transport already in place that doesn't threaten to overload our tiny local roads, so why is the plan even being considered? I therefore consider the plan to not be legally compliant as it does not have regard for national policy. I also consider the plan to be unsound as it has not been positively prepared, its unjustified and not consistent with National Policy.

To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

PSD
-
MSP
119

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Mr
James
Barker

I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not consistent with national policy and therefore not legally compliant nor is it sound. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs. Unless there are exceptional circumstances. In this instance, there are NO exceptional circumstances. Also re a sustainability appraisal, there is ample aggregate available in other parts of the south west, namely Portland and the Mendips with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. I therefore believe that this plan, when considered against reasonable alternative option, based on proportionate evidence, to be unjustified. As National Planning Policy framework requires exceptional circumstances to lift the AONB status, I believe this document to be neither legally compliant nor sound as it fails to take into account the local authority's own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which states there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. A proposal that an AONB should suffer a permanent scar for short term benefit for one company is not acceptable. The face of this AONB would change forever. The proposal states there is no anticipated shortage of supply of crushed rock sites during the Plan period and the National Planning Policy Framework requires that mineral planning authorities should provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from Outside Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage sites. Therefore, the issue of provision of a sustainable supply of crushed rock does not outweigh the presumption against location within the AONB and hence is unjustified. It was due to this lack of exceptional circumstances that the planning application for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 and nothing has changed since then. There is still a plentiful supply of aggregate close by and it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB and this is still the case. Therefore I believe the plan is definitely not justified and therefore unsound. This is most certainly not an extension. This is a new quarry requiring an industrial bridge being constructed over the Purbeck Way (a spectacular walk to quote DCC), connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. This 35 acre new quarry proposal will be the size of 17 football pitches shifting stone over a scenic footpath in thousands of lorry movements. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but also on tourism, hence employment and even possibly affecting the status of the World Heritage site and the money this brings to the area. The effects of these increased lorry movements through the small village of Corfe Castle must not be underestimated. With a current average of 70 lorry movements daily, the stone lorry traffic is already heavy and the potential of more lorries shows the plan has not been positively prepared as it does not take into account the infrastructure needs therefore is unsound. There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy to Poole and other rail links to the coast, surely this is the most environmental option, with no more lorry movements involved? A factor that is often but MUST NOT be overlooked is the private water supply to Kingston Village which is always a sensitive issue as its source is in the Coombe where this expansion is proposed, The owner of Encombe Estate is responsible for providing water to the village and as such has taken his responsibilities seriously. Having drilled a bore hole to try and provide more water, he has stated that this cannot supply the village solely, so it does rely on the supply from the Coombe. It is a fragile water supply and can be compromised easily therefore yet again I do not believe the plan to be sound as it has not been positively prepared due to its lack of understanding of the infrastructure needs, ie the local water supply and its fragility. In conclusion, I feel the council is being pushed into recommending a plan that is unsound and not legally compliant for the benefit of one company to make more money. There is a healthy supply of aggregate in the Mendips, and transport already in place that doesn't threaten to overload our tiny local roads, so why is the plan even being considered? I therefore consider the plan to not be legally compliant as it does not have regard for national policy. I also consider the plan to be unsound as it has not been positively prepared, its unjustified and not consistent with National Policy.

To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 108	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Anne Campbell		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 102	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Victoria Kikko Kawashima		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 56	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Tom Sooke		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of intrusive haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting an unwelcome precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 124	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Sam Mathison		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 70	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sarah Worth	No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment.	<p>Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles.</p> <p>Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments</p> <p>Effective? No.</p> <p>Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle which already struggles with oversize vehicles passing through and a lot of traffic in the holiday period. It will greatly affect the local roads and the infrastructure. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism " one of the most valuable sources of income for the local people and businesses If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment - Noisy extraction from the regions around Worth Matravers and Kingston Footpath disruption to the Purbeck Way which is used by tourists and locals to explore the Jurassic Coast It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 120	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Jonathan Ensor		<p>I have previously written to you on this subject and repeat my objection to this potential spoiling of the environment on the basis of the following comments. The proposed extension is not legally compliant with the relevant requirements and it is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. Put simply - There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in particular in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as potential of further damage to the AONB. This area of the Purbeck countryside is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Previously it was decided that a similar application should not be given permission to proceed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and again in 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a very unwelcome precedent. The same reasoning is entirely relevant today. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35 acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck area. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. My wife and myself are visitors to the area principally because it is unspoiled. I understand from friends that live there that the already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it please.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 54	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Isobel Woolf		<p>We wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. We ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

I wish to object to this proposed quarrying 'extension' on the following grounds.

- 1) It is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances, and in this case there are no exceptional circumstances.
- 2) There is no need for a quarry that would impact an AONB as there is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county, and in the Mendips, in areas not designated as AONB (as quoted in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy 2014).
- 3) Quarries in Purbeck require the extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads. By contrast, alternative areas have better road networks, and in the Mendips there is a rail link to transport aggregate to Hamworthy near Poole.
- 4) Land use within an AONB should be compatible with/contribute to the prevailing appearance of the landscape. In this case neither the scars created by quarrying, the proposed lorry bridge across the coombe, or berms and woodland screens would match the appearance of the existing fields and stone walls.
- 5) The land in question is not only in an AONB, it is also designated as 'Heritage Coast' and as such should be 'managed to conserve its natural beauty', and Local Planning Authorities have a duty to 'maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes'. Neither the quarrying, screening, or new lorry bridge would meet these requirements.
- 6) The Purbeck Heritage Coast has also been awarded a Council of Europe Diploma for the Conservation of Protected Areas one of only 3 in the country. One of the conditions for the Diploma is 'The extension of existing quarries or the opening of new quarries ... should not be permitted unless they do not impair the character of the Heritage Coast as a result of their negative impact on the landscape, wildlife, and the enjoyment of the area by the public or local communities'. I believe this proposal would have a negative impact on the visual aspect and tranquillity of the landscape, and because the Purbeck Way runs between the existing and extension sites, it would also have a negative impact on the enjoyment of the area by the public and local communities. Visitors come from far and wide to walk the Purbeck Way.
- 7) With prevailing winds south/south-westerly, the nearest residential neighbours c.330m to the north east are likely to be affected by noise and dust if this proposal is accepted.
- 8) Allowing this extension would set a dangerous precedent for the future. Mineral rights exist over a much larger area of nearby AONB land, and agreeing to this proposal would make it difficult to refuse future proposals for other sites.
- 9) Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed, so these earlier decisions should be upheld. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. We ask that the DCC reject it.

PSD
-
MSP
116

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Mrs
Jackie
Barker

I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not consistent with national policy and therefore not legally compliant nor is it sound. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs. Unless there are exceptional circumstances. In this instance, there are NO exceptional circumstances. Also re a sustainability appraisal, there is ample aggregate available in other parts of the south west, namely Portland and the Mendips with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. I therefore believe that this plan, when considered against reasonable alternative option, based on proportionate evidence, to be unjustified. As National Planning Policy framework requires exceptional circumstances to lift the AONB status, I believe this document to be neither legally compliant nor sound as it fails to take into account the local authority's own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which states there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. A proposal that an AONB should suffer a permanent scar for short term benefit for one company is not acceptable. The face of this AONB would change forever. The proposal states there is no anticipated shortage of supply of crushed rock sites during the Plan period and the National Planning Policy Framework requires that mineral planning authorities should provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from Outside Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage sites. Therefore, the issue of provision of a sustainable supply of crushed rock does not outweigh the presumption against location within the AONB and hence is unjustified. It was due to this lack of exceptional circumstances that the planning application for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 and nothing has changed since then. There is still a plentiful supply of aggregate close by and it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB and this is still the case. Therefore I believe the plan is definitely not justified and therefore unsound. This is most certainly not an extension. This is a new quarry requiring an industrial bridge being constructed over the Purbeck Way (a spectacular walk to quote DCC), connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. This 35 acre new quarry proposal will be the size of 17 football pitches shifting stone over a scenic footpath in thousands of lorry movements. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but also on tourism, hence employment and even possibly affecting the status of the World Heritage site and the money this brings to the area. The effects of these increased lorry movements through the small village of Corfe Castle must not be underestimated. With a current average of 70 lorry movements daily, the stone lorry traffic is already heavy and the potential of more lorries shows the plan has not been positively prepared as it does not take into account the infrastructure needs therefore is unsound. There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy to Poole and other rail links to the coast, surely this is the most environmental option, with no more lorry movements involved? A factor that is often but MUST NOT be overlooked is the private water supply to Kingston Village which is always a sensitive issue as its source is in the Coombe where this expansion is proposed, The owner of Encombe Estate is responsible for providing water to the village and as such has taken his responsibilities seriously. Having drilled a bore hole to try and provide more water, he has stated that this cannot supply the village solely, so it does rely on the supply from the Coombe. It is a fragile water supply and can be compromised easily therefore yet again I do not believe the plan to be sound as it has not been positively prepared due to its lack of understanding of the infrastructure needs, ie the local water supply and its fragility. In conclusion, I feel the council is being pushed into recommending a plan that is unsound and not legally compliant for the benefit of one company to make more money. There is a healthy supply of aggregate in the Mendips, and transport already in place that doesn't threaten to overload our tiny local roads, so why is the plan even being considered? I therefore consider the plan to not be legally compliant as it does not have regard for national policy. I also consider the plan to be unsound as it has not been positively prepared, its unjustified and not consistent with National Policy.

To make the Plan legally compliant and sound, site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 60	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Sally Phillips		I think that the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authority's own policies. The Minerals Strategy 2014 which says 'there has to be exceptional circumstances' for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principles of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of AONB status. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. This area is also very close to the Jurassic coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. This new proposed quarry is hardly an extension, it is a completely new quarry requiring a bridge over the Purbeck Way's unspoilt coombe. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 and nothing has changed to make this desirable now.	
PSD - MSP 64	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Lucy Locke		I wish to disagree with this proposed 'extension' as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. In this situation there are NO exceptional circumstances. There is sufficient aggregate in other parts of the country with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. In addition, this is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way which connects Corfe Castle to the Jurassic Coast. Planning for a quarry 'extension' was declined in 1969 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB - this remains the case today. The proposal is not sound and has no justification. I ask that it is rejected.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 68	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ellen Fielder		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. · It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. · It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. · It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment · It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. · It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 72	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Pauline Bellis		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 78	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Charles xx		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of intrusive haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting an unwelcome precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	
PSD - MSP 94	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr RE Gibson		<p>The proposal to extend the quarry by some 35 acres is certainly not justification for ruining this area of natural beauty for ever. The amount of heavy traffic that this will introduce coming through the Corfe Castle (the only access to and from Swanage, Kingston and Langton Matravers) will create horrendous problems of nuisance from noise and fumes. The summer months are particularly difficult in this respect as many of the roads are already overloaded with traffic during the holiday season and these proposals will only add to the problem.</p>	

PSD - MSP 96	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Jane Viney	<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of intrusive haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting an unwelcome precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it. I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities' own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says 'there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan'. It is also not consistent with the principles of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014, with regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated'. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. -There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy near Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. -This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement, but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castl. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. -Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way - a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB: nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound, Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.
PSD - MSP 99	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mrs Catherine	Plan involves undermining an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is unnecessary when other sites are available.	Do not use this site for quarrying.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
			Andrews			
PSD - MSP 104	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Peter Davies		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 106	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Miss Stephanie Walker		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 110	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Nicola Gibson		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies, The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says 'there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014, with regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated'. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy near Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB with an ancient Bronze Settlement, but is also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way - a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB: nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the Plan legally compliant and sound, site PK16 should be removed from the plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 112	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Fiona Morgan		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed. It seems a crying shame to scar the landscape for aggregate. If you visit the area I'm sure you'll agree that this site is of such beauty and a nature reserve for walkers to enjoy. I have been visiting this area for over 30 years to walk in what I consider to be God's country!</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 114	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr David Bowerman		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.</p>

PSD
-
MSP
118

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Mr
Andre
w
Barker

I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not consistent with national policy and therefore not legally compliant nor is it sound. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs. Unless there are exceptional circumstances. In this instance, there are NO exceptional circumstances. Also re a sustainability appraisal, there is ample aggregate available in other parts of the south west, namely Portland and the Mendips with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. I therefore believe that this plan, when considered against reasonable alternative option, based on proportionate evidence, to be unjustified. As National Planning Policy framework requires exceptional circumstances to lift the AONB status, I believe this document to be neither legally compliant nor sound as it fails to take into account the local authority's own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which states there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. A proposal that an AONB should suffer a permanent scar for short term benefit for one company is not acceptable. The face of this AONB would change forever. The proposal states there is no anticipated shortage of supply of crushed rock sites during the Plan period and the National Planning Policy Framework requires that mineral planning authorities should provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from Outside Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage sites. Therefore, the issue of provision of a sustainable supply of crushed rock does not outweigh the presumption against location within the AONB and hence is unjustified. It was due to this lack of exceptional circumstances that the planning application for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 and nothing has changed since then. There is still a plentiful supply of aggregate close by and it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB and this is still the case. Therefore I believe the plan is definitely not justified and therefore unsound. This is most certainly not an extension. This is a new quarry requiring an industrial bridge being constructed over the Purbeck Way (a spectacular walk to quote DCC), connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. This 35 acre new quarry proposal will be the size of 17 football pitches shifting stone over a scenic footpath in thousands of lorry movements. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but also on tourism, hence employment and even possibly affecting the status of the World Heritage site and the money this brings to the area. The effects of these increased lorry movements through the small village of Corfe Castle must not be underestimated. With a current average of 70 lorry movements daily, the stone lorry traffic is already heavy and the potential of more lorries shows the plan has not been positively prepared as it does not take into account the infrastructure needs therefore is unsound. There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy to Poole and other rail links to the coast, surely this is the most environmental option, with no more lorry movements involved? A factor that is often but MUST NOT be overlooked is the private water supply to Kingston Village which is always a sensitive issue as its source is in the Coombe where this expansion is proposed, The owner of Encombe Estate is responsible for providing water to the village and as such has taken his responsibilities seriously. Having drilled a bore hole to try and provide more water, he has stated that this cannot supply the village solely, so it does rely on the supply from the Coombe. It is a fragile water supply and can be compromised easily therefore yet again I do not believe the plan to be sound as it has not been positively prepared due to its lack of understanding of the infrastructure needs, ie the local water supply and its fragility. In conclusion, I feel the council is being pushed into recommending a plan that is unsound and not legally compliant for the benefit of one company to make more money. There is a healthy supply of aggregate in the Mendips, and transport already in place that doesn't threaten to overload our tiny local roads, so why is the plan even being considered? I therefore consider the plan to not be legally compliant as it does not have regard for national policy. I also consider the plan to be unsound as it has not been positively prepared, its unjustified and not consistent with National Policy.

To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 122	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr DJ Newberry		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 125	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Miss Susannah Feeley		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	This site should not be included in the plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 129	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Miss Susannah Feeley		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 137	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Robert Woolf		<p>I object to the above proposal for mineral extraction for the following reasons: It does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) unless there are exceptional circumstances. No case has been made that there are exceptional circumstances. Indeed, there is ample aggregate elsewhere in Dorset and the Mendips as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, Extraction in the Mendips, could use an existing rail link to transport aggregate. This rail link avoids the need for extensive use of heavy diesel-polluting lorries on narrow country roads in Purbeck which would result from this proposal. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands lies beside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site: one of only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this area. The land should not be sacrificed for private sector commercial gain. This is a new quarry, although described as an extension requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing the Purbeck Way which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation could affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This proposal could therefore have a serious detrimental economic effect on on tourism, local jobs and the local economy This proposal is inappropriate without justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 307	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Gary Horton		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 130	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr David Gray		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 248	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Simon Clabburn	Suttle Stone Quarries	<p>I believe the Mineral Sites Plan to be sound. The Dorset County Council Waste and Minerals Policy team and the elected County Councillors have considered the balance of 'impact' compared to 'need / benefit' and have decided that the Swanworth extension should be included as there are exceptional circumstances and that the 'pros' do outweigh the 'cons'.</p> <p>The extension is a continuation of an established aggregates quarry already in the AONB which has been quietly and unobtrusively providing stone to Purbeck and beyond for many years. The extension will continue in the same manner.</p> <p>The economic benefit the quarry provides to our employees, our customers and the local and national 'tax pots' is significant and its location in relation to the main markets of Purbeck, Poole and Bournemouth is much more sustainable when compared to aggregates which would need to be sourced from Portland and the Mendips if Swanworth were to close.</p> <p>Dorset needs this extension to help satisfy the stone requirements of our local built environment. I am employed directly at the quarry and if the extension does not go ahead my job would be made redundant. That is a prospect my family and I do not wish for. I strongly hope the examination in public later this year supports the view of Dorset County Council for the inclusion of the Swanworth extension.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 135	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr James Gagge ro		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement.</p> <p>As the party with the onerous responsibility of providing at our expense the private water supply to the residents, farmers, and businesses situated in and around Kingston, we have raised significant concerns about the risk of contamination to the water supply derived from the springs that feed into our catchment area below the proposed extension to the quarry. In spite of the legitimacy of these concerns no one has made any attempt to meet with us to discuss our concerns or explain how they will be addressed. I admit we received a technical document early in the planning process but the lack of communications since then has only added to our sense of anxiety.</p> <p>Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small narrow country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. These roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being involved in serious accidents if they are forced to share these with wholly unsuitable large trucks too. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. As there are numerous alternative sites with these materials it is not necessary to open up pristine environments of such high quality. Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 143	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Ian Mateer		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	
PSD - MSP 147	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Alison Burnet	Corfe Castle Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council have no objection to the content of the document as they see no errors in the information presented however they do have concerns regarding the impact of the extension on the AONB.</p> <p>They also wish to see evidence of the need for the greater amount of aggregate and they wish to see a properly conducted assessment into the impact of the proposed extension on the water supply to the village of Kingston.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 190	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jason Cooper		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 142	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Neil Girkins		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. During the last twenty years since living on the Purbecks, I have had at least three close encounters with quarry lorries on Kingston Hill going too fast and definitely over the central line. There is already a safety issue and Kingston Hill cannot cope with any more quarry lorries. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. The proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 186	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Pippa Knap		<p>We are three friends who spend a lot of time in Dorset and have heard about this proposal for the quarry extension, which we do not agree with. In fact looking at the plans it looks like calling it an extension is a bit of a con in itself what with an 'industrial bridge' being required to link the two sites. The fact that this bridge crosses the spectacular Purbeck Way we believe would be a travesty and, with the other options available, find it extraordinary that the Council are even considering allowing this in an area of such world renown value and across the route that links the Jurassic Way with Corfe Castle. We believe that not only would the quarry extension be a blight on all senses - the noise, the sight of it but that it will add more traffic to roads which are already overcrowded and in need of repair. This proposal is bound to bring more more heavy vehicles which will be a nightmare for local residents, off putting for tourists, and a danger to ramblers and cyclists, all of whom are vital to the local economy and are already tired of sitting in queues for hours on end. We urge the District County Council to reject it. This decision can never be reversed. Pippa Knap, Christopher Hughes, Joanna Jacobs,</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 221	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jonathan Lermitt		<p>I disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	
PSD - MSP 237	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Andy Pedrick		<p>This application is totally wrong for this area. It is too large and would seriously affect the Purbeck Way route which is currently a very peaceful walk even with the existing quarry next to it. This development will ruin the current environment and people on the route will actually have vehicles affecting the route and visible from the route.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 225	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Debbie Montague		<p>We are writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16. We own a property in East Street, Corfe Castle which we run as a holiday home and we wish to make the following comments: Our property is a Grade II listed building which is less than 10ft from the road and we have on numerous occasions experienced the house shaking as a result of heavy goods vehicles passing by at high speed. It is therefore of great concern to us that the volume of these vehicles is likely to increase, putting more pressure on the properties along the road through Corfe Castle, which was not designed for these large vehicles. We feel it would be adversely affecting the fabric of our property and the other historical buildings in the village as well as those situated in Kingston. We need to protect our heritage! There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic through Corfe Castle and the road has an extremely narrow pavement in places. Both these factors mean that both cyclists and pedestrians will be facing even higher chances of being hurt or killed by the increased number of unsuitable vehicles using the route. The area in question is also a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it does not seem necessary to open up a pristine environment such as this, where it will affect the visual impact of the area, which attracts a great amount of tourists. Both the visual impact and the even busier roads would no doubt put tourists off of visiting this beautiful area. In particular, avoiding staying in and visiting the village of Corfe Castle due to the busy congested roads! To summarise, It will endanger the current prosperous rural economy built on tourism in the area. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment. It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 191	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Daniel a Manco		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
257

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Philip
GH
Collins

The draft Minerals Plan is neither legally compliant nor sound as regards the inclusion in the plan of an allocation for crushed rock at site PK-16, Swanworth Quarry. The allocation is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework regarding Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty NPPF emphasises the sustainable use of minerals and that the contribution that substitute or secondary and recycled materials and minerals waste would make before considering the extraction of primary materials as well as the importance of environmental criteria to avoid adverse impacts on the natural environment, including visual intrusion and traffic. It also requires planning authorities to maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast and that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (as in Purbeck) which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. At para. 116 it provides 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 (emphasis added). As described below, the Mineral Planning Authority's own Local Aggregates Assessments for the draft Minerals Plan , show that there is absolutely no need for development of a new quarry for crushed rock at Swanworth . In these circumstances, it is difficult to see how the combined force of the exceptional circumstances and public interest tests in the NPPF could ever be satisfied in relation to an allocation to PK-16, Swanworth Quarry. In this regard, it should also be noted that draft Sustainability Appraisal for site PK-16, Swanworth Quarry is not only factually incorrect in its overall recommendation (even in its corrected form with the changes in the addenda) in referring to the "supply of Purbeck Stone" but relies on "on balance" and "apparent reasonableness " standards in justifying the allocation to the site in the draft Minerals plan . These standards cannot realistically be applied in the light of NPPF para. 116. The draft Sustainability Appraisal makes absolutely no reference to the Local Aggregates Assessments , relying instead on sweeping generalities, not facts or evidence. The allocation is not in accordance with the local Minerals Strategy (2014) . The available evidence in the supporting documents prepared for the draft Minerals Plan by the Minerals Planning Authority demonstrate that there is absolutely no need for additional sources of crushed rock within the area covered by the draft Minerals Plan during the Plan period. The existing landbank, the current, longstanding supply arrangements (flexible and able to respond to changes in demand), the present and projected demand for crushed rock in the Plan period and the increasing demand for, and use of, secondary and recycled aggregates as substitutes for crushed rock, mean that the areas needs for the Plan period can be met without any new quarry for crushed rock . The allocation to PK-16 Swanworth in the draft Minerals Plan ignores the Mineral Planning Authority's own evidence and is illogical, unjustified and perverse. No coherent and consistent case has been put forward for this new quarry. The Minerals Strategy (2014) identified, consistent with NPPF, the importance of secondary and recycled aggregates and emphasised (i) the excess local capacity for such products; and (ii) the environmental benefits, in terms of avoiding the use of primary materials and traffic impacts. The evidence and assessments contained in the Local Aggregates Assessment 2006-2015 (May 2017) and 2016 (DRAFT) (December 2017) show that there has been continuing growth in recycled aggregates, year-on-year (and with actual sales being noted to be likely to be higher than recorded for the assessment). Furthermore it is noted that, with excess capacity, it is assumed that output could increase provided the source of supply and markets were available. The Minerals Planning Authority appears not to have taken into account the continuing growth of recycled aggregates in assessing the future demand for crushed rock, and thus any need for an allocation of a new site or sites for crushed rock. The Minerals Strategy (2014) also specifically identified at para. 7.60 the crushed rock landbank at "approximately 13 million tonnes, sufficient for around 48 years of production. The period of 48 years is well beyond the life of the Mineral Strategy and it is therefore considered that there is no need to identify any further sources of crushed rock at the present time." (emphasis added) Para. 7.61 then provides that "the strategy for

The multiple failings identified mean that the only change that can be made at this stage to make the document legally compliant and sound would be to exclude PK-16 Swanworth Quarry from the draft Minerals Plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. The whole basis of the allocation to PK-16, Swanworth Quarry is completely misconceived and unjustified. No coherent and consistent case has been put forward for the allocation.

future extraction of Portland Stone encourages the relinquishment of those parts of the planning permission within sensitive areas, such as those close to housing. If this happens, the remaining permitted reserves of crushed rock would be reduced. However, it is expected that any reduction would form only a small proportion of the total, and the landbank would remain sufficient for well over the Plan period." (emphasis added) Para. 7.62 states that "there may be exceptional circumstances where it is appropriate to grant permission for the production and processing of crushed rock at a new site. This could be where there has been a marked change [sic] in mineral demand or unexpected reduction in supply (emphasis added). However, the evidence and assessments contained in the Local Aggregates Assessment 2006-2015 (May 2017) and 2016 (DRAFT) (December 2017) show that there has been no marked change in mineral demand or unexpected reduction in supply for crushed rock. On the contrary, the latest assessment shows demand for crushed rock falling in 2016 to 197,873 tonnes compared to a 10 year average of 230,000 tonnes and a high of 440,000 tonnes almost 20 years ago. No evidence is presented of an unexpected reduction in supply, apart from some potential relinquishing at the margins in Portland " where the reduction in supply would have a marginal impact on reserves as already foreseen in the Minerals Strategy (2014). On the contrary, the Local Aggregates Assessment 2016 (DRAFT) (December 2017) noted the recommencement from February 2017 of rail -imported crushed rock to the convenient (for Bournemouth and Poole) railhead at Poole, with the comment that "there is capacity to import at least 90,000 tonnes per annum and this could increase provided demand existed". The draft Minerals Plan distorts and misapplies the Minerals Strategy (2014) by claiming that "a sustainable supply of minerals close to the market" is in itself "exceptional circumstances". But that is not the way that the Minerals Strategy (2014) is written. The exceptional circumstances are clearly stated to be "a marked change[d] in mineral demand or unexpected reduction in supply". The term "exceptional circumstances" in Policy AS3 has to be read in that light and points a. and b. in the policy cannot themselves be additional, self-standing "exceptional circumstances". To read them as such makes no sense of either the strategy or the specific policy. So the underlying factual basis for any new quarry for crushed rock in Purbeck " or anywhere to serve the area of the Mineral Planning Authority" is simply not substantiated by the evidence. On the evidence, the issue for crushed rock is not any lack of supply sources, but falling demand and lack of prospects for sustained, and rising, demand for crushed rock. Failure to put in place restoration policies for PK-16 NPPF, at para. 143 requires planning authorities to put in place policies to ensure that worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites takes place. The evidence in the supporting documents prepared for the draft Minerals Plan shows that there are no plans or policies in place which would address the restoration of any new quarry for crushed rock at site PK-16, Swanworth Quarry, with a stated restoration method of inert landfill, even if it should receive an allocation for crushed rock in the Minerals Plan. The draft Waste Plan, prepared in conjunction with the draft Minerals Plan, shows that the need for additional new capacity for inert landfill within the Plan period is, at best, uncertain. There is considerable uncertainty about the rate of use of existing facilities and the likely growth of arisings of inert waste as well as of the impact of the diversion of inert material from landfill to recycling and of the greater emphasis on disposal of inert waste taking place at the closest facility to which it arises (thus, for instance) making remoter locations, such as Swanworth, less attractive. (It is also notable that no recycling at any new Swanworth quarry is contemplated according to the site information in the supporting documents.) Any new quarry at Swanworth would require a restoration strategy, the means to carry it out and policies and measures to ensure that it could be implemented. All these are absent in this case. The restoration strategy in the site assessment for site PK-16 is said to be "inert waste" with "final restoration form to be determined". The restoration strategy is, at best, vague save that it would take place in phases over the life of the quarry. The means to carry restoration out " with inert waste " should be identified in the draft Waste Plan, but it is not. Only the vaguest references are made to the potential use of quarries, with no sites identified. The strategies

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>to ensure that it is carried out are also absent from another relevant supporting document, the Landscape Management Guidelines . These are stated to "provide guidance on the type of restoration expected in different parts of the county, dependent on landscape character and ecology." RS 2, Restoration Strategy for the Limestone Plateau Landscape Type, relates to south Purbeck. The description of the key characteristics, the mineral characteristics and the mitigation considerations all demonstrate clearly that this section is only concerned with traditional Purbeck stone quarrying and not with industrial scale quarrying for crushed rock, such as would take place at Swanworth. This is further confirmed by the contrasts with RS 3, which explicitly covers crushed rock in Portland. So there are no landscape management guidelines for PK-16, Swanworth Quarry. This point appears to have been missed in the draft Sustainability Appraisal which refers to mitigation being "Appropriate restoration proposals in line with Landscape management Guidelines referred to in Minerals Strategy" " even though no such guidelines exist. This further emphasizes the point made earlier about the inherent weaknesses of the draft Sustainability Appraisal . The stated objective in the Land Management Guidelines is "to ensure that the minerals and waste management facilities required by society and the economy, along with the impacts of their extraction, processing or operation on people and the environment, are managed in an integrated and sustainable way. " (emphasis added) . There is clear a complete lack of integration as regards the restoration of any new quarry at site PK-16, Swanworth. It would be wrong in principle to allocate a new quarry in the Minerals Plan without the greatest clarity about the strategy, means, policies and measures for restoration, including in the Waste Plan. Conclusion The draft Minerals Plan is not legally compliant as regards the allocation to PK-16, Swanworth Quarry. It does not have regard to national policy in critical areas regarding minerals planning, sustainability and environmental matters. The sustainability appraisal is clearly deficient and misguided as regards national policy. Nor is the draft Minerals plan sound, as regards the allocation to site PK-16, Swanworth Quarry. It has not been positively prepared as it does not meet objectively assessed needs for crushed rock or achieve sustainable development for the supply of crushed rock and its substitutes, such as recycled aggregates, over the Plan period. It is not justified in terms of providing the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, including all existing supply arrangements especially when demand is falling, based on proportionate evidence. Quite the contrary, the strategy simply defies the evidence. Given all the uncertainties, its deliverability in many respects (e.g. ability to mitigate adverse impacts, ability to secure planning permissions and meet conditions and ability to restore) must be regarded as highly uncertain. Finally, it does not provide the delivery of sustainable development for a range of reasons, notably by continuing to encourage primary extraction over recycled products, traffic, visual impacts and impacts on local communities and on the preservation and protection of the AONB generally.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 233	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Martyn Dodd		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 236	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Dr & Mrs D Knott		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 238	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Stephanie Derrick		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 244	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Jane Clabburn		<p>The Minerals Plan is sound and on balance the inclusion of this extension is correct. My husband works at the quarry and grew up in Dorset. As a family we spent many years following my husbands work around the UK before finally having the chance to settle back here. I also work locally and our son is at school here. If the quarry were to close we would have to move away again to find similar work which would be far from ideal. My husbands parents, both now in their 80's live near Dorchester and having us close to help is a real support to them as they try to remain in their own house for as long as possible. I understand it is in the AONB but we all consume raw materials and they have to come from where they are found. We can't hide behind 'not in my back yard'. There has been quarrying on the Purbecks for a long time and the Purbecks will still be there long after we have all gone, so as long as the quarrying is done sensitively and put back properly at the end then there is no reason not to quarry. Us and our children need the materials now to build the homes and environment we all need.</p>	
PSD - MSP 541	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr. R Khanna	Worth Matravers Parish Council	<p>Please see attached letter for full representation. This representation has also been attached to paragraph 1 of this plan, and at Appendix A Figure 18 (PK16 Swanworth).</p>	
PSD - MSP 505	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Eden Wilford-Cole		<p>I support the plan. I work for Suttles at the Mannings Heath depot. We supply the Swanworth stone to the local building community.</p>	
PSD - MSP 527	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mrs Sue Marshall		<p>I came to work for Suttles straight from 6th form at Purbeck School. This year will mark my 20 years working for Suttles. I require Swanworth Quarry to continue quarrying as it is important to mine and my family's livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 525	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Paul Bush		I work for Suttle Stone quarries. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 523	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	mr paul gallett		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Purbeck (Swanage). Swanworth quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 499	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Caroline Percy		I have worked for Suttles for 7 years now and previously for Tarmac and consider myself as an important member of the team. I believe their vision for the future of Swanworth Quarry to be of great value to the local community and beyond providing jobs and stone for local construction schemes, without it would have to be hauled from Portland or the Mendips upping costs and limiting supply needs. As for the AONB, this would be restored as already displayed at the other areas of the Quarry.	
PSD - MSP 533	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Mark Cockwell			

Natural England has previously commented on this proposal (July 2016) and these comments remain valid.

In that response we referred to adverse effects on the AONB as being the key issue; the significance of this issue has also been identified by

other consultees, by your own landscape experts and in the Sustainability Appraisal/SEA.

In summary our view is that the proposal is of a scale that these impacts are likely to be highly significant and, in the light of policy protection for AONBs in the NPPF and Minerals Core Strategy, there is uncertainty about the ability of the proposal to receive planning permission. Thus in this respect the Plan would appear to fail the soundness test because there remain significant regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery.

We have identified a number of areas where further information combined with changes to policy might help to rectify this defect. In our view some crucial issues are not adequately addressed within the Plan and its Sustainability Appraisal/SEA and this is not in accord with the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and the Directive that these regulations implement. Neither is it valid to suggest that this is not important because a full EIA would be necessary at application stage. Here the point is that an allocation within a sites plan is highly significant and should not be made without appropriate appraisal of impacts in line with the Regulations and Directive. If everything were left to the application stage the whole purpose of a sites plan would be negated. In particular we would point out two issues.

First the Sustainability Appraisal/SEA fails to adequately consider alternatives. Thus at 6.13:- Only one site allocation has been put forward for crushed rock. Given its location in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, its possible inclusion in the Plan will require detailed justification. There is no need to carry out any assessment of options, apart from assessment of the site itself (see Appendix A).

It is hard to see why, because only one crushed rock site has been allocated, the statutory need to consider alternatives [eg The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 Part 3 12 (2) (b)] is negated. It is cannot be the case that this is the only site in Dorset where it is possible to win crushed rock.

The second issue concerns the need to assess the degree that landscape mitigation might reduce the harm to the AONB. The Regulations and Directive require reports to include (Schedule 2):- **7. The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme .**

Whilst we appreciate that it is not possible to go into the same detail at his stage as would be appropriate at application stage this does not mean that the whole of this element of the assessment can simply be ignored, as has been done here. For the Sustainability Appraisal/SEA merely identifies the need for more detailed landscape and visual impact assessment to identify and implement possible mitigation of identified impacts . Leaving such a crucial issues entirely unaddressed at this stage is not in accord with the requirements of the Regulations and Directive, the result being that any meaningful assessment of the likely scale and significance of the potential impact on the AONB is difficult if not impossible.

In our view the specific issues where clarification and/or modification of the Plan is required are as follows:

1. The length of time that the quarry might remain operational seems to be based on the projected output in relation to the mineral reserve (with a discrepancy between the size of the reserve quoted in the Site Assessment and the Development Guidelines). At first sight such a timetable seems optimistic (as far as minimising the length of time the quarry would be in use) given the length of time the existing quarry has been operational (it

is clearly visible on a 1972 aerial photo). Moreover it takes no account of how the availability of inert fill might affect progress and how quickly restoration might then be achieved eg through prioritised phases. Further information on these points is necessary.

2. The issue of the working of the site in relation to cessation and restoration of the existing quarry is not covered in the Policy, background text or the development guidelines (although site assessment says that the extension would not be worked until the current site is finished). There is a potential cumulative effect on the AONB from the two sites being open simultaneously and at present there is nothing in the Plan that serves to minimise such an effect. In these circumstances a better definition of finished is required in relation to the degree to which restoration of the existing quarry should have progressed (currently about 30% of the existing quarry seems to be restored and this proportion seems to have changed little in the last 10 years). Moreover, the development guidelines need to deal with the issue with a new clear and specific link between these Guidelines and Policy MS-3.
3. We have already identified the lack of any appraisal of possible mitigation as a critical deficiency. Potential mitigation measures such as different screening options, phasing and early restoration should be evaluated in the Development Guidelines with appropriate corresponding changes made to Policy MS-3 as necessary. Mitigation considerations should include the quality and condition of landscape features which, where appropriate could be enhanced/restored. For example the restoration of walls may reduce visual impacts, creation of new walls eg along the northern part may serve to provide functional screening in relation to the visual receptors on the B3069.
4. The possible arrangements with the tunnel are not adequately explained anywhere in the documentation so that it is not possible to come to a sensible view about how a tunnel and associated bridge might affect the AONB. It is difficult to understand exactly what is meant by the only mention of the tunnel in the development guidelines (This will include creation of a tunnel over the access to the extension area). The potential impact of these artificial structures on the natural qualities of the AONB seem nowhere to be considered. Given that there seems to be some doubt about the technical feasibility of a tunnel it is unclear if these Guidelines are requiring a tunnel or whether the proposal might be acceptable without one. These uncertainties need to be addressed.
5. The red line around the proposed allocation includes a small area of about 0.6ha at the top end of the coombe situated to the east of the proposed access corridor. This comprises an east facing slope at the northern end of the coombe (the south end of this small area is touched by the Purbeck Way at the point where it changes direction before climbing the opposite side of the coombe). It is unclear why this area is included within the allocation site since if it were worked it would open up views into the remainder of the site. It is at a lower level so not suitable for providing screening which needs to be at the top of the slope. In these circumstances we would recommend that this area is removed.
6. One aspect of the proposal that should count in its favour is that within the allocation site at present the natural element of the AONB is not well represented, apart from the landform itself. There is an opportunity therefore for enhancement as part of the restoration. In general terms we support the restoration vision but have the following more detailed comments.
 - (a) the objective should not just be for limestone pasture but for limestone pasture of conservation interest (eg species-rich limestone pasture)

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) some areas should be left to naturally revegetate as early successional limestone habitats are particularly valuable (c) we do not think that new copses would be appropriate in this open landscape. <p>7. It is probable, and certainly it cannot be ruled out at this stage, that even with full mitigation there will be residual adverse landscape and visual impacts on the AONB. In these circumstances Policy DM4 of the Minerals Core Strategy should apply requiring compensatory environmental enhancements to offset the harm. Such measures may also serve to moderate detrimental effects in line with the requirements of the NPPF (115/116). However, at present the Plan only refers to mitigation and as such does not provide an adequate basis for provision of the necessary enhancements. The Plan should be amended to address this point through a new a specific policy requirement to this effect in MS-3 together with details about the mechanism of implementation within the Development Guidelines.</p>	
PSD - MSP 513	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Kenneth Lock		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 531	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Wayne Thomson		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 515	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Lloyd Earwaker		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 497	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Ben Hayes		I support the plan, I work at the Suttles Depot in Poole and we sell a lot of the Swanworth Stone to all the local builders.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 511	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	MR James Drane		I work for Suttle Transport and have done so for 20 years. I live locally in Corfe Castle. Swanworth Quarry continuing is vital to my family's and my livelihood. The Plan is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this and I strongly support their view.	
PSD - MSP 509	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Ian Warne		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound, my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 495	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Alan Hall		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 529	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Tim Hammond		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live in Swanage. Swanworth Quarry staying open is important to my livelihood. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 489	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Judith Nash		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed. Swanworth Quarry is owned by Suttles and they have other businesses in the area. I think they would be able to find further jobs when the quarry closes in 2024.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 435	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Judith Nash		<p>I disagree with this site being included in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan for the following reasons: It is against Planning Policy. There should be no new permission unless there exceptional need. There is no exceptional need. Superior quality stone can be obtained from from the Mendips. Swanworth is within an AONB on the Jurassic Coast. Whilst traditional local dimension stone quarrying is an accepted part of the Purbeck scene roadstone quarrying certainly is not because of the devastating effect it has on the landscape. The road from Kingston through to the end of Corfe Castle used by the heavy lorries loaded with roadstone is steep and winding and poses a danger to every other road user. This is especially so for pedestrians on Kingston Hill where there is no pavement and where the dry stone walls are frequently damaged. The Kingston water supply might be adversely affected in the long term by dumping more waste. On Purbeck far more jobs are created by tourism than by a roadstone quarry. The quarry extension would spoil this unique and popular area.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 493	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Shanie Joyce		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 355	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mark & Stephanie Helme		<p>We wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it does not follow the National Planning Policy Framework, as the guidelines do not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. We feel there is aggregate available elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, none of these have an AONB environmental restriction in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link avoids the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on the narrow country roads in and around the Purbeck area, as well as damage to the AONB. We are regular tourists to your beautiful county and enjoy walking in the peaceful countryside, being able to see bee orchids growing in the wild. We would feel differently if this quarry extension was given a green light. We are alarmed that the quarry will require a heavy industrial bridge to cross over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. We understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and again in 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. If the quarry is allowed to extend, the impact would be detrimental to the outstanding landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry would destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands which is enjoyed by so many visitors. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, which local jobs and the local economy depend.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 443	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Debbie Dickens		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 487	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sally Hughes		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 425	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Steve Lamb	Suttle Stone Quarries	<p>The files attached to this representation relate to the Swanworth Quarry extension as allocated in the pre-submission draft Mineral Sites Plan. The representations have been made by Quarryplan (GB) Limited on behalf of Suttle Stone, the operators of Swanworth Quarry. It is considered that the Mineral Sites Plan has been positively prepared, is justified, effective and consistent with National Planning Policy with regard to the allocation of the quarry extension area. The files attached contain extensive information in support of the allocation and demonstrates that there are exceptional circumstances to warrant the allocation of the site even though it is within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Information is also provided on the environmental aspects of the extension.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 327	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Gary Paul Stacey		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 381	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Janet Jenn		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 383	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Isabell a Dorey		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 385	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jon Dorey		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it. This site will generate an additional 30 lorry movements every working day through Corfe Castle.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 387	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Rufus Dorey		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 389	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Lena Scholz		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 391	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Daisy HC		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 393	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Loveday Rowlands		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 395	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Rebekah Aginede		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 397	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Lucy George		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 399	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Abike Disu		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 401	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Phoebe Walton		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 403	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Amelia Baron		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 405	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	cecilia Mann		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 407	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Annie Wilson		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 409	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Janet Jenn		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed. The significant number of extra lorries on the roads, particularly Kingston Hill where there are no pavements, would further endanger pedestrians and cyclists (Purbeck cycleway) and residents who join the road when driving from their drives/tracks/roads. The residents of Kingston have no mains water supply, thus reliant upon a private water supply which could be compromised. A significant proportion of local residents are employed in the tourist industry which would be adversely affected by the proposed plan. This site should not be included in the plan at all.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 411	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Victoria Burford		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 413	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	N David		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 437	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	N David		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	PK16 should not be in the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 415	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Libby Carpenter		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 417	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Maria-Clarisse Tripp		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 419	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Julie Winsor		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 421	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	KM David		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 423	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Emma Lines		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 427	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Gilly Merrick		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 429	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Regina Entwistle		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 431	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Ben Jourdain		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 445	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Celia Henderson		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 447	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sally Clarke		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 449	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Theo Cowper		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 451	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Nigel Symin gton		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	
PSD - MSP 540	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr. R Khanna	Worth Matravers Parish Council	<p>Please see attached letter for full representation. This representation has also been attached to paragraph 1 of this plan, and at Appendix A Figure 27 (PK21 Gallows Gore).</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 428	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	John & Susie Mitchell		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legal Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.
PSD - MSP 508	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Ian Travers		<p>I work for Suttle Stone quarries at Swanworth Quarry. I live in Langton and if Swanworth were to close I would lose my job and as I am now 57 years old, it would be very difficult to find other employment.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 518	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Mark Cockwell		I have worked for Suttle Stone quarries for 14 years. I live in Swanage and think it is very important that Suttles continue quarrying as it is very important to my life and livelihood in the area. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 510	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Jimmy James		I support the Mineral Sites Plan. I live in Swanage and have worked at Swanworth Quarry for 37 years. Purbeck and Dorset need the stone and it doesn't make sense to haul it all the way from Portland or the Mendips.	
PSD - MSP 524	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Paul Roberts		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 528	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Terry Dyke		I work at Suttles Stone quarries and live locally in Purbeck (Swanage). Swanworth Quarry's future is important to me and my family. I think this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 522	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Paul Crook		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and I live in West Lulworth. I have worked at the quarry for 14 years and rely on this for my livelihood. I think this document is sound.	
PSD - MSP 496	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Alan Smith		I have worked for Suttles for 39 years, and for Swanworth to continue is very important to me and my family. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	Although I do not wish to speak at the examination, I am relying on my employer to speak on my behalf and represent my interests.
PSD - MSP 532	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Alan Hall		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound, my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 386	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Sasha Dorey		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it. I notice that the local council has agreed to support this proposal as long as there is no significant increase in vehicle movements. Clearly, there will be a very significant increase in vehicle movements. 125,000 tonnes of aggregate a year equates to 25 lorries full each day.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 453	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Imogen Jones		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 455	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Isabella Mirisola Jones		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 457	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	L Pattman		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 459	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Euan McCreery		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 461	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	PJ Cannings		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 463	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Melanie Hamrick		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 465	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Henrietta Petitpierre		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it. I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 467	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Susan Bayley		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it. I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 469	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Archie David		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 485	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Archie David		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Minerals Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principles of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014, with regard crushed rock. The existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy near Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 abd 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB: nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound, site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 471	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jane Sykes		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 473	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Lucy Wirgman		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 475	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jane Young		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 441	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jane Young		<p>I disagree with this site being included in the Minerals & Waste Local Plan for the following reasons. I don't agree that there is an exceptional need. Aggregate can be obtained elsewhere in the country where there are no AONB restrictions. Swanworth Quarry is within an area AONB. The extension would have a detrimental effect on the landscape. The Kingston water supply, relied on by many households, might be adversely affected by contamination. The road from Kingston to Corfe (where I've lived for 23 yrs) is steep with many bends. It is used by hikers and cyclists. There have been many accidents, increased road use by lorries would add to the danger. The local economy relies on tourism. The extensions would be visible spoiling the beautiful landscape for the tourist. I hope that the DCC reject the application</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 477	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jemima Mitchell		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 479	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Kim Hennessy		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 481	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Andrew Dennison	The Willbridge Practice	<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 486	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Julie Wood		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed. I spend my holidays in around Kingston, for its stunning walks and scenery. I have just read Sir Simon Jenkins (ex chairman of the National Trust) who describes the view next to this proposed aggregate quarry site as one fo the 100 Best Views in England. I cannot believe that anybody would destroy this. Back title "England's 100 Best Views" written in association with the National Trust.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 478	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sas Watson		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 470	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Patrick Wigan		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 456	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Penny Mussel I		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 480	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Gemma Carter		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 483	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Margaret Harris		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Minerals Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principles of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014, with regard crushed rock. The existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy near Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 abd 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB: nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound, site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 491	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Denis Nash		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.
PSD - MSP 501	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	David Price		<p>I believe the plan to be sound. I feel an unfavourable result would lead to suffering on many levels, ie employees, dependents, local businesses, charities and many sponsored events would suffer. Suttles pride themselves on their position in the community.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 503	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Darren Hambidge		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound, my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 507	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Henry Stokes		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Swanage. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 517	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Matt Davis		I agree with the plan. I live in Poole but used to live in Purbeck. Purbeck needs the quarry.	
PSD - MSP 519	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Martin Percy		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 521	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Nicholas Crocker			

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 571	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Elspeth Saint		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 593	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Nicholas Harley		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 573	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr David Leather		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. In these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sits alongside. Visitors like me come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset and part of its attraction is its unscarred beauty and tranquillity which would be seriously impacted by this proposed development. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 575	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Susan Leather		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. In these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sits alongside. Visitors like me come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset and part of its attraction is its unscarred beauty and tranquillity which would be seriously impacted by this proposed development. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 577	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	RA Corbin		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 579	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	M Clarke		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 442	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Sally Feben Smith		<p>I am writing as a local living in Kingston. I object to PK16, Swanworth Quarry extension going onto the Plan and think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy 2014, which says "there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan"; there is no shortage of crushed rock and therefore no need to remove the AONB status. I think the plan has not been positively prepared or advertised as local people are unaware of the situation or the size (35acres) of this quarry and its prominent situation on the rolling Purbeck uplands, between Worth Matravers and Kingston. Quarrying, small limestone quarries, has been going on in this area for centuries, but this is a large aggregate quarry, not top grade Limestone, and comes with blasting, crushing machine and large lorry numbers. This is just not the right place. The proposed area is not only an AONB, but located within the Purbeck Heritage Coast, which is recognised through the Council of Europe's Diploma for the Conservation of Protected Areas, one of only 3 in the country. This area also includes a Bronze Age settlement, in fact the quarry wants to drive its lorries between the 2 Bronze Age Barrows. The road overlooking this site has breath taking views across Corfe Castle and the heathland beyond and is mentioned in Sir Simon Jenkins book of "England's 100 Best Views". This area is unique. The AONB reports time and again in the proposal, that it will have an adverse effect on this unique countryside, because of the open visual beauty of this Purbeck Plateau which will be impossible to camouflage. The argument made by Suttles, the owners of Swanworth Quarry, has been the need for more local aggregate supplies. The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014 says there is sufficient supply to meet the demand in the county and from The Mendips." With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated." There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from The Mendips to Hamworthy near Poole. This line is preserved under Policies in the Mineral Strategy 2014, as are port importation facilities at Poole. This would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck and avoid damaging the AONB. There is no need to destroy an area that is so special, The second argument has been employment. When the present owners took over the Swanworth Quarry from Tarmac, it had a finite amount of aggregate remaining. And Tarmac where planning to convert the area into A Nature Reserve. Suttles is a large company, Swanworth is only part of the business. At present they have planning up to 2024, which gives them plenty of time for the present employees to be absorbed into their other businesses.</p>	To make the Plan legally compliant and sound, PK-16 should be removed from the Plan

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 468	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jason Cooper		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 330	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mandy Shanks		<p>The public want to know what use will be made of the current Swanworth quarry. Its working machinery base will still be left functioning but what about the rest of the current quarry? Are you aware of the noise that the whole village of Worth has to put up with every time the dynamite explosions go off at Swanworth and how the ground vibrates as a result? I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. I visited the site but it was not explained how this would operate in the future or the safeguards. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals the explosives used to quarry makes the sound of a military site and causes my house to shake. the good agricultural pasture land will disappear. the stone extracted is rubble which is already extracted in portland. the purbecks have traditional small stone quarries. This extension is like a military operation, distroying the actual structure of Purbeck land.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 354	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Christine Anstey		<p>I'm writing regarding policy MS3, Paragraph 1.9, Site Code PK-16 and wish to remind you that the site is neither Legally Compliant nor Sound. Legally Compliant? No. Not least because it has failed to secure community involvement. Information has been misleading and poorly explained to stakeholders. Sustainability reports show the project to be woefully lacking and is not in line with national policy regarding local communities and the environment. Positively Prepared? No. The plan does not take into account the local infrastructure and ignores development needs. The heavy traffic will be running along small country roads and through historic villages. There are dangerous blind corners and narrow sections only suitable for light traffic. The roads are shared with cyclists and horse riders which face much higher chances of being hurt or killed by unsuitable vehicles. Justified? No. This a beautiful natural environment, overlooked by SSSI's and on the Jurassic Coast (a UNESCO World Heritage site. It is not a suitable site for the extraction of low grade road materials. There are numerous alternative sites with these materials and it is not necessary to open up pristine environments Effective? No. Consistent with national policy? No. It will damage the vitality of town centres as heavy traffic is pushed through villages like Corfe Castle. It will endanger a prosperous rural economy built on tourism. If any employment is generated it would most likely not be local. It fails to conserve or enhance the natural environment It fails to conserve or enhance the historic environment by clogging the historic town of Corfe Castle with heavy lorries. It is an unsustainable use of minerals</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 382	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Nigel Jenn		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed. More lorries using the Kingston Hill to Corfe Road which is winding with no pavement and its steepness leads to vehicles travelling downhill at some speed. Water is supplied by Encombe Estate and water table could be affected by this development. Tourism brings more money into the area than one quarry. Have always accepted the mining of Purbeck Stone but not aggregates that can be sourced in other areas.</p>	This site should not be included in the plan at all.
PSD - MSP 410	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Carole Dean		<p>PK16 Document unsound: not consistent with National Policy. Site within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). So planning permission should be refused except in exceptional circumstances. These are not exceptional circumstances, This is not in the public interest to have more development at Swanworth Quarry. Similar proposals rejected in 1968 & 1988.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 384	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	George Holden - Hutchinson		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 388	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	James Ryder		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill, which is a good reason to reduce heavy traffic. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 390	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Zara Lawson Johnson		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 392	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Arina Lugavt cova		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 394	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Arabella Batt		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 396	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Sofia Sergeeva		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 398	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Eliza Reynolds		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 400	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Liv Jayaraj		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 402	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Georgina Yarnell		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 404	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Prue Barnes		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 406	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Izzy McIntosh		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 408	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Holly Fletcher Price		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered tht the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 412	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Abi Taylor-Hall		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 414	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Rosie Kremer		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 416	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Bianca Pulze		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 418	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Dawn & Richard Gordon		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as it is not justified and not within National Policy. Nothing has changed since two previous proposals were rejected. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the rock extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. My main objection is that there is no justification for ignoring the principles of an AONB in this case. National Planning Policy does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate available from Portland and the Mendips, with none of the AONB environmental implications as there are here. In the case of the Mendips, aggregate can be transported by rail to the Poole depot. In addition, it is not an 'extension'. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which to quote DCC 'is a spectacular walk' connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Not only does this site sit in an AONB, it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline in a World Heritage Site, one of only three in this country. Therefore, the land should not be sacrificed or destroyed for limited commercial gain and poor-quality aggregate. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. Tourism is the biggest employer in the Isle of Purbeck. This extension plan would have a detrimental effect on tourism for short term gain. The private water supply to Kingston, which is not robust, would be compromised. The peace of Kingston and Worth Matravers would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic with associated pollution. An industrial atmosphere would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of Purbeck and could deter visitors, which could have a knock-on effect on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. No amount of restoration work can replace such intended devastation. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 420	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Cara Brooks		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 422	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Peta Laydon		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 424	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	M Parish		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 430	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Susan Holborow		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 432	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Rhiannon Eland		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

PSD
-
MSP
440

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Dr
John
Beavis

Bourne
mouth
Universi
ty

The proposed site is not legally compliant with the AONB status, as there are no exceptional circumstances and is unsound as it is not justified to destroy this Bronze Age site. As I have said in the previous consultations, see below.

Criterion 11 : Swanworth Quarry extension - an archaeological objection to this proposal. The most compelling reasons for preserving these Bronze Age round barrows and this landscape are justified on the following note. The Barrows are burials, chronological markers for a period in the early 2 nd millennium BC, when an agricultural landscape was well established and beginning to have a "settled appearance". They were located here, in the "outfield" or at a boundary between settlements, where the ancestors could be at once part of the living community yet undisturbed by its mundane activities. This can be thought of as a "ritual" landscape, being more to do with the dead than with the living, not only when the Barrows were built, but in some sense throughout the 4000 years which have passed since " as later land has preserved them, and the Site Assessment still respects them. There is published evidence of domestic settlement in the immediate vicinity of the threatened area to the east, west and south. This comprises flint tools, pottery, waste from manufacturing processes, corn storage and corn drying. It hints at domestic occupation before the barrows were built, continuing until the end of the Roman period and beyond. The context of this evidence was destroyed by quarrying or ploughing, some of it, incidentally, by Sheepsleights, the ancestor of the quarry which this application seeks to expand. But the most compelling pieces of evidence immediately associated with the threatened area and still able to demonstrate with great clarity the relationship use at that time between the Barrows and settlement pattern in the Iron Age - Roman period are the surviving earthwork remains on Kingston Down (the scheduled monument coloured pink on the Site Assessment). Aerial photography from the Second World War shows Kingston Down covered with a patchwork of small rectangular arable "Celtic Fields" associated with two groups of irregular farming and domestic enclosures. The fields draped over the entire plateau and down the adjacent hill slopes are associated with trackways, and, perhaps indicating the pressure on land use at that time, a prominent boundary separating what must have been 2 farms. A plan drawn by RCHM about 1960 shows quite clearly the Celtic Fields of the eastern farm reaching out towards the earlier barrows of the threatened area. Settlement on these limestone plateaux intensified throughout the Bronze Age, Iron Age and into the Roman period, and developed a unique "Purbeck" character. Flint tools were used for the production of bracelets and armlets and later lathes. By the Roman period domestic artefacts, such as inlaid furniture and the use of Purbeck Marble were used for kitchen ware .. So these farming settlements and farmers were also hosts to cottage industries. In summary, the threatened area has a unique and significant archaeological potential because it encapsulates a piece of landscape at the interface between ritual practices and a very particular way of domestic life. Over time, as this domestic shift intensifies, this subsoil must have recorded the effects of shifting tensions between these two domains of perception and action. This potential is too significant to destroy. If this archaeological potential is recognised it needs to be dealt with by experts. Archaeologists are very good at gathering evidence efficiently; But in the future assisted by more capable analytical tools we will be better able to exploit the potential of this site for the benefit of future generations, whose past will help them to define who they are just as it helps us. If we preserve it for them. They will thank us. Dr John Beavis, BA, MSc, PhD, CChem, MRSC, MCifA Reader in Archeology (retired), Bournemouth University

PK16 should be removed from
the plan

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 444	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	DE Medhurst		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 446	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Anya Pasterack		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 448	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Kirsty Bugler		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 450	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Fergus M David		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 484	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Fergus M David		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Minerals Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principles of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014, with regard crushed rock. The existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy near Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 abd 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB: nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound, site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 452	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs MM Grive		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 454	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ella Howlett		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 458	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Linda Conway		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 460	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Harriet Dipper		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 462	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Katharine Mortonn		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 464	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	James Petitpi erre		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it. I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 466	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Julian Bayley		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. This area is unique not only an AONB, overlooking Corfe Castle but in these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sitting alongside. Visitors like me come from all over the country and further afield to enjoy this special area, we dont want the noise of extensive industrial operations. This area is exposed to winds from all directions and sound would carry and impact on the local villages. We come here to get away from our noisy busy lives, please dont destroy this peaceful haven, in our overcrowded country, it is more important than ever before. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it. I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 472	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Christine Mifsud		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 474	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Yvonne Tucker		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 490	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Jane Young		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 476	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	PJ Feben-Smith		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
482

Figure
18

Swanworth Quarry Extension

Ann
Boyce

Not legally compliant The definition of this on page 1 of this document states that to be legally compliant it must have regard to National Policy. As a development such as this is counter to the National Policy for AONB, it is not legally compliant. National Policy for AONBs says that a development such as this will not be allowed unless there are EXCEPTIONAL circumstances. As there is ample supply of crushed rock/aggregate from Portland or the Mendips, and the supply from the Mendips can be provided to Dorset by rail to the depot, recently reopened at Hamworthy, (and so no increase in road mileage would follow), there are NO exceptional circumstances. Is Unsound: The Plan in relation to the Swanworth Quarry is NOT SOUND as it is NOT justified and NOT consistent with National Policy. Not Justified " the plan doesnt provide the most appropriate strategy because Two previous similar proposals to extend the quarry, in 1968 and 1988, were refused and nothing significant has changed since then. It was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The proposal is more for a new quarry than an extension. A bridge is proposed over the Purbeck Way, substantial enough for large vehicles to carry aggregate to the old quarry site. This will be a major blight on the appearance of the area. The Purbeck Way, to quote Dorset County Council, is a spectacular walk connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. It would be severely impacted by this. The quarry site comes within 200 metres of the B3069 and will be clearly visible, impacting the appeal of this area which is not only part of an AONB but also of the Purbeck Heritage Coast. This has been awarded a Diploma by the Council of Europe and is one of only 3 such areas in England. A condition for this Diploma is that the extension of existing quarries conforms to the exceptions principle. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. The B3069 is a popular route used by tourists and a member of the National Trust described to me the layby immediately adjacent to where the quarry extension would approach the road as the layby with the best views in Dorset. That will not be the case if this goes ahead. It is very difficult to assess the impact of something like this on tourism " but tourism creates very many jobs in the area. The water supply to residents in Kingston is sourced from the area of Coombe Bottom and Hill Bottom, very close to the existing quarry and to the proposed extension. This water supply is not robust, at present with two boil notices being issued in the past 18 months or so. The development could pose a serious risk to this supply. Apart from the impact of the noise and dust on the AONB, these also impact residents of Kingston and Worth Matravers and more movements, including within the two quarries area, will make this worse. Although I understand that the proposal is to maintain the same level of lorry movements in and out of the quarry (at 75 in and out, or 150 in total), this does represent a continuation of the pressures applied to the local roads which based on previous permissions, would end in 2023 or 2024. So, the comparison is 150 movements against few or none. The road through Corfe Castle and the one up Kingston Hill, with its sharp turn at the top, are not really suitable for this kind of traffic. Acceptance of this proposal would set a precedent (against National Policy on AONBs) and I fear would lead to proposals in the future to add a further extension towards Kingston. Consistent with National Policy I have mentioned this in my comments above. The Plan is not consistent with National Policy re AONBs. Further, it is inconsistent with the Governments 25 year Environment Plan, recently announced by the Prime Minister, which supports protection to National parks and AONBs. I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe

Refuse permission for the
extension of Swanworth Quarry
PK16.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 488	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Gre-ta Hardy		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 492	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Kate David		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.
PSD - MSP 494	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Alex Venour		I support the plan as a self-employed plant operator. I sometimes work at Swanworth and other quarries in Dorset.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 498	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Chris Lemon		I work for Suttles and live in Swanage. I support the plan as without it, I would probably be out of work.	
PSD - MSP 500	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Dan Dando		I work at Swanworth and live at Kimmeridge. I have a young family and need to work to support them. It would not be easy to find similar paid full time work if Swanworth closed.	
PSD - MSP 502	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	darren Bird		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound, my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 504	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	David Sansom		I work for Suttle Stone Quarries and live in Swanage. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound, my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 506	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Geoff Twigg		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Wareham. Swanworth Quarry carrying on is important to my livelihood and my family. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 512	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Kevin Cort		I support Suttles plan to keep digging and as a result will create more work for Suttles and myself, as being self employed.	
PSD - MSP 514	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Miss Louise Coombes		I support the plan. I am based at Swanworth and live locally in East Stoke. My job is heavily reliant on Swanworth so it needs to continue.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 516	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Mr Marcus Amey		I support the plan. I work for Suttles at Swanworth and at their depot in Poole. The loss of Swanworth could cause a problem with my job.	
PSD - MSP 520	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Nathan Anderson		I work for Suttles Stone quarries and live locally in Purbeck. Swanworth Quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family and I think that this document is legally compliant and sound. My employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 526	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	Sonny Jenn		I work for Suttle projects and I support the Quarry.	
PSD - MSP 530	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	William Dyke		I work for Suttle Stone quarries and live locally in Swanage. Swanworth quarry continuing is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	
PSD - MSP 534	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry	George Brown		I work for Suttles and locally live in Dorset. Continuation of Swanworth Quarry is important to my livelihood and my family's. I think that this document is legally compliant and sound and my employer has provided supporting evidence of this.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 562	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 study would be required if water features present in or near the site. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrogeological assessment Ecological study required if water features present in or near the site. Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 572	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Elspeth Saint		<p>I am a regular visitor to Dorset and Purbeck, in particular, and I wish to disagree with this proposed extension. It does not appear to be legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances in this case. I walk regularly in this beautiful, tranquil area especially along the Purbeck Way which, I understand, will require an industrial bridge over it to for heavy aggregate-hauling lorries. In these rolling hills, there are ancient Bronze Settlements and the Jurassic Coastline sits alongside. Visitors like me come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset and part of its attraction is its unscarred beauty and tranquillity which would be seriously impacted by this proposed development. I understand that planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. I dont see that anything has changed. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 570	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr Simon Cooke		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 574	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mr David Leather		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	<p>To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 576	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Mrs Susan Leather		<p>I think the document is neither legally compliant or sound as it fails to take into account the local authorities own policies. The Mineral Strategy (2014) which says there has to be exceptional circumstances for additional areas of crushed rock to be included in the plan. It is also not consistent with the principals of an AONB. The National Planning Policy Framework requires exceptional circumstances for there to be a lifting of the AONB status. There are NO exceptional circumstances in this case. There is ample aggregate in the county and in the Mendips as quoted in the Minerals Strategy 2014. With regard crushed rock, the existing landbank is adequate to meet demand and therefore no new sites will be identified unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. There have been no changes to circumstances since previous proposals were turned down. *There is already a rail link currently transporting aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy in Poole, and other rail links to the coast, so there would be no extra haulage lorries involved. *This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage site of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. *Legally, this is not an extension at all. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge to reach it over the Purbeck Way " a key tourist attraction. Planning for a quarry was declined in 1968 and 1988 when it was considered that the nature and scale of the extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. Nothing has changed.</p>	To make the plan legally compliant and sound. Site PK16 should be removed from the Plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 578	Figure 18	Swanworth Quarry Extension	Paula Unknown		<p>I wish to disagree with this proposed extension as its not legally compliant or sound, and is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework , which does not support aggregate extraction in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances. There are no exceptional circumstances. There is ample aggregate elsewhere in the county and in the Mendips, as quoted in The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Strategy 2014, with none of the AONB environmental restrictions in place. There is already a current rail link to transport aggregate from the Mendips to Hamworthy, near Poole. This railway link would avoid the need for extensive use of haulage lorries on narrow country roads in the Purbeck as well as damage to the AONB. This area of rolling Purbeck uplands is not only an AONB, with an ancient Bronze Settlement but it also lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline within a World Heritage Site, of which there are only three in the country. It also overlooks Corfe Castle. Visitors come from far and wide to visit this part of Dorset. The land should not be sacrificed for limited commercial gain. This is not an extension. It is a new quarry requiring a heavy industrial bridge crossing over the Purbeck Way, which, to quote DCC, "is a spectacular walk" connecting Corfe Castle with the Jurassic Coast. Nothing has changed . Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 " it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction would be highly intrusive and damaging to the AONB. The quarry owners have mineral rights over a much larger area so this would be setting a precedent. The visible impact would be permanent and detrimental to the landscape. It would be adjacent to the B3069 and easily visible. This 35acre new quarry, would further destroy the tranquillity and beauty of the Purbeck rolling uplands. Landscaping in this exposed area will be unsatisfactory and this devastation may also affect the World Heritage status. Visitors come from all over the world to this area and tourism is the biggest employer in Purbeck. This extension plan could have a detrimental effect not only on the AONB but on tourism, local jobs and the local economy. The already vulnerable private water supply to Kingston could also be compromised. This proposal is not sound and has no justification for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan. I ask that the DCC reject it.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 50	Figure 19	White's Pit	Mr Ian Marine r	Commer cial Recyclin g Ltd	Commercial Recycling (Southern) Limited (CRSL) support the inclusion of the Whites Pit Recycling Facility in the draft Mineral Sites Plan. The designation of this existing inert recycling facility will provide certainty to the future of the site as well as potential development of the facilities it can offer the minerals and recycling industry. On this point the Plan has been positively prepared, following one of the criteria of a "sound" plan. Additionally, by the inclusion as a preferred site for the development of the Whites Pit recycling facilities, the Plan has had regard to national policy which promote the provision of adequate facilities to meet the continuing and increasing need to recycle Construction and Demolition waste. Therefore in relation to this site, the Plan meets one of the tests of a legally compliant plan.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 554	Figure 19	White's Pit	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity Consideration of the nearby designated conservation sites must be undertaken when assessing this site. This should also be addressed when designing the surface water drainage scheme and any other activities that may potentially impact on these designations. Groundwater and contaminated land As the site is situated at a historic landfill it is likely contamination is present. It is likely that a site investigation, mitigation and remediation strategy and verification report will be required in areas where made ground is to be encountered. There may be additional controls placed on drainage and infiltrations due to the existence of made ground. We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Surface water drainage An appropriate surface water management scheme would need to be provided at the planning application stage. This must consider both surface water flow within and off the site, and also take into account water quality issues by incorporating appropriate pollution prevention measures. These water quality issues may arise from the contaminated land beneath the site, or from the construction/ operation of the recycling centre. Therefore all aspects must be considered in the design and management. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrogeological assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 368	Figure 19	White's Pit	Gerald Rigler	Society of Poole Men	<p>It is considered that recent decisions taken by the Planning Committee of the Borough of Poole may need to be challenged by Dorset County Council in so far as :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 some aspirations for allowing waste treatment sites may conflict with mineral extraction sites that may become necessary, 2 some aspirations for allowing houses to be built may conflict with mineral extraction sites that may become necessary (houses close to quarries would not be good news), and 3 respect for the purposes of protected land / reserved land appears to be in need of improvement. Whilst enforcement of any policy over an extended period of time can be expected to be difficult, any chances of success in such enforcement would be undermined if the policies were in conflict on the dates of their initial approval. <p>It would be re-assuring to know whether the concerns expressed above are real and have been or will be addressed. I am referring to the Green Belt Zone to the North of Poole that is understood to contain mineral reserves (in areas best known to you) and which may be compromised by alleged decisions (that apparently cannot be challenged by mere mortals) made by the planning sub-committee of the Full Council operating in the Borough of Poole who seem to have a relaxed view (since overview and scrutiny is ineffective) about the need to sanitize areas for potential mineral extraction and the need to ensure that housing is not too close to quarries and / or waste processing areas.</p> <p>My concern relates to the potential for further alleged decisions (if clear requirements are not known) as well as the alleged decision concerning 324 houses on land South of Magna Road : BoP planning reference APP/17/00008/F defines relevant details for the proposed 324 houses. Hopefully, since the proposed Local Plan for Poole is about to be subjected to Examination in Public your position / needs will become clearer to me.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 434	Figure 19	White's Pit	Butch Road	Arrowsmith Road Residents' Association	<p>Residents have contacted DCC Minerals & Waste Planning Policy team and it was confirmed that only 3 properties (being within 250m of the site) were notified by hard copy of 'RA01 White's Pit, Canford Magna', edged in red, west of the existing recycling plant. However, road signs were placed at the traffic lights at the site entrance in Magna Road and either end of Arrowsmith Road.</p> <p>It would be virtually impossible to stop at these points without endangering oneself (we recommend the Inspectorate visit these points). The local community were therefore unaware of this consultation plan.</p> <p>There are 46 residential properties in Arrowsmith Road, the majority of whom have been affected at some time by the site. The nominated site 'Inset 8' was originally only granted temporary planning use. Outside this timescale, it operated illegally. Poole Borough Council were informed and subsequently WH White applied for permanent full approval, Application 14/00120Y. Approval was granted for a further 8 years only until 1.8.2022, after strong objections from the local community.</p> <p>It is understood that the owner/operator nominated this site to be included in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan. It has now become clear to residents of Arrowsmith Road, Bearwood, Broadstone and Merley that once this has been included in the Draft Plan and accepted, it would be virtually impossible for PBC Planning Department to refuse a planning application for full permanent approval in 2022 if it has already got approval in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan. Therefore, inclusion is not appropriate at this time.</p>	<p>Historically, waste processing, however carefully managed, can never be entirely nuisance free, albeit from air or noise pollution. With the right conditions and wind direction, residents are frequently affected and suffer from the foul odours and noise which emanate from the site, dramatically affecting their quality of life. Residents have complained to the Environment Agency frequently since operations began.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 3	Figure 20	Trigon Hill extension	Mrs Susan Eaves		<p>My property, North Trigon Farm, is within 250m of the proposed ball clay extraction site and I have the following concerns:</p> <p>The impact on local wildlife could potentially be significant, this includes badgers, bats and local ponds/marshy areas with rare bog plant species and dragonflies. I am assuming that a very thorough Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken.</p> <p>As a resident, I have had to endure the considerable noise and truck traffic associated with the tip for the last few years- this involved noise/smells and dangerous fast moving vehicles along a small and narrow road. The mention of as many as 55 vehicles a day is not acceptable considering the amount of traffic we have had to endure with the waste tip.</p> <p>The excavation work for the tip had a dramatic effect on local drainage of water patterns with water diverted to areas not previously affected. My own garden has changed dramatically and the proximity of yet another major excavation scheme is troubling.</p>	<p>Until I can be given reassurances about all these matters, I do not consider this to be a sound proposal in keeping with social and environmental sustainability.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 90	Figure 20	Trigon Hill extension	Mr John Williamson		<p>Being a resident living by the C7 (Bere Regis to Wareham Rd.), I find it quite alarming that we are going to have to put up with up to five sand and gravel reliant operations, including a clay pit along this road, All the extra HGVs or LGVs are going to finish destroying the road surface and in particular the road edges and verges, this is an increasing danger to other road users which has caused some of them to leave the road completely by accident.</p> <p>In my opinion the only sensible option is to upgrade the whole length of the road to accommodate this influx of large vehicles. I appreciate that these materials can only be won from the areas where they lay but something needs to improve for the safety of the local populus and the many visitors (campers) that use this road.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 566	Figure 20	Trigon Hill extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 assessment required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. The assessment will have sufficient level of details, commensurate with the status of the Principal aquifer. Made ground may be encountered. It is likely that a site investigation may be required to determine land quality. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Hydrogeological assessment Flood Risk Assessment Protect and enhance any water features in site. Ecological study if water features present in site Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the Biodiversity Strategy Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence WFD Assessment may be required</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 36	Figure 21	Blacklands Quarry	Mr Graham Bowers		<p>References :</p> <p>PK02 Blacklands extension</p> <p>PK18 Quarry 4 extension</p> <p>PK17 Home Field</p> <p>I understand that these plans are preliminary but I would like to put my comments in writing for the record. I understand that the red boundaries on the site maps don't necessarily indicate the area of extraction but like my neighbours in Blacklands we are concerned about the details. Re PK 02.....I assume this is an extension of the Quarry working area? Is this associated with PK 18?</p>	
PSD - MSP 555	Figure 21	Blacklands Quarry	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity No comments. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrogeological Risk Assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 359	Figure 21	Blacklands Quarry	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	I support this proposal and associated policies.	
PSD - MSP 556	Figure 22	Southard Quarry	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity No comments. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrogeological Risk Assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 66	Figure 23	Downs Quarry Extension	Mr D J Chambers		PK15: the site plan is wrong. The area marked in blue saying permitted mineral site: if you care to inspect the site you will find they have already dug more than double the area. Why? Also, the nominated site goes up to the east boundary fence. Is there going to be a bund along the east boundary? We want some protection for our property from noise, dust and outlook.	Remove from proposal for reasons given in question 4.
PSD - MSP 277	Figure 23	Downs Quarry Extension	Mr & Mrs RT & WJ Wiggins		We live at xxxxx, Haycrafts Lane the nearest residential property to this site. REF Planning Application 1176/2013/0592 & 118PA6/20130593 I am writing to confirm and reiterate certain conditions that were agreed at a meeting with Simon Hart of Lovells Quarry & Huw Williams from DCC in January 2014 regarding the above mentioned applications. Bunds have now been moved as requested ,running from south to north with the lower section moved back to allow for tree planting on the completed section, which has now been done. The only new comment about the bunds would be that if there is any chance of building them up a bit, especially at the northern end that would be appreciated , also to watch the height of the overburden/ storage behind as it is becoming taller ! Quarrying to continue in phases as laid out from north to south in previous applications and terms agreed then are kept to. ie A single excavator with no drilling or blasting techniques & dumper truck for transport Minimal use of beepers etc Normal working daylight hours Good communications to be maintained between operator and neighbour e.g. Notification if any particularly noisy operations are to be done or extra machinery etc Void at northern bottom end to be gradually filled as the phases progress. Presumably the finishing date of 2027 has been granted with restoration to woodland & grassland completed by 2028. We do not object, providing the conditions above are properly monitored and we hope the date can now be achieved.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 557	Figure 23	Downs Quarry Extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study Hydrogeological Risk Assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence Water Framework Directive Assessment may be required</p>	
PSD - MSP 372	Figure 23	Downs Quarry Extension	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	<p>In terms of PK-15 Downs Quarry Extension, Planning Permission has now been granted for mineral extraction at this site. Planning Permission Ref: PL\1579\13 (6/2013/0593) is the substantive consent. I therefore propose that PK-15 is removed from the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 37	Figure 24	Home Field	Mr Graham Bowers		<p>References : Blacklands quarry 4 extension .. PK18 " " " " ...PK02 " " Home Field.....PK17 I understand that these plans are preliminary but I would like to put my comments in writing for the record. I understand that the red boundaries on the site maps don't necessarily indicate the area of extraction but like my neighbours in Blacklands we are concerned about the details. Re PK 17.....This appears to be quite a large plot right up to the Boundary of Priests Way. I would like to know more about the intentions of the Quarrying Co. with this land.</p>	
PSD - MSP 558	Figure 24	Home Field	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study required Hydrogeological assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence Water Framework Directive Assessment may be required</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 360	Figure 24	Home Field	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	I support this proposal and associated policies.	
PSD - MSP 38	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	Mr Graham Bowers		References : Blacklands quarry 4 extension .. PK18 " " " " ...PK02 " " Home Field.....PK17 I understand that these plans are preliminary but I would like to put my comments in writing for the record. I understand that the red boundaries on the site maps don't necessarily indicate the area of extraction but like my neighbours in Blacklands we are concerned about the details. Re PK 18....I suspect this is a request for an area of extraction. This is very close to the houses in Blacklands and the dust and noise could be considerable. It is of course very close to Priests Way ..a public walk way and area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	
PSD - MSP 63	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	Gloria Harding		This proposed site is too near the track known as Priest's Way - it will impact on the properties in the hamlet of Blacklands and surrounding area for the following reasons: - Increased noise - Increased dust - Damage to wildlife - Increased use of Heavy Plant - Damage to natural beauty in a World Heritage Site - Detrimental environment impact - Too near neighbouring properties	Reduce the size of the development site.
PSD - MSP 76	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	Mrs Linda Pounds		The proposed site is too close to the Priest's Way track. For the following reasons it will impact badly on the hamlet of Blacklands and the surrounding area. Due to the prevailing wind from the south-west it will increase noise levels and increase in dust and diesel fumes. Damage to wildlife, ie deer, hares, barn owls hunting ground and skylark nesting area. This I have observed as a resident for 32 years at Blacklands. Damage to natural beauty on a heritage site. Detrimental environment impact to walker of Priest's Way and near neighbouring properties.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 223	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	S Hart	Lovell Purbeck Limited	<p>Lovell Stone Group supports the proposed Allocation of PK-18 Quarry 4 Extension and would like to highlight the importance of its inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan.</p> <p>The Lovell Stone Group operates Quarry 4 and its associated Service Area. The stone from this quarry is processed at Downs Quarry where Lovell Purbeck employs 35 people local to this area. Stone extraction in Quarry 4 is, however, due to enter the final phase of extraction in 2018 which will take 2 years to complete. As a result, the grant of Planning Permission for an extension to the quarry will be required by 2020 at the latest.</p> <p>The stone from Quarry 4 forms a significant volume of that processed and sold at Downs Quarry. As a result, the adoption of PK-18 Quarry 4 Extension in the Mineral Sites Plan is vital to ensure the commercial viability of Downs Quarry and the employment and economic benefits it provides to this rural area.</p>	
PSD - MSP 373	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	S Hart	Lovell Purbeck Limited	<p>The following representation is made on behalf of the Lovell Stone Group: Lovell Stone Group supports the proposed Allocation of PK-18 Quarry 4 Extension and would like to highlight the importance of its inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan . The Lovell Stone Group operates Quarry 4 and its associated Service Area. The stone from this quarry is processed at Downs Quarry where Lovell Purbeck employs 35 people local to this area. Stone extraction in Quarry 4 is, however, due to enter the final phase of extraction in 2018 which will take 2 years to complete. As a result, the grant of Planning Permission for an extension to the quarry will be required by 2020 at the latest. The stone from Quarry 4 forms a significant volume of that processed and sold at Downs Quarry. As a result, the adoption of PK-18 Quarry 4 Extension in the Mineral Sites Plan is vital to ensure the commercial viability of Downs Quarry and the employment and economic benefits it provides to this rural area. I am also writing to confirm that I would like to attend the Hearing to support PK-18 Quarry 4 Extension and its associated policies, on behalf of the operator (Lovell Stone Group).</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 559	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study required Hydrogeological assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	
PSD - MSP 361	Figure 25	Quarry 4 extension	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	I support this proposal and associated policies.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 309	Figure 26	Broadmead Field	Mr Dave Ogborne	Wessex Water	Policy MS-6: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone Broadmead Field, Langton Matravers (PK-19 - see Submission Policies Map - Inset 14) There are existing water mains and abandoned water tanks at the south of the site - these should be retained and relevant provisions provided in the development guidelines.	
PSD - MSP 560	Figure 26	Broadmead Field	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study required Hydrogeological assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 322	Figure 26	Broadmead Field	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>PK-19 Broadmead Field DWT welcomes the removal of the SNCI from this site allocation, but would like to ensure that a substantial buffer to that site is included in any proposed quarrying of the remainder of the site.</p> <p>For all the allocated Purbeck Stone sites DWT is pleased that the restoration vision includes nature conservation after-use, integrating semi-natural grasslands (as well as native hedgerow and copse retention) as a key element. We would like to have seen the suggestion of some additional pond creation to benefit Great Crested Newts, for which this area is known to be important, stated in the restoration vision too, since assessment for impacts on this species is recognised as a key requirement of any application.</p>	
PSD - MSP 362	Figure 26	Broadmead Field	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	I support this proposal and associated policies.	

Comment from Len and Celia Mann of Ballard View, Haycrafts Lane, BH19 3EE:-

Gallows Gore, PK21, is a very unusual site. All other proposals are separated from residential properties, or sometimes close to just one property. Gallows Gore has fourteen surrounding properties, including seven adjacent, sharing a fence with the field. DCCs own Mineral Safeguarding Area policy outlines the need to save areas for mineral extraction, limiting other future uses of the land. In the case of Gallows Gore, the horse has already bolted. Planning for the fourteen houses, and other infrastructure, has been given past permissions, making mineral extraction extremely disruptive to the local residents.

In addition the degree of mitigation proposed by DCC to reduce the impact on residents significantly reduces the amount of stone that could be extracted in any case.

This issue was red flagged in the original proposal and it still stands out as the major problem with this application. It's not as if this is the only issue, there are several other serious problems with the site:-

Access is a key issue and the original comment by DCC said that use of the narrow Haycrafts Lane would not be allowed. We now understand, from DCC officials, that this is now their preferred route! Instead of using the lane, right to the main road, the new plan uses about one hundred meters of the lane to link with Landers existing site, west of Haycrafts Lane. The steep narrow lane is already difficult in the summer months due to the holiday makers with caravans etc., but add to that the multiple stone lorries on a daily basis will make for an accident waiting to happen. This route also takes the lorries right in front of most of the houses, demolishing the proposed 50m plus gap between the residents and the noise and dust. The route also crosses a water main from the adjacent reservoirs, part of Wessex Water's critical infrastructure. It goes on.

The next major issue is that Wessex Water's two reservoirs, supplying water to Swanage and surrounding areas, are adjacent to the site. Quarrying next to the reservoirs could be critical and I quote Wessex Waters own comments, which include:- ' Serious concerns, critical infrastructure, operations will be injuriously affected '. I've written to them and they replied:- ' The site assessment seems to be proceeding despite the concerns we have raised with DCC. '

The next serious issue is the effect on our Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Unlike the existing quarries on top of the hill, Gallows Gore is highly visible from the valley and Purbeck Hills beyond, including the village of Harmans Cross. I have spoken to Richard Brown, the Dorset AONB planning officer and his strong views are reflected in his original objections. ' This site would be unlikely to comply with a number of policies within the Dorset AONB Management Plan, principally due to its exposed location. '

There are several other issues including the effects on wildlife, highlighted in the original application. The site is on a steep slope and water run-off is already an issue, affecting the gravel track which needs regular maintenance. A quarry, and inevitable flooding, will only exacerbate this problem.

The site has already been quarried from underground and the tunnels and access points are of archaeological interest. They also pose a structural stability problem highlighted by a professional surveyor as potentially causing damage to properties, if the quarrying was to go ahead.

Most of the residents were not properly informed about the application causing us to miss the first comment stage. This has been discussed at length with DCC's CEO and other officers, including sending a letter to the CEO signed by all the residents affected. While this is now history, please take into account that the objections raised here, and by other residents, are the first opportunity we've had to raise any official objections. We have commissioned a surveyor's report that indicates a thirty percent loss in value of our property, just because the application exists. In 2014 we purchased what I thought would be our dream retirement home, and invested heavily in its refurbishment, so I don't intend to sell my house, but some of my neighbours need to sell, but they are trapped here while this application exists.

Remove this
proposal from the
plan for reasons
given to question 5

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>The field owner says he doesn't need stone for ten to fifteen years but that he also may sell the site on in the shorter term. This leaves the residents in a state of complete uncertainty which seems totally unfair, causing unnecessary hardship. While it would be easy to leave the site in the plan for later stages, including planning, to try to sort these issues out, I believe that it would save so much wasted time and anguish if the site was removed from the plan now. We understand the need for Purbeck Stone, however, there must be a limit to the disruption caused. There are so many issues associated with this site and yet it could alternatively become a site of historic interest with its underground tunnels and old ways of extracting stone.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 15	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Len Mann		<p>Further to my main comment I'd like to add the following:-</p> <p>Firstly, the injustice of Gallows Gore (PK-21) remaining in the draft Minerals Plan, considering that the Quarr Farm site has recently been removed. The Quarr Farm proposal was proposed in the adjacent field to Gallows Gore, the other side of the reservoirs. The main reason for dropping it from the plan, explained to me by DCC, was the problem of access. This is a problem for both sites but being adjacent sites it's difficult to see why it's a major problem for one site and not the other. It would mean that two different quarry owners would need to cooperate over use of the access road which is always possible. Or if given permission, Quarr Farm might be sold to Landers.</p> <p>Another issue common to both sites is keeping a gap to Wessex Waters reservoirs and underground pipes. This would result in a reduced area to quarry in Quarr Farm, but no less than Gallows Gore now that the rear section is excluded due to protecting butterfly habitat etc. Then there is the AONB issue for both sites. In this regard Gallows Gore is the higher site and visible from further afield! The major issue of adjacent residential properties is significantly less for Quarr Farm, with just two adjacent, compared to Gallows Gores seven.</p> <p>The underground tunnels are another issue for Gallows Gore. We aren't aware of tunnels under Quarr Farm; there may well be some, but the situation won't be worse than it is for Gallows Gore. So, myself and my neighbours agree absolutely that Quarr Farm should be excluded from the minerals plan, but we don't understand why Gallows Gore remains, when it has even more issues.</p> <p>Secondly, I'd like to add to my comments about the proposed access route to Gallows Gore, where the stone lorries will travel back and forth over Haycrafts Lane. I mentioned the danger to traffic on the lane but forgot to mention the high number of walkers and cyclists in the summer months. I walk up and down the lane a lot and one has to be very careful of passing cars, when it can be very tight for a car and just one walker. It will be so dangerous with the large stone carrying lorries. It's not possible to widen the lane and DCC have said they want to preserve the road margins in any case. These are additional factors to the already major issues of:- High density residential housing, AONB exposure, and Reservoir Infrastructure. Len and Celia Mann, Ballard View, Haycrafts Lane, BH19 3EE.</p>	Please remove Gallows Gore from the mineral plan for the reasons given above.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 17	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Roger Brown		<p>Further to representations made by the Gallows Gore action group with regard to unsuitability of the site and large vehicles on a single road (Haycrafts Lane) and the close proximity of the houses and two water reservoirs, there are further concerns with regard to extraction from that site.</p> <p>Our property (Stoneacre) lies some 300m to the north down Haycrafts Lane from the proposed extraction site. Apart from the noise and dust from the site it would be partially visible from our property. It will undoubtedly affect our property and our main concern is that it will be detrimental to our holiday accommodation business (Annexe to Stoneacre)</p> <p>This is a well established business of some 27 years and we have feedback from our guests stating that this is most quiet and peaceful place to stay for a holiday. This will certainly not be the case if this site is used for extraction. Our business is regulated by Visit England and we have had favourable comments from them over the years with regard to being a pleasant place to stay. We are, along with other holiday home owners, promoting the Swanage area. I can not believe that stone extraction in a most unsuitable location can be more important than a well established holiday business.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that these objections are taken into consideration before any decisions that will affect everyone in the vicinity are made. I would add that I have been a resident at this property since 1965 and was and am well aware that this is a quarrying area but this designated site is not in the best interests of any of the nearby residents.</p> <p>Lastly I do hope that all our objections are considered and that this proposed extraction is not already a done deal!!!</p>	To remove this proposal from the plan for the reasons given to question 4

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 29	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr David Joseph		<p>Input from Dave and Jean Joseph, Kamloops, Haycrafts Lane, Swanage BH19 3EE</p> <p>PK-21 Gallows Gore This quarry proposal has seriously affected our lives. We had an agreed sale for our property in June 2016. When our buyer received his search information the Gallows Gore quarry proposal was shown and our buyer dropped out. In fact we and most of our neighbours were unaware that the quarry proposal existed as we hadn't been informed. Just being in the draft plan means that the value of our property has significantly reduced and we are now unable to find a buyer. We are in our seventies and we need to downside to pay off our debts, mortgage etc, and live out our lives comfortably.</p> <p>Another problem is as we age, and we no longer drive, we will be isolated here, considering the hill up to the local bus stop. We are now backed into a corner and unable to move. This is such a depressing situation for us it has also affected our health. We are in such a mess over this we can only look for compensation for this ridiculous situation we find ourselves in. Yet another stressful issue for us do deal with, yet what choice do we have!</p> <p>We don't understand how the quarry was allowed into the draft plan when there are so many issues against it. The proposed access road is one of our biggest worries. Having been told that Haycrafts Lane is not suitable, we now hear that the plan is to use the lane right outside our house! The Lane is so dangerous being a steep hill and a narrow single track lane. A stone carrying lorry will barely fit in the lane and there is bound to be an accident when you think about the walkers, cyclist, including schoolchildren, walking to the bus stop at the top of the lane. Add to this the mud, always made when stone lorries are involved, and it's definitely an accident waiting to happen. Then there's the issues of AONB where the field is visible to the whole valley and the village of Harmans Cross. Then the Reservoirs, with Wessex Water very concerned about their infrastructure. Finally the fourteen houses, seven with a boundary on the field, is so many more than any other site. We really don't understand why this proposal was ever allowed to get into the draft plan.</p>	Please remove Gallows Gore, PK 21, from the mineral plan.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 30	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Jon Slaymaker		<p>Sir, I am painting scenario for you.</p> <p>Imagine setting in your living room reading or watching television and at the same time you are subjected to a background noise of heavy drilling and reversing warning horns from trucks. This is what we have to put up with from the adjacent field workings at the quarry five days a week. Now fast forward if this planning is allows to proceed. Either myself or may wife may be working in our office at the front of our house and will be subject to the same sounds, there will be no escape !</p> <p>Another issue we have is that the trucks removing the stone from Gallows Gore will have to exit into Haycrafts Lane. We have enough problems with mud on the top road and I can only imagine the top end of Haycrafts will be subject to continuous mud contamination during wet periods. When we have heavy rain at the moment a stream of mud coloured water flows down the lane towards Primose farm. Therefore I am objecting to the proposed planning request.</p>	
PSD - MSP 65	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr D J Chambers		<p>I am writing to object to the PK21 quarry plans. Haycrafts Lane has signage at the top and bottom saying 'single track lane with passing places' and 'not suitable for HGVs'. This gives you some clue why this lane would not be suitable for an industrial site with an entrance onto the lane!</p> <p>If the entrance at Avalon was not acceptable, driving straight onto Haycrafts Lane is even more dangerous. There are no passing places from site entrance to main Kingston Road. Lorries would destroy the grass verges and deposit mud on the road, cars would not be able to get past. Cars and lorries would have to reverse up or down the lane, into the main Kingston Road: an accident waiting to happen. To say there will only be 5 movements that equals 10 for their return back to the quarry. No one seems to check up on this, it will be abused.</p> <p>THE ROAD IS NOT SUITABLE FOR HGVs. We are in an area AONB. If we are going to be surrounded by quarries, it won't be an AONB for us! We already have noise from heavy machinery, constant dust on our windows and paintwork, and loud radios from the existing quarries. The noise of cutting machinery all night sometimes.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 86	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Alan Stephenson		<p>Our objections and concerns regarding the above can be summarised as follows " although we have expressed these previously to you - and please note we did not receive a letter informing us of this development in July 15</p> <p>Total impractibility of this site due to the following :- The close proximity to at least 6 immediately adjacent residential properties. The value of which has been reduced " by an independent authority " by 30%. With one owner having lost a crucial sale. This situation will undoubtedly continue until this plan is thrown out and impacts on other surrounding properties also!</p> <p>This site is in an area of AONB and would be conspicuous right along the valley from Corfe Castle through to Swanage. The site would be an undoubted ugly blot on the beautiful landscape. Heavy lorry access would be very disruptive, dirty and dangerous in such a restricted area. Frequent horse, cyclist and pedestrian activity " as well as caravans and motor homes in the Summer add to these dangers. The sloping nature of the field is such that it is highly visible from all the surrounding properties and is prone to flooding making extraction highly dangerous.</p> <p>Many birds, reptiles and other animals " including deer " use this site and are in danger of being uprooted/frightened.</p> <p>Haycrafts Lane is simply not up to the activity/task of accommodating large vehicles " in normal circumstances it is difficult to pass in the single lane track. It is also the track of Wessex Waters infrastructure for local supply.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 74	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Richard Brown	Dorset AONB Team	<p>The Countryside & Rights of Ways Act 2000 confirms that the purpose of designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) is the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the areas. NPPF section 115 states 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..."</p> <p>Dorset AONB Team considers that the use of Gallows Gore is likely to produce adverse effects of on the natural beauty of the AONB. Despite our general support of the on-going supply of local building stone, this site would be unlikely to comply with a number of policies within the Dorset AONB Management Plan, principally due to its relatively large scale and exposed location.</p> <p>It is understood that there will be some scope for mitigation through design and operation, such as a phased approach to extraction and restoration, as well as restricting stockpiling and buildings. However, there is concern that the residual impacts could be harmful to the character and appearance of the AONB, due to the visibility of the sites along and across the Corfe Valley and from the Purbeck Ridge. This is because development within the site area would notably extend the existing pattern of Purbeck Stone quarries along the upper slopes of the Valley and into a relatively exposed location on the north facing upper slopes, resulting in a relatively widespread visual impact.</p> <p>Consequently, there is concern regarding the contribution of this site to the cumulative effects of quarrying in the area.</p>	

PSD
-
MSP
92

Figure
27

Gallows Gore

Mrs
Rosemary
Khanna

Gallows Gore, PK21, is located immediately outside my back garden and has substantial visual and environmental impact on my property and those of my neighbours. It is clearly visible in the AONB from miles away and a very unusual site which was formerly used for underground rather than the proposed surface open cast stone extraction.

All other proposals are separated from residential properties, or sometimes close to just one property. Gallows Gore has fourteen surrounding properties around PK21 alone, including seven adjacent, sharing a fence with the field. Planning for fourteen new and improved residential properties, and other infrastructure, has been given over the past 15 years and implemented making future mineral extraction on PK 21 extremely disruptive and potentially very expensive for these local residents.

Various iterations of the Minerals Plan removed many safeguards for residents from environmental impact. Any degree of mitigation proposed by DCC Planners in the Minerals Policy and Site Plan to reduce the impact on residents could from past history be undeliverable in practice. Such ideas have proved vulnerable to removal at the later planning application stages especially as they would to be effective significantly reduce the amount of stone that could be extracted in any case. This issue was red flagged in the original proposal and it still stands out as the major problem with this application.

There are several other serious problems with the site:- I am concerned how little attention is taken in the Plan to cumulative impact of this and other existing sites in the Gallows Gore area. At present there is already significant potential on a day by day basis for dust and surrounding noise being created from the existing adjacent and other quarry and processing sites generally around Gallows Gore.

Access is a key issue and I understood from the original comment by DCC said that use of the narrow Haycrafts Lane would not be allowed. I now understand, from DCC officials, that this is now their preferred route for the very large stone lorries. These are so wide they would take up the whole road width using about one hundred metres of the lane to link with Landers existing site, west of Haycrafts Lane. The steep narrow lane with poor inter visibility is already difficult to access onto and is used by large numbers of cyclists and walkers especially those generated by the many camping sites (using the bus stop on the Kingston to Langton road) especially in the summer months as well as the holiday makers with caravans etc., To add to that the conflict with multiple additional stone lorries on a daily basis will make road safety an issue . This route also takes the lorries right in front of most of the houses surrounding my house with the noise and disturbance of quarry traffic , The route also crosses a water main with its pumped service to my property from the adjacent reservoirs, part of Wessex Water's critical infrastructure.

The next major issue is that Wessex Water's two reservoirs, supplying water to Swanage and surrounding areas, are adjacent to the site. Quarrying next to the reservoirs could be critical and I quote Wessex Waters own comments, which include:- ' Serious concerns, critical infrastructure, operations will be injuriously affected ' . I see they have replied to a neighbour: - ' The site assessment seems to be proceeding despite the concerns we have raised with DCC. '

The next serious issue is the cumulative effect on our Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. With the impact of the existing quarries on top of the hill, Gallows Gore is highly visible from the valley and Purbeck Hills beyond, including the village of Harmans Cross. The Dorset AONB planning officers strong views are reflected in his original objections. ' This site would be unlikely to comply with a number of policies within the Dorset AONB Management Plan, principally due to its exposed location. '

There are several other issues including the effects on wildlife, highlighted in the original application.

Remove this proposal from the plan for reasons given to question 4.

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
					<p>The site is on a steep slope and water run-off is already an issue, affecting the gravel track which needs regular maintenance. A quarry, and inevitable flooding, will only exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>The site has already been quarried from underground and the tunnels and access points are of archaeological interest. I am concerned that these tunnels pass in close proximity to my house. Further excavations on PK21 also pose a structural stability problem highlighted by a professional surveyor as potentially causing damage to residential properties, if the quarrying was to go ahead. Recent applications have been made on other sites to dig out even further in later phases to mine much deeper seams increasing potential problems for residents.</p> <p>A recent surveyors report indicates a thirty percent loss in value of our property, just because the PK21 Plan proposal application exists. Some of my neighbours need to sell, but they are unable to do so as they are trapped here with Planning Blight while this Plan process continues and if PK21 approved considering our ages in perpetuity. I understand the field owner has indicated he doesn't need stone for ten to fifteen years but that he also may sell the site on in the shorter term. This leaves the residents in a state of complete uncertainty which seems totally unreasonable, causing unnecessary hardship.</p> <p>I believe that it would save so much wasted time and anguish if the site was removed from the plan now. I understand how Purbeck Stone is a limited and unrenewable resource which should be conserved , however, there must be a limit to the disruption caused in the Gallows Gore area . Historically nothing is reinstated and the setting let alone enforcement even of the limited planning conditions on quarrying acknowledged by recent new operators as being far less than their experience in other parts of the country. . There are so many issues associated with this site and yet it could alternatively be left an undisturbed site in the AONB of historic interest supporting local jobs encouraging Purbeck visitor numbers with its underground tunnels and old ways of extracting stone.</p>	

I would like to make a representation as a Director of Landers Quarries Ltd and the owner of the area labelled PK21 in the draft Mineral Sites Plan. Our interest in the site comes from knowing it would viably yield the high quality middle Purbeck building stones in particular Downsvein. Historical knowledge informs us that the Downsvein within the site is better quality than other permitted reserves in Purbeck. Examples of this stone laid as flooring can be found as early as the 1500s in the nave of Westminster Abbey and Athelhampton House. Another significant floor at Knole House (Sevenoaks) follows somewhat later and there has been many more ecclesiastical examples from the 17th and 18th Century including Rochester cathedral, and as far afield as the Americas.

In recent years we have supplied new or replacement flooring at Rochester cathedral, Christchurch Spitalfields, Boxgrove priory, Westminster Abbey, St. Martins-in-the-Fields and Salisbury cathedral and currently supplying Richmond church with an entire new floor.

Given the above, PK21 contains a mineral of importance and there is merit to this particular site. Considering the impact of the quarry we would make the following points:

- 1 As the site is almost adjacent to Landers existing stone yard, excavation could be achieved without any overburden or stone heaps stored above ground level (as achieved currently in Broadmead quarry under our stewardship).
- 2 Subtle top soil bunds can further mitigate against the visual impact on surrounding properties.
- 3 Currently moving between PK21 and Landers yard would involve using only approximately 40 metres of Haycrafts Lane. Whilst Haycrafts Lane is generally unsuitable for large vehicle movements this particular section is straight and has good visibility each way. The impact on the verges will be minimal.
- 4 The excavation would be located at a greater distance from adjacent houses than other current quarry operations.
- 5 We would anticipate that activity might amount to only one month per annum with the quarry lying dormant the rest of the time. Worked in conjunction with our other sites we do not anticipate an increase in scale of workings of the business.
- 6 The digging equipment complies with Tier 5 emissions and current noise regulations.
- 7 Some attention has been drawn to old underground workings and whilst there are shafts in the South East and South West corners, the lanes run to the South and West respectively. There is no evidence of similar workings within the proposed area of PK21.
- 8 In the field to the north of PK21 there are some reservoirs. The intended operation will not threaten their integrity but obviously any plans would be fully discussed/authorised by the owner.
- 9 This business has been running for nearly 100 years and the family name in Purbeck quarrying goes back 10 or 11 generations. We feel a responsibility to a supply of material for important monuments and a trade that defines the heritage of this area. Whilst realising it is a sensitive operation we feel that a detailed application (whenever that is made) will be able to mitigate a lot of the concerns that can only be assumptions at this stage.

Please note Dr. Treleven Haysom would like to speak at the public examination.

We have already submitted a Representation Form , but because it was handwritten we are sending this email just to clarify our main points and make sure you can read them ! We live at xxxxx, Haycrafts Lane on the opposite side from Gallows Gore field PK 21.

We already have first hand experience of having Landers Quarry immediately bordering the field above us and Lovells Quarry to our west with our house being the nearest property to the Downs Quarry extension PK 15. Gallows Gore is totally unsuitable for the following reasons :

CLOSE PROXIMITY There are at least 15 properties in close proximity to the field & 7 or so sharing the actual boundary . All these will be affected by all the adverse impact of quarrying.

ACCESS Haycrafts Lane is a single track Lane (with signs to say that) and is NOT suitable for stone lorries. The original gate is at the entrance to the track down to Avalon, directly above the Wessex Water Reservoir and a new gate has been put in almost opposite the boundary with Landers Quarry (I wonder why ?) but which ever route the lorries take it is not safe. The Lane is much busier now due to the housing in Haycrafts itself & also due to the quantity of new housing in Harmans Cross, and at least 4 campsites busy from Spring to Autumn with the congestion that tourism brings.

PK - 08 Quarr Farm has been taken off the plan & it was stated in the 2015 Mineral sites plan that **NO ACCESS WOULD BE ALLOWED ONTO HAYCRAFTS LANE !** There are also **NOT SUITABLE FOR HGVs** signs at the bottom & recently top of the lane !

AONB Very obvious visual impact when looking from the valley, which has been taken into consideration in past applications . Non compliance with Dorset AONB Management Plan

4.ADVERSE IMPACTS Noise , Dust, Water Run off - we have already experienced these conditions from the surrounding quarries. All the aforementioned residents would become completely surrounded and end up as a an island of residential properties surrounded by a sea of quarries !

WESSEX WATER Have serious concerns about the proximity of the land to the reservoir, water main crossing the adjacent field , effects on water table and stability of land & underground structures with the heavy machinery and drilling.

HISTORIC QUARRYING This is always brought up as a reason to allow quarrying on a particular site . Of course there has been quarrying all over Purbeck going right back to Roman times and virtually every house & garden & piece of land around here has o hole on it where someone has quarried in the past ! There is now a massive difference in the operation from what it was with a few men with hammers chipping away to the huge mining operations of today .

Nothing will make this plan compliant or sound. We live with the existing quarries and try to work with them in a sensible way , many residents are Purbeck born and bred and understand the importance of the industry to Purbeck - BUT there has to be a balance. This application is not on an already existing site It is a new piece of ground and given the present circumstances around the residential properties now in Haycrafts Lane differing from the past, it has made the application completely inappropriate.

PSD
-
MSP
170

Figure
27

Gallows
Gore

Mr Len
Mann

Input from Len and Celia Mann, xxxxxxxx Haycrafts Lane. This is our third and probably final comment on the Gallows Gore proposal, PK-21 I want to point out some glaring errors and some surprises in the site survey :-

Firstly the site survey says that there are no significant water issues within 500m! Water runs down the site and washes away the track to Avalon. The owner has to repair the track on a regular basis. But more significant are the two large reservoirs adjacent to the northern fence along with their underground pipes running along the edge of the field. The potential quarrying is of great concern to Wessex Water. In fact the reservoirs, and the infrastructure connected, aren't even mentioned at any point in the site survey! This is a major omission.

The site survey says that the field is not visible from Harmans Cross! I can see about 80% of the houses from my house and even more from the field. This is clearly an error.

Access-There is major contradiction over the use of Haycrafts Lane in the site survey. Some parts of the survey say its use is not acceptable and other parts say it's OK to use a shorter distance of the lane. This has raised a lot of anger from local residents and further away, from people that have personal experience of walking, cycling and driving along the lane. Some people seem to see the hill as a challenge and drive up at great speed. Having stone lorries turning onto and off of the lane will be at least as bad as lorries driving right to the top of the lane. It's also ironic that just days ago the council erected signs each end of the lane saying Not Suitable for HGVs!

Just slipped into the site survey is the new information that extraction will now take sixteen years, not five as in the previous proposal! It's as if this is a minor detail not a 300% + increase in the disruption, noise, dust and mud for residents to endure!

There is new discussion in the site survey about dinosaur footprints and underground workings. Not just the recent works in the 1960s but much earlier, both Iron Age and Roman works are mentioned. DCC have told me that the extent of these works would need to be established before permission would be given. This seem to put more commercial pressure on a site which is already marginal for all the other reasons highlighted.

I have raised all of the above issues with DCC earlier in January. I had a detailed reply, broadly acknowledging the errors and I understand a corrected site survey is pending. However, as of today it's not been changed, and probably it shouldn't be changed part way through a consultation period, so I've decided to send in these comments while the consultation is still open.

On a final note I am concerned that the AONB issue is not seen as a key issue by DCC. They talk of mitigating the effect and they have a good understanding with the AONB officer, who works in the same building as the officials. The trouble is that Gallows Gore, if allowed, would be the first site to be visible right across the Swanage valley. This sets a precedent and would open the door for further quarries all along the sloping side of the hill, visible from the valley. If you apply to build a single house in the area, one of the council's objection is on AONB grounds, yet we're in danger of allowing a massive visual change to the valley, replacing green grazing land with open cast quarrying. The above points are in addition to the major issue of high density residential housing, fourteen houses in close proximity.

Remove Gallows Gore from the minerals plan for the reasons given in answers to question 4

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 183	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr David Joseph		<p>We are very concerned about our future. The existing quarry in front of our property is now an unsightly mess, with very high piles of Purbeck Stone. We cannot open the front windows because the dust and grit comes in, and goes all over the house. Also forever washing cars covered in dust and grit. If PK 21 is allowed to developed, we will be sandwich between quarries, and it will be like living on an island surrounded by quarries with further dust problems, and noise</p> <p>Also vibration that could affect our house structure. The DCC said Haycrafts Lane is not suitable for Heavy lorries, we know have read, that DCC has now moved goal posts again by allowing Haycrafts Lane to be used for heavy lorries. This will also contribute to more dirt dust vibration and congestion and danger to all users of Haycraft lane.</p> <p>WE have now found out the works on PK21 now take 16 years instead of original 5 years as stated in DCC site survey WE are getting very confused now as the DCC keep changing dates and moving goal posts What will happen to this BEAUTIFUL AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY we all live in, and people come from all over the country to stay in this area.</p>	
PSD - MSP 195	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Roger Brown		<p>Water and mud contamination on Haycrafts Lane..... Comments have previously been made with regard to excess water generated from quarrying. We have photographic evidence of this water running down past our property on Haycrafts Lane from the current quarry on the corner of Haycrafts Lane and Kingston Road (bear in mind we live below the two reservoirs so this muddy water runs an awful long way!) Therefore if the proposed site at Gallows Gore were to be used for quarrying there would be even more muddy water flowing down the lane on the opposite side to what currently occurs making hazard conditions especially in the winter if it were to freeze.</p>	To remove this proposal from the plan for the reasons given to question 4
PSD - MSP 189	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Roger Brown		<p>Further to my previous comments, many years ago a local real estate agent valued our property and stated that if Haycrafts Lane was to become an industrial lane it would most certainly devalue all the properties in it. This has now become a reality. Haycrafts Lane generates more council tax than any other lane in the area with precious little attention levelled at it with regard to potholes and resurfacing. With the proposal for it to be used for industrial purposes it can only deteriorate further. All us council tax payers deserve better than this!!</p>	To remove this proposal from the plan for the reasons given to question 4

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 131	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr D J Chambers		<p>I followed an HGV stone lorry up Haycrafts Lane, once past Avalon (Water Board) there are no official passing bays! From the proposed entrance/exit of the industrial area, the road is very narrow and in some places the lorry only had 6ins space each side on the tarmac road. Once at the top, Kingston Road, the lorry had to cut across the road and mount the verge to swing right. Traffic could not turn left from the Kingston Road into Haycrafts Lane as there was no space. This means the cars would block the Kingston Road, which is busy in the summer. The land is not suitable for HGVs as the sign says and to even suggest 5-10 lorry movements a day is ridiculous, and an accident waiting to happen. Pics H/W of damage to lane which will increase with this proposal (with comments!!).</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 180	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Doreen Farr		<p>I am writing to express my concerns about the inclusion of the above site in the Minerals Site Plan.</p> <p>There are fourteen properties around the site, seven of which are actually adjacent to the site. I understood from discussion with DCC representatives at a previous presentation at Wareham that there is supposed to be a 50 metre exclusion zone between a quarry and surrounding houses. Surely if this is strictly applied would the amount of acreage left for quarrying be viable?</p> <p>Even with the construction of a bund the amount of intrusion to those houses would be unacceptable. A large bund would also spoil the views unless it was built far enough away from the houses as to not interfere with this. If so this would further reduce the amount of ground available to be quarried. I know one does not buy the view when one buys a house but the detrimental effect on the value of the properties adjacent to the field by the proposed quarrying is already considerable and can only get more so if permission is granted.</p> <p>The access to the site is via Haycrafts Lane which is not suitable for stone lorries especially with the amount of holiday traffic in the summer and the large number of walkers and cyclists who use the lane at all times of the year. Stone lorries in this narrow lane would make walking and cycling there very dangerous. It is bad enough trying to pass walkers and cyclists in a car let alone a lorry.</p> <p>The amount of mud brought out on to the lane in the winter by the lorries would make the surface of the road dangerous. The quarries do not have a very good record of clearing debris on the road.</p> <p>As the Quarr Farm field proposal has been withdrawn, partly on the grounds of access, surely that same criteria should apply to the Gallows Gore field. It is in an AONB area and is very visible from a considerable area in the valley, much more so than the quarries at the top of the lane, and would be a huge blot on the landscape. If the mineral authorities insist on quarrying behind these houses could it not be possible to have a series of short term digs, preferably in the summer, with immediate re-instatement as was done when Haysom's Quarries dug the marble between Primrose Hill Farm and Quarr Farm a few years ago. At least then it would be controllable and would not be an open ended situation.</p> <p>There is already considerable water run-off from to the fields below and this would only be exacerbated by quarry workings in this field. I urge the planners to reconsider and reject this proposed area at Gallows Gore. We have already made representations against this proposal previously and reiterate all comments we made then.</p>	
PSD - MSP 254	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Conor O'Luby		<p>This will damage the setting of the AONB and is thus not compliant with national policy.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 561	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity No comments. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrogeological assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 358	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Dave Ogborne	Wessex Water	<p>Understandably Wessex Water are very nervous of this development and any adverse impact upon the critical assets immediately adjacent the site. Our position now is that subject to robust assessments, that protect our statutory operations, the site may be able to proceed. In the circumstances this should lead to a position where a stand off distance can be determined with any appropriate mitigating measures.</p> <p>A detailed pre-assessment of risks will help to establish the scope of assessments to overcome our grounds for objection. The points outlined below appears to provide a basis for developing the necessary criteria demonstrating that there will be no impact on Wessex Waters critical asserts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of in-depth details of proposals • detailed pre-assessment of risks • working method statements identifying required protection measures and buffer/no-work areas • vibration monitoring • possible indemnity <p>I trust this reflects our position at this stage.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 310	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr Dave Ogborne	Wessex Water	<p>Gallows Gore, Harmans Cross (PK-21 - see Submission Policies Map " Inset 13) We have previously objected to this allocation owing to the location of critical infrastructure including reservoirs and trunk mains and the impact of quarry workings and extractions.</p> <p>There are also distribution mains located within the access highway, which may require protecting from any construction loadings and temporary works.</p> <p>If the site remains allocated and seeks planning consent, Wessex Water acting as the sewerage undertaker will require specific and robust assessments to be completed. The criteria will need to be specified and will be developed from the following points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed pre-assessment of risks demonstrating that there will be no impact on Wessex Waters critical assets • provision of in-depth details of proposals • working method statements identifying required protection measures and buffer/no-work areas • vibration monitoring • indemnity provisions <p>In default of the information being provided at the application stage we will insist upon a minimum clearance/stand off distance of 30 metres from site boundary to quarry excavations.</p>	
PSD - MSP 439	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Patricia Clark		<p>I would like to object in the strongest terms possible to the proposed opening of a mineral extraction site off of Haycrafts Lane. Haycrafts Lane is one very large holiday destination with five caravan and camping sites, four working farms plus the Swanage Railway. You cannot seriously be contemplating opening a site in the area of outstanding natural beauty. It would be wholesale vandalism on the part of the Quarry company. Not forgetting the horrendous impact on property and peoples daily lives.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 436	Figure 27	Gallows Gore	Mr & Mrs RT & WJ Wiggins		<p>This Plan is neither justified or effective for the following reasons:</p> <p>Close " very close proximity of adjacent housing " seven sharing a boundary with the field and fourteen ++ in the surrounding area all having access onto Haycrafts Lane. Properties on both sides of the lane will be affected by impact from quarrying " as we already have had experience of this from Landers Quarry and Lovells quarry with the Downs Quarry Extension.</p> <p>Dust, Noise, Visual impact are all very valid facts and properties on the same side as the Gallows Gore site ie below it are already experiencing quite severe water run off from the area, which would become unsustainable in the case of quarrying activities.</p> <p>AONB Apart from the obvious understanding of what AONB means there will a huge visual impact when looking from the valley up to this site, which many people living in the valley have already commented about. Also the application does not comply with policy set out by Dorset AONB Management Plan.</p> <p>Wessex Water Have concerns about the reservoir, surrounding adjacent land and existing water structures. PK-08 Quarr Farm, the adjacent field to the North has been taken off the plan for this reason and also access onto Haycrafts Lane.</p> <p>Historic Quarrying All these sites are constantly putting forward the reason that because the land has been quarried historically it should be allowed. I think we can all agree that the situation regarding present residencies in the area is totally different to Roman times and since! " Purbeck has always been quarried nearly all the properties in this area have the odd hole at the bottom of their gardens that has at one time been quarried! One man with a hammer as opposed to the huge mining operations of today!</p> <p>Access Is a key issue. Haycrafts Lane is a single track lane with some passing places and would not be suitable whether lorries came out of a gate (new?) original gate opening onto to Avalon track opposite the Wessex Water Reservoir and cross over the lane to Landers quarry (no entrance at present) or go to the top of the lane and into the quarry that way. There are HGV not suitable signs at the top & bottom of Haycrafts Lane Highways Dept seem to have identified the problem?! Very busy particularly in summer.</p>	<p>Nothing will make this application legally compliant or sound. It is a different situation in applying for this site " completely new and unquarried than some of the other applications which are extensions of existing works. It should be taken out of the process immediately.</p>

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 563	Figure 28	Marnhull Quarry extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 assessment required. River Corridor Buffer Zone - In order to minimise developed encroachment and impacts on river corridors and their associated wildlife, a no go buffer zone must be provided alongside any watercourses or wetland features of interest. The required width of the buffer zone will need to be determined subject to the provision of further site information. No activities associated with any stage of the mineral extraction must occur in this buffer zone, including light spill. Groundwater and contaminated land We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Hydrogeological assessment Ecological study required if water features present in or near the site. Protect and enhance water features adjacent site, Chivricks Brook. Opportunities for river restoration/project partnership projects Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence Water Framework Directive Assessment may be required</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 535	Figure 28	Marnhull Quarry extension	Robert Bartlett	Marnhull Stone Ltd	<p>The identification of this site is supported, as it will provide a secure future reserve of local building stone that will be supplied both locally and on a wider basis to contribute to maintaining the local character of the area.</p> <p>In identifying the area, it would be helpful to refer to the need for 'ancillary' buildings that are required for the cutting and dressing of the stone and other purposes (storage, product display etc). This could be added under an 'Other' paragraph (Q.5).</p>	<p>The importance of maintaining availability of local building stone is recognised, which includes the provision of ancillary buildings required to manufacture the products that are needed (eg cut/masonry blocks, random building stone etc).</p> <p>All ancillary buildings etc. need to be removed at completion of quarrying activities.</p>
PSD - MSP 591	Figure 29	Frogden Quarry Extension	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	I support this proposal and associated policies.	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 564	Figure 29	Frogden Quarry Extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare 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 study required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. The assessment will have sufficient level of details, commensurate with the status of the Principal aquifer. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study required Hydrogeological assessment Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence Water Framework Directive Assessment may be required</p>	
PSD - MSP 324	Figure 30	Whithill Quarry	Dr Sharon Abbott	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>BS05 Whithill Quarry, Lillington DWT is pleased to note the recognition that a full ecological assessment of this site will be required to include any adverse impacts on the nearby Honeycombe Wood SNCI.</p>	

ID	Number	consultation point	Full Name - consultee	Company / Organisation - consultee	Representations	To make Plan sound
PSD - MSP 565	Figure 30	Whithill Quarry extension	Ms Katherine Burt	Environment Agency	<p>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. If site area greater than 1 hectare FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider management of surface water run-off from development site. Fisheries and Biodiversity No comments other than to highlight the Local Wildlife Site that is adjacent to the quarry extension area. This will need consideration. Ecological assessment likely to be required. Groundwater and contaminated land We note that the abstraction licensing regime has changed and abstraction for de-watering is now licensable, therefore permits and licenses are required. We would expect all mineral applications to be supported by a hydrogeological assessment in order to demonstrate no significant negative impact on hydrogeological connectivity and pathways and surface water flow regimes. This is to protect river and wetland habitats and ecology, and also river users. The assessment will have sufficient level of details, commensurate with the status of the Principal aquifer. We require an assessment to demonstrate that the proposed restoration for this site will have no significant impact on water quality and cause no deterioration in WFD status. This is particularly relevant for sites adjacent to, and which drain to, watercourses and wetland features of interest. Environment Management Land and Water Permit applications should be submitted to the Environment Agency for any discharges of water (eg from washings or overflows) to surface waters or groundwater. There should be no polluting discharges from operation or construction of the quarry unless authorised by and within limits of an Environmental Permit. Summary of Studies required and other considerations Flood Risk Assessment Ecological study required Hydrogeological assessment Protect and enhance water features near site. Restoration proposals should incorporate wetland features Environmental Permit Abstraction Licence Water Framework Directive Assessment may be required.</p>	
PSD - MSP 592	Figure 30	Whithill Quarry extension	Nick Dunn	Land and Mineral Management Ltd	I support this proposal and associated policies.	