

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Binnegar</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS01</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>3</b>

### Site Description

The site is located approximately 3.5km west of Wareham. It is situated to the south of the C80 Puddletown Road and to the east of Binnegar Lane. It is suggested for the extraction of 4.79 million tonnes\* of sand and gravel over a period of 19 years. This 14 hectare site currently contains a mix of heathland, woodland and agricultural uses. Restoration is proposed to a lower level of heathland.

\* This total requires conformation

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Common Land/Public Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is registered common land and there are good opportunities to manage it for public access – aggregate extraction would prevent this.</li> <li>Value of the site for public access and recreation would be permanently diminished.</li> <li>It would be difficult to replace the common land elsewhere.</li> <li>There may be scope for a small extension to the existing working north of the site (eastwards) if this were linked to an overall scheme for management of the rest of the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Initial investigations appear to show the entire site lying within common land and the implications of this need to be investigated. Aggregate extraction would not necessarily permanently prevent public access.</p> <p>Should this site be progressed to the next stage of the Plan, the need and opportunities to replace common land would also need to be investigated.</p> <p>The extent of the area considered suitable for future working will need to be determined if this site is to be progressed. The quantity of sand and gravel contained within any proposed area will need to be confirmed.</p>
<p><b>2. Nature Conservation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site was formerly heathland and there are good opportunities to manage it for nature conservation.</li> </ul>	<p>Release of all or part of this land for sand extraction would present opportunities for restoration to heathland, and/or public open</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of trees and rhododendron for screening would prevent beneficial management taking place.</li> <li>There may be scope for a small extension to the existing working north of the site (eastwards) if this were linked to an overall scheme for management of the rest of the site.</li> </ul>	<p>space for informal recreation to mitigate against effects of human pressures on the heaths, as appropriate.</p> <p>The need for landscaping to prevent views into site is accepted. Native vegetation screen (gorse, birch, pine) managed on rotation would provide alternative to rhododendron.</p> <p>As stated above, the extent of the area considered suitable for future working will need to be determined if this site is to be progressed. The quantity of sand and gravel contained within any proposed area will need to be confirmed.</p>
<p><b>3. Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close to the boundary of the AONB</li> <li>Any extraction over the majority of the site would be likely to be visible from the AONB.</li> </ul>	<p>The need to have regard to the setting of the AONB is accepted. If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact.</p>
<p><b>4. Archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presence of Battery Bank Scheduled Monument which needs protecting along with its setting</li> <li>Potential for archaeology within the site</li> </ul>	<p>Battery Bank and its setting would need to be protected by leaving a suitable stand-off from the working area.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed there would be the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage</li> </ul>

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site**

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Restoration to heathland</b></p>	<p>Extraction from this site would enable restoration to heathland, and/or public open space for informal recreation to mitigate against effects of human pressures on the heaths, as appropriate.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purbeck District Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>

## Observations

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<p><b>1 Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Potential increase in traffic on A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown</li> <li>b. Potential increase in traffic on C6 through Winterborne Kingston, which is used as a rat run</li> <li>c. Consider impact on Strategic Road Network</li> <li>d. Possible implications for A35 trunk road to the north</li> <li>e. Would need to be supported by Transport Assessment</li> <li>f. Rail transport may present a sustainable alternative to road transport due to proximity to Bournemouth to Waterloo main line.</li> <li>g. Traffic movements should be specified</li> <li>h. 'Existing' traffic movements should be specified as permission for the current site is yet to be implemented</li>   <li>i. Junction of Puddletown Road with A352 should be widened as it is currently dangerous and the turning area needs to be improved.</li> <li>j. Contributions towards the implementation of the Purbeck Transportation Strategy are unlikely to be spent on improvements to this junction.</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible.</p> <p>Should the site be progressed to the next stage of the Plan, estimated traffic movements will need to be determined from both north and south of Puddletown Road.</p> <p>This concern is noted. DCC is already aware of the problem and the Local Transport Plan improvement team have been notified. Improvement works would be sought with any planning application, which would be over and above the requirements of the Purbeck Transportation Strategy.</p>
<p><b>2 Nature Conservation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within Puddletown Road Strategic Nature Area, where opportunities for restoration to heathland should be sought</li> <li>• A strategic plan to recreate a large area of heathland and associated acid grassland, wetland and woodland to link with existing SSSIs and SNCIs would be of huge benefit.</li> </ul>	<p>The adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1999) no longer includes a policy to establish a Restoration Strategy Advisory Group. However, the principle of developing an overall strategy for mineral working and restoration in the Puddletown Road area is supported. Involvement with Dorset Wildlife Trust would be welcomed.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy regarding a heathland restoration strategy for the area should be included.</li> <li>• Close to SSSI/SAC/SPA/Ramsar site.</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed an ecological assessment would be required together with an assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites. The opportunity to recreate heathland is acknowledged.</p>
<p><b>3 Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workings should remain screened by the treeline when viewed from the south (AONB).</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that retaining the treeline would provide screening benefits, especially in relation to long distance views from the south.</p>
<p><b>4 Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Puddletown Road is a rural road used by cyclists and horseriders</li> <li>• Public use of the site is limited.</li> </ul>	<p>Puddletown Road is the only means of access to the quarries that lie along it. It is agreed that there is presently limited public use of the site.</p>
<p><b>5 Existing Binnegar site</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity must be taken to properly restore the existing site when it is worked out.</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that all mineral workings should be restored to appropriate uses.</p>
<p><b>6 Mineral Reserve</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reserve should be clearly divided between ‘sand and gravel’ and ‘sand’</li> </ul>	<p>Ideally, the estimate of reserves in the site should distinguish between ‘sand and gravel’ and solely sand, although this may not be possible.</p>
<p><b>7 Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within Flood Zone 1</li> <li>• There may be one or more ‘ordinary’ watercourses flowing through or close to the site.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels</li> </ul>	<p>Areas within Flood Zone 1 have the lowest probability of flooding. If this site were to be progressed, a strategic flood risk assessment would need to be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>It is noted that the Environment Agency has no objection in principle from a flood risk or groundwater protection perspective.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arne Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• East Stoke Parish Council</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Wareham St Martin Parish Council</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Environment Agency</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Broadmayne Parish Council</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RSPB South West Regional Office</li></ul>

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Cannon Hill</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS02</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>976</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>1</b>

**Site Description**

This site is situated immediately east of Wimborne Minster and Colehill. It is suggested for the extraction of 2.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 12 to 25 years. This 60 hectare site is owned by the Forestry Commission and is currently used extensively by local people for recreational purposes. Restoration is proposed using inert fill back to woodland at original ground levels.

**Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site**

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1 Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional impact from heavy goods traffic on an already stretched road system</li> <li>• Inadequate access point onto the Ferndown/Wimborne by-pass</li> <li>• A31 considered incapable of taking any additional traffic</li> <li>• Concern over use of local roads</li> <li>• School traffic in the area already overwhelming</li> <li>• Danger and possibilities of accidents from traffic</li> <li>• Damage to roads</li> <li>• A31 should be upgraded to a dual carriageway</li> <li>• Wimborne Minster and Ferndown have been identified as potential locations for urban extensions – further implications for the A31</li> </ul>	<p>Concern has been expressed by the Highways Agency at the level of additional congestion on the A31(T) that this development and other long term proposals in the area would generate.</p> <p>All HGV traffic would need to access the site only from the A31 at Uddens Drive or through Uddens Plantation from the Ameysford Roundabout, if acceptable to the Highways Agency.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance would be sought from the developer.</p>

<p><b>2 Amenity/Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 100,000 visitors per year</li> <li>• Loss of an important amenity space/community spirit</li> <li>• Likely to increase pressure on nearby designated heathland sites e.g. Holt Heath through Whitesheet Plantation and Ferndown Common both Natura 2000 sites protected under the Habitats Regulations</li> <li>• Furthermore require people to drive rather than walk to such sites</li> <li>• Regularly used as a safe place for exercising, riding horses, bikes and walking</li> <li>• Used by scouts, clubs and other groups for recreation and education</li> </ul>	<p>The importance of this area for recreation is acknowledged as is its value in attracting visitors away from protected heathland. This will be a very important factor when considering the suitability of this site.</p>
<p><b>3 Too near residential properties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mineral extraction inappropriate within 25metres of housing</li> <li>• Loss of quality of life</li> <li>• Would affect the character of the Colehill area</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zone from nearby houses. It is agreed that extraction within 25 metres is unlikely to be appropriate. It is also agreed that development would affect the character of the Colehill area.</p>
<p><b>4 Impact on archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including known Barrows</li> </ul>	<p>Scheduled Ancient Monuments on the site would need to be protected by leaving a suitable area un-worked around them.</p>
<p><b>5 Noise disturbance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extraction</li> <li>• Vehicle reversing beepers</li> <li>• Site sirens</li> </ul>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p>
<p><b>6 Dust causing health impacts</b></p>	<p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<p><b>7 Pollution</b></p>	<p>Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>

<p><b>8 Negative impact on existing landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest considered to be of outstanding natural beauty</li> <li>• The forest would never be the same again</li> </ul>	<p>Although it is not formally a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it is accepted that the forest is attractive and appreciated by those who use it. This will be an important factor when considering the suitability of this site.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact.</p>
<p><b>9 Important &amp; rare piece of Green Belt land should be retained</b></p>	<p>Government guidance is that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land as Green Belts, which is to maintain openness. Mineral working can be acceptable provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.</p> <p>Green Belt designation is considered relatively extensive in south east Dorset.</p>
<p><b>10 Impact on Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including deer, snakes, lizards, badgers, foxes, nightjar</li> <li>• Loss of valuable mixed coniferous woodland</li> <li>• “Makes a mockery of tree preservation orders”</li> <li>• The forest would never be the same again</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>The existence and significance of tree preservation orders will be investigated should the site be progressed.</p>
<p><b>11 Three schools in close proximity</b></p>	<p>There is unlikely to be any unacceptable impact on local schools from either the lorry traffic or the mineral working itself.</p>
<p><b>12 Bridleways and footpaths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is criss-crossed with bridleways and footpaths including the Castleman Trailway</li> <li>• Cycle routes form part of local sustainable transport policy</li> <li>• Pedestrian access to the north and east of Colehill dependant on footpaths through Cannon Hill</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for their diversion. The importance of the Castleman Trailway is accepted.</p> <p>It is accepted that if mineral extraction does take place access to Cannon Hill would be significantly restricted.</p>
<p><b>13 Infilling issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern shown to the use of this site as a household landfill site following extraction of gravel.</li> <li>• Concern shown to where the inert fill would come from</li> </ul>	<p>It is not proposed to infill this site with household waste. Concern over source and sufficiency of inert fill is shared and further information on the source of fill will be sought from the developer.</p>



<p><b>14 Water Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for dewatering due to the high water table – possible subsidence</li> <li>• Impact on Wessex Water apparatus</li> <li>• Vibrations could cause strategic water mains to burst</li> <li>• Contamination</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>It is known that trunk and distribution mains lie within the site and account would need to be taken of these should extraction take place.</p> <p>With regards to contamination, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>15 Destruction of woodland would be against the governments commitment to reducing carbon emissions</b></p>	<p>Much of the site is commercial woodland which would be felled in any case although re-planted more quickly than if mineral extraction was to take place.</p>
<p><b>16 Cumulative impact of development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern shown of the cumulative impact of mineral development in addition to extra housing, radio masts etc</li> </ul>	<p>Cumulative impact from various forms of development including housing on the area in general and road network in particular is agreed to be an important consideration and will be taken into account.</p>
<p><b>17 Evidence should be provided that the mineral present is of a suitable quality and quantity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reserve should be clearly divided between ‘sand and gravel’ and ‘sand’</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the quality and quantity of mineral should be established and evidence will need to be supplied if the site is to be progressed. The suitability of the sand for different purposes will also need to be established.</p>
<p><b>18 The site is important to our tourist industry</b></p>	<p>It is considered mineral working at this site would have only limited impact on tourism.</p>
<p><b>19 Consider Bournemouth Airport Safeguarding with particular emphasis on the birdstrike aspect.</b></p>	<p>The importance of ensuring birdstrike hazards are not created is acknowledged. The use of inert fill should avoid this risk.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colehill Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ferndown Town Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wessex Water</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset Community Partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bournemouth &amp; West Hampshire Water plc</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wimborne Civic Society</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vale of Allen Parish Council</li> </ul>

• Dorset Wildlife Trust	• English Heritage
-------------------------	--------------------

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site**

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
8 Extraction should take place in close proximity to where it is used	This is agreed where environmental and other impacts are within acceptable limits.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;  
None

**Observations**

Nine comments were classified as “observations”. Points raised are adequately covered above.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

• Lower Winterborne Parish Council	• Bournemouth Airport
• Holt Parish Council	• Environment Agency

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

There were no petitions submitted for this site.

A large percentage of the comments submitted to this site were identical through the use of a standard response form produced by an individual.

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Crossways</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS03</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>1</b>

### Site Description

The site is situated east of the village of Crossways and immediately south of Redbridge Road and the currently active Moreton Pit. The 3.5 hectare site is within an operational waste site, consisting of restored agricultural land. It is proposed to extract 250,000 tonnes of building sand over a period of three to five years. Restoration is proposed using inert fill to grazing land at original ground levels.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<b>1. Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of further traffic movements on local quality of life</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any cumulative transport impacts.</p>
<b>2. Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to restore the site for strategic open space is not strictly relevant as Crossways not identified as a growth area in emerging RSS</li> <li>Opportunity to restore to heathland rather than improved pasture</li> <li>Existing restored areas in the area are extremely poor.</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that there is potential to help provide multi functional open space in association with planned growth across the county and that this could form part of the network of green infrastructure sites. It is also considered that the site could also be managed in whole or in part as agricultural land such as grazing/hay meadow.</p> <p>It is felt that the areas that have been restored are acceptable.</p>
<b>3. Mud or dust on access road</b>	<p>Conditions would be imposed on any permission granted to prevent spillage and mud on the road. If mud and material is being</p>

	deposited this could lead to enforcement action being taken against the operators. New application north of road includes proposal for new wheel wash.
<b>4. Noise</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of woodland which currently provides some protection from noise to residents would exacerbate the issue.</li> </ul>	This site does not include any woodland. This comment would appear to relate to land to the north of Redbridge Road. If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.
<b>5. Landscape</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal unlikely to have significant visual impact</li> <li>Important to secure appropriate management of roadside hedgerows and trees with additional planting where necessary</li> <li>Document should refer to relevant landscape character type and area</li> <li>Site falls within Crossways Gravel Plateau Character Area</li> <li>Document should confirm this site is outside of the AONB.</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact and mitigation measures. If possible, the opportunity should be taken to secure appropriate management of roadside hedgerows and trees with additional planting where necessary.</p> <p>Consideration of the Landscape Character Area that the site lies within will be given should the site be progressed to the next stage of the plan.</p> <p>The site is not within the Dorset AONB.</p>
<b>6. Nature Conservation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workings would continue on the verge of the railway line in the direction of Tadnoll, believed to be a SSSI.</li> </ul>	The site being promoted is located south of Redbridge Road and is not close to the railway line or Site of Nature Conservation Interest.
<b>7. Mineral</b> could be obtained from base of adjacent site or another nearby site.	Mineral extraction would continue from land to the north of Redbridge Road.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Dorset District Council</li> </ul>	
--	--

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<p><b>9 Reptiles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No or limited conflict with reptile species/habitats</li> <li>b. Pond restoration for amphibians would be a bonus</li> <li>c. Surveys for amphibian species prior to works would be beneficial</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed an ecological assessment would be required. This survey should pick up the presence of important species of amphibians and reptiles and the need for further more specific survey work in order to reduce any adverse impacts.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul> |  |
|---|--|

### Observations

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential increase in traffic on A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown</li> <li>• Potential increase in traffic on C6 through Winterborne Kingston, which is used as a rat run</li> <li>• Severe traffic consequences on B3390, especially over Hurst Bridges</li> <li>• Consider impact on Strategic Road Network</li> <li>• Possible implications for A35 trunk road to the north</li> <li>• Would need to be supported by Transport Assessment</li> <li>• Redbridge Road used not only by residents but also traffic to and from Winfrith.</li> <li>• Tonnage limits should be imposed since larger and larger vehicles are being used by contractors presently.</li> <li>• Rail transport may present a sustainable alternative to road transport due to proximity to Bournemouth to Waterloo main line.</li> <li>• Proposer has made no explanation of potential impacts and mitigation proposals, in particular damage to E/W road giving access to both sites.</li> </ul>	<p>As stated above, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant which included assessment of local roads such as the B3390 and C6.</p> <p>We are not aware of any recent increase in the size of lorry. There are currently no restrictions on the number of vehicle movements permitted.</p> <p>There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible. Damage to Redbridge Road has been raised in other representations. If this site is progressed, impacts on the road will need to be examined.</p>

<p><b>2. Dirt on roads</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossing of 'Brownjohn's Copse' between the sites is continuously filthy and potholed from unwashed plant crossing cover</li> <li>• Planning condition for this site should be included regarding standards of maintenance of the road.</li> </ul>	<p>As stated above, conditions would be imposed on any permission granted to prevent spillage and mud on the road. If mud and material is being deposited this could lead to enforcement action being taken against the operators.</p>
<p><b>3. Nature Conservation/SANG</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tadnoll and Winfrith Nature Reserve (SSSI and internationally designated) is currently well-used for dog walking, which disturbs ground nesting birds. Restoring this site as a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace would divert people away from the SSSI.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p><b>4. Restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding how soon sympathetic restoration would take place.</li> <li>• Restoration for recreation and nature conservation preferable to agriculture.</li> <li>• Only clean, uncontaminated inert waste should be used to infill</li> </ul>	<p>The time taken of achieve restoration can be of concern, especially if this relies on a supply of inert fill material. Although the benefits of restoration to recreation or nature conservation are acknowledged, there will be situations when a return to agricultural use is more appropriate. This would need to be balanced against the need for SANG, referred to above.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>
<p><b>5. Landfill</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site within Old Heath Farm authorised landfill, which takes non-hazardous waste.</li> <li>• Consider potential impact on integrity of landfill</li> <li>• Consider pollution prevention issues</li> </ul>	<p>Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>6. Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within Flood Zone 1</li> <li>• There is at least one, possibly more, 'ordinary' watercourse flowing through or close to the site.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels.</li> <li>• Potential impact on water courses and associated wetlands should be assessed with regard to biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<p>Flood Zone 1 has the lowest probability of flooding. It is noted that the Environment Agency has no objection in terms of flood risk issues and from a groundwater perspective. If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p>
<p><b>7. Economy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of value to local jobs and the economy.</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the current operations provide local employment.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

• Lower Winterborne Parish Council	• Dorset Wildlife Trust
• Moreton Parish Council	• Environment Agency
• Highways Agency	• RSPB South West Regional Office

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Dorey's</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS04</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>

### Site Description

This site is situated about 1km south west of Stoborough. It is suggested for the extraction of 5,860,000 tonnes of sand and gravel (though largely sand) in association with ball clay extraction over a period of 11 or 12 years. This 37.7 hectare site is being promoted by Aggregate Industries and is currently agricultural land and woodland, adjoining the existing working Dorey's Pit ball clay site to the north. It is proposed that working of aggregates would precede phased working of ball clay deposits. Restoration of the site would provide opportunities for heathland creation and more diverse wetland/open water habitats.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<b>1 Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased congestion</li> <li>• Accidents</li> <li>• Suitability of bridge over the railway</li> <li>• Holme Lane unsuitable for heavy traffic</li> <li>• Noise</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of the suitability of local roads and any increased risk of accidents. However, it is accepted that the proposal for sand and gravel extraction here would generate a considerable increase in HGV traffic.</p>
<b>2 Specific Impact on Grange Road</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage</li> <li>• Receding verges</li> <li>• Safety issues for cyclists, horse riders and pedestrians</li> <li>• Dust and dirt</li> </ul>	<p>See comments regarding traffic impacts above.</p> <p>It is accepted that receding verges along Grange Road is an issue which will need to be addressed by the mineral operator.</p> <p>The deposit of dirt and mud on the road should be addressed by the imposition and enforcement of planning conditions.</p>
<b>3 Impact on AONB and World Heritage Coast</b>	<p>Impact on the AONB is a very important consideration to be addressed in detail should this site be progressed to the next</p>



	<p>stage of the Plan. If this site were to be progressed, further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact, particularly the cumulative impact of mineral working in this part of Dorset on views from the ridge.</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that there will be any adverse impact on the World Heritage Coast.</p>
<p><b>2 Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to wildlife</li> <li>• Impact on Povington and Grange Heath SSSI</li> <li>• Loss of woodland including many mature trees</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>Removal of sand and gravel in addition to ball clay would create a larger void and a lower landform closer to the water table. If this resulted in wetland restoration, options for biodiversity would be fewer.</p> <p>There will be a need to investigate the significance of trees and hedges and the need to protect them.</p>
<p><b>3 Impact on quality of life of local residents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity of dwellings</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zones from nearby houses.</p>
<p>4 Noise, dust and dirt from processing sand and gravel</p>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p> <p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<p>5 Impact on landscape character</p>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact,</p>

	particularly due to the location of the site within the Dorset AONB. Removal of sand and gravel in addition to the ball clay would inevitably create a larger void and change in landscape character.
6 There are other sites more suitable as there is an abundance of sand and gravel in Dorset	It is agreed that sand and gravel is found more widely than ball clay however not necessarily in abundance in acceptable areas. However, each site being suggested will be carefully assessed on its merits and will only be progressed if it is felt that it is a sustainable source of mineral to meet future needs.
7 The principle of extracting sand and gravel with the AONB has up till now been resisted. Adverse impacts outweigh the need	It is agreed that sand and gravel extraction has until now generally been resisted within the AONB. The principle was considered in the Issues and Options consultation on the Minerals Core Strategy. Although no principle has yet been adopted, it would be necessary to demonstrate that adverse effects on the AONB are outweighed by the need for sand and gravel.
8 Economic argument for extraction in this area is unsound.	There is an accepted requirement for sand and gravel to be extracted locally to supply south east Dorset. The question is whether this site is an appropriate one.
<b>9 Loss of houses and rural businesses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate compensation</li> <li>• Loss of farmland</li> <li>• Loss of livelihoods</li> </ul>	<p>Clarification of which, if any, properties would need to be demolished is required.</p> <p>The extent to which this land could be restored to agriculture will depend on final restored ground levels in relation to the water table. Any adverse impact on farming businesses would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral and opportunities for restoration. The combined impact if major sand extraction also takes place will also need to be considered.</p>
<b>10 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate reinstatement of land to its existing use</li> <li>• Lakes not appropriate in this locality</li> <li>• What would be the timescales for restoration to be completed</li> </ul>	If this site is to be progressed it will be necessary to determine the most appropriate restoration having regard to final ground levels and the water table. More detail is required on restoration.
<b>11 Cultural Heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on listed buildings</li> <li>• Impact of leaving monuments isolated by surrounding quarrying</li> </ul>	It is accepted that if this development were to go ahead the setting of two Grade II listed buildings would be affected. Measures to ensure these impacts are minimised would be an important consideration.

	An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include the protection of Three Lords Barrow which is situated on the edge of the site. Consideration will also be given to the setting of the barrow.
12 Impact on tourism	It is considered mineral working at this site would have only limited impact on tourism. However, the greatly increased level of activity associated with sand and gravel extraction in addition to ball clay would be more noticeable to those visiting the area.
13 Extraction supports a minimal number of jobs	It is agreed that mineral extraction supports a relatively small number of jobs compared to other industries. Clearly sand and gravel extraction would provide a greater number of jobs than solely ball clay.
14 Impact on public rights of way and bridleway	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for and acceptability of their diversion.  In particular, a bridleway running through the southern plantation would be affected and consideration should be given to retaining this as part of a southern screen.
<b>15 Water resources</b> • Impact on water levels	It is agreed that potential impacts on hydrology will need to be investigated in greater detail and details sought from the promoters.
16 Concern that the site operations could be expanded to include landfill of waste in the future	No indication has been given that there is any intention to infill this site with waste. Landfill is highly unlikely to be appropriate in this locality particularly as it is within the Dorset AONB.
<b>17 Consider use of the railway</b>	It has been suggested by the promoters that at least some of the extracted sand and gravel could be transported by rail from Furzebrook.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

• East Holme Parish Council	• Lovell and Barnes Ltd
• Purbeck District Council	• Wareham St Martin Parish Council
• Arne Parish Council	• Dorset AONB
• Natural England	• Campaign to Protect Rural England

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Church Knowle Parish Council</li> <li>• English Heritage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steeple Parish Council</li> </ul>
--	--

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
1 Sand and Gravel overlying the ball clay would be removed as a matter of course and processing these would relieve pressure on other greenfield sites	It is agreed that the overlying sand and gravel would need to be moved to reach the ball clay found below. However, the removal for sale of the sand and gravel would be on a much greater scale than ball clay extraction resulting in relatively high vehicle numbers in the AONB and the creation of a greater void making restoration challenging. The suitability of this site for the extraction of sand and gravel will require careful appraisal and various assessments would need to be undertaken.
2 Waste minerals (clays and silt) could be used as restoration materials to enhance existing areas of Dorey's Pit.	It is agreed that waste excavated material would be used in the restoration of this site.
3 Major advantages if the scheme restores heathland habitats and links fragmented heathland sites. Further habitat/species surveys would be beneficial.	If this site is to be progressed it will be necessary to determine the most appropriate restoration having regard to final ground levels in relation to water table.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggregate Industries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>
--	---

### Observations

Eight comments were classified as "observations".

Observation	DCC Response
<b>1 Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic on the A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown and C6 through Winterborne Kingston</li> <li>• May be an impact on the SRN along the A35 to the north</li> </ul>	See comments relating to traffic above.
2 Review extent of area described as Existing Mineral Site in terms of coverage along Holme Lane.	DCC will check the extent of the existing mineral site and amend if necessary.

<p>3 Reserve should be clearly divided between sand and gravel and sand only.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the quality and quantity of mineral should be established and evidence will need to be supplied if the site is to be progressed. Figures should differentiate between overlying sand and gravel and the lower sands of the Poole formation.</p>
<p><b>4 Water resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible impact on natural drainage</li> <li>• Impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels should be considered</li> <li>• Impact on watercourses and associated wetlands</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed there is could be a potential issue regarding hydrology which will need further investigation.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imerys Minerals Ltd</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Stoke Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</li> </ul>	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>East Parley Residual Reserve</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS05</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>1</b>

### Site Description

The site consists of two areas of land located to the west of Chapel Lane at East Parley. The two areas lie either side of the eastern arm of Parley Common, a SSSI and Natura 2000 site. The site is 12 hectares in total and is currently used for agriculture. It is suggested as a borrow pit for the extraction of 500,000 tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of five years. Restoration to heathland is proposed, using inert fill, to strengthen the emerging habitat link between the main part of Parley Common to the west and Hurn Common to the east.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic congestion</li> <li>• Already chaotic traffic volumes</li> <li>• Impact on local, narrow roads intolerable</li> <li>• Traffic on Parley Lane is already a significant problem</li> <li>• Road improvements needed at Blackwater and Parley Cross junction</li> <li>• Traffic impact on Parley Lane and Parley Cross</li> <li>• Cumulative traffic impacts of this site in combination with other developments in the area including employment land development, incinerator; MBT plant, passenger and industrial expansion at the airport and potentially with urban extension area proposed for east and south of Ferndown.</li> <li>• Increased traffic on the already heavily used B3073, which experiences tailbacks at peak times.</li> <li>• Traffic volumes likely to be higher than stated due to inert waste being transported to the site, extracted material being transported to another site for processing and operators</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>Concern has been expressed by the Highways Agency at the level of additional congestion on the A31(T) that this development and other long term proposals in the area would generate. However, whilst this site is within proximity to the A31 it may be considered more acceptable than others within the locality due to the shorter timeframe and local supplier nature of the proposal</p> <p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance would be sought from the developer.</p> <p>Information on numbers of vehicle movements in association with the importation of inert fill has been requested from the site</p>

<p>potentially allowing local builders to collect materials from the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transport and travel plans required to address traffic issues related to cumulative development</li> </ul>	<p>promoter. This information will be considered in the assessment of this site.</p> <p>Public transport and traffic issues are an issue being considered by the Local Transport Plan for South East Dorset.</p>
<p><b>2. Water Supply</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact upon existing Wessex Water apparatus effluent disposal main.</li> </ul>	<p>Appropriate protection of the apparatus should be achieved.</p>
<p><b>3. Impact on residents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjoins houses on Barrack Road – severe impact on their amenities</li> <li>Boundary within 50m of houses</li> <li>Quality of life and well being</li> <li>Sustainability Appraisal makes no mention of impact on residents of Parley Cross (including cumulative impacts of development)</li> <li>Site should not extend as far west (to within 100m of properties)</li> <li>Visual impact</li> <li>Vibrations</li> <li>Dust</li> <li>Light</li> <li>Odours</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zone from nearby houses.</p> <p>Although the SA does not make specific reference to impact on residents of Parley Cross, impacts on nearby residents were considered and will continue to be considered and assessed if this site is to be progressed.</p> <p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul> <p>It is considered that there is unlikely to be any smells resulting from mineral extraction or infilling with inert waste. However, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>4. Potential reduction in property values</b></p>	<p>In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.</p>

<p><b>5. Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents already hear noise from Eco Composting</li> </ul>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p>
<p><b>6. Chapel Lane</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject to HGV traffic for Recycling Centre and Eco-Composting</li> <li>Private road not maintained by Dorset County Council</li> <li>Road surface is deteriorating rapidly, additional HGV traffic would worsen the situation</li> <li>DCC should adopt Chapel Lane and put in place the proposed link road across the corner of the Bournemouth Sports Club to the Recycling Centre</li> </ul>	<p>See comments on traffic above</p>
<p><b>7. Located next to Portfield School – HGVs passing the entrance will pose a hazard</b></p>	<p>It is not considered that the development of this site would pose any additional danger to Portfield School.</p>
<p><b>8. Site should not be worked concurrently with any other site in the Hurn or Parley area</b></p>	<p>If this site were to go ahead it is likely that it would be worked concurrently with other sites in the Hurn and Parley Area.</p>
<p><b>9. Nature Designations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to and possibly overlapping SSSI/Ramsar/SPA/SAC sites</li> <li>Site may have in situ biodiversity interest including breeding Annex 1 birds</li> <li>Impact on wetland interest at Parley Common</li> <li>Likely impact on nature sites due to depth of working and level of water table</li> <li>All plans should be agreed with Natural England before inclusion in the MSAD</li> <li>Impacts must be considered in themselves in light of Habitats Regulations – any impact on Natura 2000 sites cannot be offset against long term restoration of the site to heathland</li> <li>Changes in hydrology likely to impact on sites</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>The RSPB believes mineral extraction will have an adverse effect on designated sites and their features that cannot be adequately mitigated. This needs to be investigated if the site is to be progressed.</p> <p>Extraction would need to ensure that water supplies are not disrupted or that the water quality is not affected in the surrounding areas both during and after extraction.</p> <p>If this site is to be progressed Natural England would be consulted throughout the process.</p>
<p><b>10. Proximity to Green Belt</b></p>	<p>Government guidance is that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land as Green Belts, which is to maintain openness. Mineral working can be acceptable provided</p>



	that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.
<b>11. Proximity to Common Land</b>	We are unaware of any registered common land in the immediate vicinity that would be affected by the development of this site.
<b>12. Would restart mineral working in this area</b>	This is an area which has had extensive mineral working in the past. It is acknowledged that no mineral extraction currently takes place along Chapel Lane and if this site were to go ahead mineral working would be restarted.
<b>13. Air traffic safety</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water on site may attract birds in close proximity to airport</li> <li>• If pumps used to drain site they would be operational 24/7</li> <li>• Potential impact on air traffic safety</li> </ul>	<p>There is potential for a high risk site in terms of birdstrike due to its proximity to Bournemouth Airport. Any extraction at this site would require the most careful consideration and robust safeguards at every stage of working and restoration.</p> <p>There is concern over source and sufficiency of inert fill and further information on the source would be sought from the developer to ensure a satisfactory and timely restoration can be achieved.</p>
<b>14. Inert waste</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volumes of inert waste available are falling</li> <li>• Filling with inert waste would continue after mineral extraction extending the life of the site</li> </ul>	<p>Concern over source and sufficiency of inert fill is shared and further information on the source of fill will be sought from the developer.</p> <p>Details on the entire life of the development with regards to the importation of fill will be sought from the site promoter and considered when the site is assessed.</p>
<b>15. Flood Risk</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken.</p> <p>A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p>
<b>16. Historic landfill – risk of pollutants on this site</b>	Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.
<b>17. Public Rights of Way would be affected</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapel Lane is a bridleway – suffers from commercial traffic</li> </ul>	The bridleway that runs parallel to Chapel Lane should not be detrimentally affected if mineral extraction were to take place on this site.
<b>18. Groundwater</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on groundwater may affect the Moors River</li> </ul>	Impacts on hydrology should be investigated if this site were to be progressed.

<b>19. Land may have been recommended for other developments such as open spaces that may have greater benefit (SANG?)</b>	This site in this location is considered to have little value as SANG.
--	--

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

• East Dorset District Council	• Natural England
• West Parley Residents Association	• Christchurch Borough Council
• Barrack Road Residents Association	• RSPB
• East Dorset Community Partnership	• Wessex Water
• Campaign to Protect Rural England	• Hurn Parish Council

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
10 Restoration to heathland would provide a valuable habitat link between Parley and Merritown	Agree

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

• The Herpetological Trust
----------------------------

### Observations

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<b>1. Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The A31 between Oakley to the west and the A338 junction to the east is currently operating at capacity leading to delays at peak and other times.</li> <li>• Extent of existing operational problems on A31 north of Bournemouth forecast to increase by 2026, extending westwards to the junction with the A350</li> <li>• Seasonal traffic and likely to be additional flows on the SRN in this area leading up to and during the 2012 Olympics.</li> <li>• Afteruses should not be such that the site generates traffic movements</li> </ul>	See comments relating to traffic above

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relatively high incidence of serious accidents on the eastbound carriageway north-east of Bournemouth – this section is in the worst 15% for the SRN.</li> <li>Site close to Bournemouth Airport which suffers from existing congestion issues and poor accessibility</li> <li>Afteruses should not be such that the site generates traffic movements</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site lies within East Dorset Heaths Strategic Nature Area on the South West Nature Map, where opportunities for restoration and recreation of heathland and associated habitats should be sought and brought forward</li> </ul>	Restoration to heathland is proposed.
<p><b>3. Similar applications for this site have previously been rejected</b></p>	This site should be considered on its merits by undertaking a full assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
<p><b>4. Damage to environment would outweigh benefit</b></p>	This will be considered by undertaking a full assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.
<p><b>5. Water Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several ordinary watercourses flow close to the site</li> <li>Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels</li> </ul>	Consideration will be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels. Only clean uncontaminated inert waste should be used to infill the quarry at this site.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bournemouth Airport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Great Plantation (Hethfelton)</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS06</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>

### Site Description

The site is located to the east of Dorchester, north west of Stokeford. It is known locally as Great Plantation or Hethfelton. The site adjoins two existing sand and gravel quarries at Hyde Plantation to the north and Masters Pit to the east. It is suggested for the extraction of 5.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 18 years. This 75 hectare site is currently a Forestry Commission plantation. Restoration is proposed to low level forestry and heathland.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorset Heaths SAC and SPA within site which would need to be excluded from working area</li>   <li>• Impact on nightjar and populations of protected reptiles</li>   <li>• Much larger permanent open heathland areas would need to be established within current area of plantation for species</li> <li>• Site should only be considered in the context of an overall nature conservation plan for the forest block</li>   <li>• Significant loss in naturalness due to loss of original landforms and hydrology</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the Dorset Heaths SAC and SPA would need to be excluded from the working area. More detail on precise areas proposed for extraction would be necessary should this site be progressed to the next stage of the Plan.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed, an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>The value of the existing plantation for key bird and reptile species is recognised and maintenance of the ecological function for key interests would be expected to be planned into phased working and restoration of the area.</p> <p>Loss of natural landform is inevitable from mineral extraction but restoration has potential to allow creation of a final landform of high biodiversity value incorporating wet and dry features.</p>
<b>2. Restoration</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mix of quarries and heathland could provide high biodiversity value but virtually all quarried areas have long term management problems (particularly invasion of gorse)</li> <li>Restoration to forestry lessens biodiversity value</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that a mix of quarries and heathland could provide high biodiversity value. The problem with gorse invasion is recognised, but is capable of being resolved through appropriate long term management.</p> <p>Replanting the site with conifers would reduce biodiversity value.</p>
<p><b>3. Archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site contains a number of tumuli, the setting of which should be preserved</li> <li>Battery Bank would be directly affected</li> </ul>	<p>The Scheduled Monuments on the site and their settings would need to be protected. If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan, the promoter would need to assess and if necessary evaluate the potential impact on the four Scheduled Monuments, their settings and any associated archaeological remains to determine what quarrying may be feasible.</p>
<p><b>4. Located within AONB</b></p>	<p>The site is not in the Dorset AONB. However, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact including views from the AONB.</p>
<p><b>5. Need for mineral</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for sand</li> <li>Valley gravel extraction has always been opposed by the County Council</li> </ul>	<p>There is an ongoing need for sand produced in Dorset and there will be a requirement for further deposits to be released for working if at all possible to meet Government guidelines.</p> <p>This reserve does not comprise valley gravel and is largely sand of the Poole Formation. Although the Adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan contains no such specific policy, the document currently being prepared will consider whether or not such a policy is appropriate.</p>
<p><b>6. Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on Puddletown Road and Bere Regis</li> <li>Damage to rural roads</li> <li>Cumulative impact with Binnegar Quarry</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p>

	<p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance and improvements would be sought from the developer.</p> <p>A financial contribution towards the Purbeck Transport Strategy may be required.</p>
--	--

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wareham St Martin Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site**

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
11 Restoration a. Opportunity to restore to heathland	Heathland as the predominant after-use would be encouraged.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purbeck District Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>

**Observations**

Eight comments were classified as “observations”. Points further to those above are detailed below.

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<b>1. Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to further increase traffic issues on A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown</li> <li>Potential to further increase traffic issues on C6 through Winterborne Kingston, used as a ratrun</li> </ul> b. Consider impact on Strategic Road Network c. Possible implications for A35 trunk road to the north	<p>As stated above, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts.</p> <p>Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is</p>

<p>d. Would need to be supported by Transport Assessment e. HGV levels on Puddletown Road and local road network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail transport may present a sustainable alternative to road transport due to proximity to Bournemouth to Waterloo main line.</li> <li>• Traffic movements should be specified</li> </ul>	<p>likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible.</p> <p>Estimated traffic movements will need to be determined</p>
<p><b>2. Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site lies within Puddletown Road Strategic Nature Area where opportunities for restoration and recreation of heathland and associated habitat should be sought and brought forward.</li> <li>• A strategic plan to recreate a large area of heathland and associated acid grassland wetland and woodland to link with existing SSSIs and SNCIs would be of huge benefit.</li> <li>• A policy regarding a heathland restoration strategy for the area should be included.</li> <li>• Site contains in situ biodiversity interest including Annex 1 birds</li> </ul>	<p>The adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1999) no longer includes a policy to establish a Restoration Strategy Advisory Group. However, the principle of developing an overall strategy for mineral working and restoration in the Puddletown Road area is supported. Involvement with Dorset Wildlife Trust would be welcomed.</p> <p>As stated above, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites. The opportunity to recreate heathland is acknowledged.</p>
<p><b>3. Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within Flood Zone 1</li> <li>• At least one possibly more ordinary watercourses flow through or close to site</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels</li> </ul>	<p>Flood Zone 1 has the lowest probability of flooding. If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken.</p> <p>A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment may be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>It is noted that the Environment Agency has no objection in terms of flood risk or from a groundwater perspective.</p>
<p><b>4. Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current role of forestry sites in terms of public amenity and recreation</li> </ul>	<p>If the development were to go ahead there would inevitably be some impact on recreational use and amenity of this part of the forest.</p>

	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for their diversion and the creation of new routes.
<b>5. Life of quarry</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainability Appraisal should place more emphasis on fact that restoration would not be until eighteen years later</li> </ul>	Noted, but some areas would be restored in well under eighteen years.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Stoke Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSPB</li> </ul>

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None



<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Hodge Ditch Area 2</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS07</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>

### Site Description

The site is located on the western border of Dorset, east of Chard Junction. It is suggested as an extension to the existing quarry at Chard Junction for the extraction of 800,000 tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of eight years. The 10.5 hectare site is currently used for agriculture. Proposed after-use and details for restoration are presently unclear and will need to be clarified.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<b>1. Nature Conservation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference should be made to possible impacts on adjoining SNCI</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required, including any potential impact on the SNCI south of the road.</p>
<b>2. Located within AONB</b>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact particularly due to the location of the site within the Dorset AONB. Mitigation measures such as screening would need to be considered.</p>
<b>3. Cultural Heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely to affect setting and integrity of Forde Abbey</li> <li>Impingement on historic park and gardens</li> <li>Tranquillity of the Registered Park and Gardens and the Abbey may be adversely affected by ancillary activity</li> </ul>	<p>Impact on Forde Abbey and its setting is a very important consideration to be addressed in detail should this site be progressed to the next stage of the Plan.</p> <p>It is known that the suggested site and part of the current workings lie within the historic park and gardens.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the tranquillity of the Registered Park and Gardens and the Abbey is likely to be adversely affected during the period of working.</p>

<p><b>4. Cumulative impacts/restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing Chard Junction quarry should be properly restored first</li> <li>Parkland should be extended as phased extraction proceeds</li> </ul>	<p>Much of the existing Chard Junction quarry has been restored for nature conservation and agriculture purposes, and restoration is continuing.</p> <p>The opportunity for creation of parkland needs to be investigated with the promoters of this site.</p>
<p><b>5. Valley gravel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extraction of valley gravel against Dorset County Council policy</li> </ul>	<p>The Adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan contains no such policy. The document currently being prepared will consider whether or not such a policy is appropriate.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Dorset District Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage</li> </ul>

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site**

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<p><b>12 Proposed life</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Life could be less than 8 years at current sales levels shortening any potential impacts</li> </ul>	<p>Although sales from this site have been high in recent years, the current economic climate may in fact extend the period of working.</p>
<p><b>13 Restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could complement Forde Abbey Gardens</li> </ul>	<p>Opportunities for the creation of parkland or a landform to complement the gardens would need to be investigated.</p>
<p><b>14 Use of existing infrastructure</b></p>	<p>It is agreed the existing haul roads and processing plant would be used.</p>
<p><b>15 Reptiles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would be beneficial to undertake habitat surveys to assess reptile/amphibian use of the site before the works and put forward a mitigation plan if these species are likely to be present.</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required. This survey should pick up the presence of important species of amphibians and reptiles and the need for further more specific survey work in order to reduce any adverse impacts.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggregate Industries UK Limited</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>

## Observations

Reason for observations	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Cross-Boundary Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate proposals are coherent with strategies of neighbouring authorities</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p><b>2. Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible implications for A35 trunk road to the north</li> <li>• Would need to be supported by Transport Assessment</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail transport may present a sustainable alternative to road transport due to proximity to Bournemouth to Waterloo main line.</li> </ul>	<p>The observations of the Highways Agency have been noted and will be taken into account. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible.</p>
<p><b>3. Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within River Axe CAMS unit within Otter Sid Axe and Lim CAMS.</li> <li>• Status is 'water available' which should be taken into account in the assessment of the site.</li> <li>• Site designated as a Minor Aquifer</li> <li>• A stream runs along the south-eastern and eastern sides of the site</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be flood risk associated with the watercourse along the eastern side of the site. A sufficient easement should be left alongside the watercourse.</li> <li>• Works should not result in an increased rate or volume of surface water discharge from the site.</li> </ul>	<p>The observations made by the Environment Agency have been noted and will be taken into account.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EA recommend that a minimum of a 10m buffer is put in place to protect all wet areas and water courses adjacent to or within the site.</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impacts on woodland north of the site, potentially used by otters and bats</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required.
<b>5. Amenity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts on visual amenity</li> <li>Effects upon recreational usage of Liberty Trail</li> </ul>	<p>Impact on visual amenity and views generally would need to be considered.</p> <p>It is agreed that the proposed site could have a significant effect on the Liberty Trail and its use for recreational purposes. Opportunities for diverting both the Trail and other bridleways and footpaths would need to be considered.</p>
<b>6. Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restoration to nature conservation welcomed</li> <li>EA would wish to comment on precise detail of restoration proposals.</li> </ul>	Details of proposed restoration and afteruses need to be clarified with the promoters of this site.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government Office for the South West</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RSPB South West Regional Office</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Horton Heath</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS08</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>

### Site Description

The site is situated approximately 1.5km south west of Verwood and lies immediately south east of Woodlands Park. The site encompasses Horton Common SNCI and an area in the centre was used as a temporary borrow pit to provide sand and gravel for a nearby golf course. The 29 hectare site is currently forested. It is suggested for the extraction of 750,000 tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of six years. Restoration is proposed for nature conservation purposes.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1 Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant and detrimental impact on SNCI</li> <li>• Important species and rare plants including Annex 1 birds</li> <li>• Should be no net loss in biodiversity interest</li> <li>• Site should be targeted for heathland restoration</li> <li>• Important surviving fragment of Horton Common</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the area is important in terms of biodiversity and that careful consideration would need to be given to this factor. If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required.</p> <p>A phased working scheme would be necessary to preserve the nature conservation interest – the MPA will work closely with the operator and advisory bodies to ensure this is feasible, should the site be progressed.</p>
<p><b>2 Recreation &amp; Amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of SANG</li> <li>• Threat to other more sensitive heathland areas</li> <li>• Loss of public footpaths and bridleways</li> </ul>	<p>If the development were to go ahead there would inevitably be some impact on recreational use and amenity.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities and acceptability for their diversion.</p>
<p><b>3 Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on narrow lanes in the vicinity</li> <li>• Impact on Horton road, a minor C class road extensively used</li> <li>• Potential for accidents</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that there are access difficulties with this site.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts.</p>



	There may be further archaeological features present and if this site were to be progressed there would be the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation.
<b>9 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unproved viability of nature conservation restoration as proposed</li> <li>• Backfilling would not restore the original heathland as the soil horizons would be permanently destroyed by sand and gravel removal</li> <li>• Restoration required following the borrow pit extraction has not been undertaken</li> </ul>	Further information has been requested from the site promoter with regards to restoration proposals.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

• East Dorset District Council	• East Dorset Community Partnership
• Campaign to Protect Rural England	• Natural England
• Dorset Wildlife Trust	• Environment Agency
• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds	• English Heritage

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
16 The area has been used in the past for the extraction of sand and gravel	Agree, in August 2004 permission was granted for part of this site for the formation of a temporary borrow pit to provide sand and gravel for the adjacent golf course.
17 No annoyance to local residents as the route would be over farmland	There may be an impact to residential properties in close proximity to the site.
18 Access to public highway could be altered to a position eastwards towards Three Legged Cross which would give the added benefit of extinguishing the existing very dangerous access at Clump Hill.	Alternative accesses will be considered if this site is to be progressed.
19 The proposed scheme could allow extraction and restoration to heathland habitats in the current areas on pine plantation.	Further information has been requested from the site promoter with regards to restoration proposals.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site; The Herpetological Conservation Trust

### Observations

Two comments were classified as “observations”. Additional comments not adequately covered above are as follows:

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<b>1 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any input of food waste has the potential to cause significant increased birdstrike hazard.</li> <li>Wet restorations should be carefully considered although small lakes or ponds may be acceptable</li> </ul>	<p>It is not proposed to infill this site with household waste so there should be no increased birdstrike hazard.</p> <p>Further information has been requested from the site promoter with regards to restoration proposals.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bournemouth Airport</li> </ul>
---	---

Petitions/Standard Responses: None

**Site Name** Hurn Court Farm  
**Site Reference** MSAD AS09  
**Number of disagreeing comments** 12



**Number of observations**            **8**  
**Number of agreeing**            **1**  
**comments**

**Site Description**

The site is located just south of Bournemouth Airport and adjoins the existing Hurn Court Farm quarry to the east. This 14.2 hectare site is currently agricultural land and it is suggested as an extension to the existing quarry for the extraction of 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of four years. Progressive restoration is proposed using inert waste to return the land to agriculture at original ground levels.

**Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site**

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1 Impact on landscape character</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land required as SANG</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact and mitigation measures.</p> <p>The potential for the site to act as a Strategic Green Space, following extraction, will be encouraged if deemed appropriate and in an acceptable timescale, in order to help mitigate effects from increased housing provision in South East Dorset.</p>
<p><b>2 Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of endangered species (hares, barn owls)</li> <li>• Impact on nearby SSSI</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed an ecological assessment would be required. The site lies some distance to the west of the SSSI.</p>
<p><b>3 Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parley Lane cannot cope with extra traffic</li> <li>• Exasperate access difficulties to the airport</li> <li>• Road improvements needed at Blackwater and Parley Cross junction</li> <li>• Cumulative impact with employment land development, potential urban extension, incinerator, airport expansion</li> <li>• Risk of accidents</li> </ul>	<p>There would be no net increase in traffic movements since the site would be an extension to the existing quarry. However, concern has been expressed by the Highways Agency at the level of additional congestion on the A31(T) that this development and other long term proposals in the area would generate.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts.</p> <p>Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p>

<p><b>4 Loss of Green belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity to common land</li> </ul>	<p>Government guidance is that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land as Green Belts, which is to maintain openness. Mineral working can be acceptable provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.</p> <p>We are unaware of any common land in the immediate vicinity that would be affected by the development of this site.</p>
<p><b>5 Proximity to the airport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bird strike issues</li> </ul>	<p>This is a potentially high risk site for birdstrike due to its proximity to Bournemouth Airport. Any extraction at this site would require the most careful consideration and robust safeguards at every stage of working and restoration. Although the aspiration is restoration to farmland, the interim stages may contain water lagoons, there is likely to be temporary ponding and the site may serve as a refuge for birds driven from the airport from which they can quickly return.</p> <p>There is concern over the source and sufficiency of inert fill in the area and further information on this would be sought from the developer to ensure a satisfactory and timely restoration can be achieved.</p>
<p><b>6 Proximity to tourism/recreational activities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on economy from reduced visitor numbers</li> <li>• Impact on Adventure Wonderland &amp; nearby golf course</li> </ul>	<p>Any adverse impact on tourism would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral.</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that mineral extraction would reduce visitor numbers in general, however there could be some impact on Adventure Wonderland as it is immediately adjoining the suggested site.</p>
<p><b>7 Inert waste</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volumes are falling as recycling increases therefore extended development life</li> <li>• Traffic generated from importation of waste is of concern</li> </ul>	<p>As stated above, there is concern over the source and sufficiency of inert fill and further information on this would be sought.</p> <p>Details of traffic movements associated with the entire life of the development, including both extraction and the importation of fill, will be sought from the site promoter and considered when the site is assessed.</p>

<p><b>8 Water resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and quantity</li> <li>• High water table</li> <li>• Contamination of River Stour and Christchurch Harbour</li> </ul>	<p>Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency, with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p>9 Site should not be worked concurrently with any other site in the Hurn or Parley Area</p>	<p>Whilst it is not proposed to work this site concurrently with the existing Hurn Court Farm quarry, it is possible that if this site were to go ahead there would be other quarrying operations in the general area taking place at the same time.</p>
<p><b>10 Proximity to residential properties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site should not extend as far south as Dales Lane, inadequate distance for screening measures</li> <li>• Visual impact</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Dust</li> <li>• Vibrations</li> <li>• Light</li> <li>• Odour</li> <li>• Impact on quality of life</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zones from nearby houses.</p> <p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p> <p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul> <p>It is considered that there are unlikely to be any smells resulting from mineral extraction or infilling with inert waste. However, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p> <p>Other potential impacts, including light pollution and vibration, would need to be addressed at the time of any planning application. However, such impacts are unlikely to be so unacceptable as to be incapable of mitigation or preclude any extraction in principle.</p>

<b>11 Impact on property values</b>	In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.
<b>12 Cultural Heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on Grade II listed farmhouse and barn at Merritown Farm and Dales House</li> </ul>	Impacts on the nearby listed buildings and their setting will need to be considered in detail if this site is progressed.
<b>13 Loss of grade 2 agricultural land</b>	It is proposed to restore the site back to agricultural land of an equal or improved quality, therefore loss will be temporary. However, restoration to woodland and use of the land as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace may be encouraged if deemed appropriate.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Dorset District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Parley Residents Association</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Barrack Road Residents Association</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Christchurch Borough Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hurn Parish Council</li> </ul>

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
20 Limited reservations but reptile and amphibian surveys should be undertaken.	If this site were to be progressed, an ecological assessment would be required. This survey should pick up the presence of important species of amphibians and reptiles and the need for further more specific survey work in order to reduce any adverse impacts.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

The Herpetological Conservation Trust

### Observations

Eight comments were classified as "observations". Points further to those above are detailed below.

Observation	DCC Response
-------------	--------------

<p><b>1 Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A31 between Oakley to the west and the A338 junction to the east is currently operating at capacity</li> <li>• Seasonal traffic and likelihood of additional flows on the SRN in this area leading up to and during the 2012 Olympics.</li> <li>• Afteruses should not be such that the site generates traffic movements</li> </ul>	<p>There would be no net increase in vehicle movements as this site is being suggested as an extension to an existing operation.</p> <p>It is proposed to restore the site back to agricultural. This afteruse would not generate significant traffic movements. However, restoration to woodland and use of the land as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace may be encouraged if deemed appropriate, and these uses may generate some traffic movements</p>
<p>2 Future availability of adequate volumes of inert fill would need to be assured</p>	<p>Agree there is concern over the source and sufficiency of inert fill and further information on this would be sought from the developer to ensure a satisfactory and timely restoration can be achieved.</p>
<p>3 Site is not well placed for the creation of public amenity space but potential should be considered</p>	<p>Restoration to woodland and use of the land as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace will be encouraged if considered appropriate.</p>
<p>4 Concern shown to the use of this site as a household landfill site following extraction of gravel.</p>	<p>It is not proposed to infill this site with household waste.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bournemouth Airport</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds</li> </ul>	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Moreton Plantation</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS10</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>1</b>

### Site Description

The proposed site is located approximately 1km north east of Moreton Village and approximately 11km east of Dorchester and is adjacent to the Ministry of Defence Bovington Camp and Tank Museum to the east. The site is bounded to the north by a minor public road from Pallington to Bovington and agricultural land to the west and south. The 194 hectare site consists of two blocks. It is suggested for the extraction of 6 million tonnes of sand as well as 0.45 million tonnes of gravel from the western block and 0.5 million tonnes of gravel from the eastern block, over a period of 14 years. The site is currently forested, with areas of restored heathland. Restoration to heathland is proposed with wet restoration including some large water bodies in the western block.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site includes Natura 2000 designated sites</li> <li>• Would not pass Habitats Regulations tests</li> <li>• Exceptional species interest</li> <li>• Site supports bird species including nightjar, woodlark, Dartford warbler</li> <li>• Habitat of rare ladybird spider</li> <li>• Protected species of reptiles and invertebrates</li> <li>• Notable invertebrate species</li> <li>• Loss of flora and fauna that will never recover</li> <li>• Whole area comprises catchment for the SSSI in the south, therefore excluding SSSI not sufficient</li> <li>• Large part of the south of the site has been restored to heathland using Heritage Lottery funding</li> <li>• Requirement to maintain restored heathland for 25 years</li> </ul>	<p>Aggregate Industries state that working areas would avoid statutory designations and heathland regeneration areas</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that there is significant potential risk for damage to ecology and biodiversity from extraction at this site. Further information from the promoters would be needed to identify the specific areas affected.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on Natura 2000 sites.</p> <p>The relationship between the area subject to Heritage Lottery funding and the proposal for sand and gravel extraction needs clarification.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas in the north of the site have been restored to heath under English Nature species recovery project</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Loss of amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area is well used for public access and recreation by locals and visitors</li> <li>• Tranquil area</li> <li>• Loss of public rights of way (footpaths and cyclepaths)</li> <li>• Effect on part of Dorset Jubilee Trail, which runs from Forde Abbey on Somerset border to Bokerley Dyke on Hampshire border. Fencing would create a right of way not pleasant to use.</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged that this area is well used for recreation by local people and visitors and that if the development were to go ahead there would inevitably be some impact on recreational use and amenity.</p> <p>It would be a challenge for this area to be worked for mineral extraction without unacceptable impacts on amenity.</p> <p>However, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for their diversion.</p>
<p><b>3. Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Cloud's Hill – Grade II listed building and former home of Laurence of Arabia</li> <li>• Tourist attraction</li> <li>• Would directly affect designated assets</li> </ul>	<p>Although it is stated that working areas would avoid Clouds Hill, and include a significant stand-off, there may still be an impact on its setting. This would be considered in detail if this site is progressed.</p>
<p><b>4. Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual impact from road between C6 and Waddock Cross</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact and mitigation measures, especially in relation to views from roads.</p>
<p><b>5. Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe traffic consequences on B3390, especially over Hurst Bridges, and A35</li> <li>• Cumulative traffic impact with recent permission for Binnegar quarry</li> <li>• HGV access would present dangers due to fast moving traffic along C80 minor road and hidden dips</li> <li>• Existing impacts of speeding quarry lorries</li> <li>• Damage already caused to country roads by heavy traffic</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative transport impacts.</p> <p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance and improvements would be sought from the developer.</p>

	A financial contribution towards the Purbeck Transport Strategy may be required.
<b>6. Impact on military quarters at Bovington</b>	There may be limited impact on the military quarters at Bovington, although there is already considerable vehicle and military activity in the area
<b>7. Water</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water flow would be permanently changed</li> <li>• Extraction would mean it would not be possible to maintain hydrological conditions</li> <li>• Effect on local water courses as sand is below water table</li> </ul>	It is agreed there is a potential issue regarding hydrology in this area, which will need investigation. The MPA will liaise closely with the Environment Agency to ensure there would be no adverse impacts on hydrology.
<b>8. Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could sympathetic restoration be achieved?</li> <li>• Timescale</li>   <li>• Proposed wet restoration would alter the character of the area</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that such a large sand deposit would result in a lengthy period of working and it is not known how feasible progressive restoration would be.</p> <p>Wet restoration with some large bodies of water would alter the character of the area. Any benefits or disadvantages of this change would need to be investigated.</p>
<b>9. Conflict with MoD usage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is under review to provide an extension to the existing defence training area</li> </ul>	A decision by the MoD on whether or not part or all of this site will be required as an extension to the training area is awaited.
<b>10. Estimated reserve not stated in correct format</b>	The stated reserve was sufficiently clear for the purposes of the plan at this stage. As with most sites, further geological information will be sought if they are to be progressed.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

• Purbeck District Council	• The Ramblers' Association
• Moreton Parish Council	• Campaign to Protect Rural England
• Natural England	• Defence Estates
• Dorset Wildlife Trust	• RSPB
• Affpuddle and Turnerspudde Parish Council	• The Herpetological Conservation Trust
• English Heritage	

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site**



Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<b>21 Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working areas would avoid statutory designations and heathland regeneration areas</li> <li>Mitigation of impacts through restoration</li> </ul>	Any ecological concern would still need to be addressed during the Plan process and preparation of any planning application.
<b>22 Protection of cultural heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Working areas would avoid Clouds Hill with a significant stand-off</li> </ul>	Any potential impact on cultural heritage would need to be addressed during the Plan process and preparation of any planning application.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aggregate Industries</li> </ul> |
|--|

### Observations

Nine comments were classified as “observations”. Points further to those above are detailed below.

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<b>1. Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider impact on Strategic Road Network</li> <li>Possible implications for A35 trunk road to the north, with a direct link via B3390 and access to congested section of A35 to southeast of Dorchester.</li> <li>Would need to be supported by Transport Assessment</li> <li>Rail transport may present a sustainable alternative to road transport due to proximity to Bournemouth to Waterloo main line.</li> <li>Substantial widening of the road at Waddock Cross junction, an existing blackspot, would be necessary</li> </ul>	<p>It is noted that the Highways Agency have stated that they would need to be satisfied that there would not be an unacceptable impact on the SRN with evidence from a Transport Assessment</p> <p>As stated above, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative transport impacts.</p> <p>There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible.</p> <p>Impact on local roads including the junction at Waddock Cross would need to be examined.</p>
<b>2. Need for sand</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Much of the area is sand only and the need for this is questionable</li> </ul>	There remains a need to identify additional sources of sand in Dorset to meet demand over the plan period.
<p><b>3. Flooding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the site within Flood Zones 2 and 3. May be appropriate to modify site boundary so there is no encroachment within Flood Zones 2 and 3, which would remove the need to carry out a Sequential Test.</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This could include no encroachment on flood zones 2 and 3 if considered appropriate.</p>
<p><b>4. Groundwater</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels</li> </ul>	It is noted that the Environment Agency has no objection from a groundwater perspective although the impacts on hydrology would need to be investigated.
<p><b>5. Map</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be useful to show restored heathland areas and presence of rare species on the map</li> </ul>	This suggestion by GOSW is agreed and areas will be shown on the map if possible and if the site is progressed.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government Office for the South West</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency</li> </ul>

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

**Site Name** Parley Court Phase 3  
**Site Reference** MSAD AS11  
**Number of disagreeing comments** 61  
**Number of observations** 6  
**Number of agreeing comments** 0

**Site Description**

This site is situated north of Bournemouth and is bordered to the south by the River Stour and the Stour Valley Way. It is suggested for the extraction of 1.3 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 12 years. This 71 hectare site is currently in agricultural use. Restoration is proposed using inert fill, with the majority of land being returned to agriculture.

**Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site**

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1 Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including deer, badgers, kingfishers, otters, moths and many more</li> <li>• Impact of Stour Valley Nature Reserve Moors River SPA</li> <li>• Impact on Christchurch Harbour SSSI</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.</p>
<p><b>2 Noise</b></p>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p>
<p><b>3 Dust</b></p>	<p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<p><b>4 Smell</b></p>	<p>It is considered that there is unlikely to be any smells resulting from mineral extraction or infilling with inert waste. However, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.</p>

<p><b>5 Impact on Landscape Character</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual eye sore</li> <li>• Impact from Stour Valley Way path</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact.</p> <p>The importance of the Stour Valley Way path is understood and the impact on it will be important factor when considering the suitability of this site.</p>
<p><b>6 Loss of a strategic green space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should be compatible with the provision of strategic green infrastructure, and should not close off options for use of the land for green spaces i.e. maintenance of an access corridor</li> <li>• Inappropriate use of the Green Belt, which should be retained</li> <li>• Rare quiet, rural area</li> </ul>	<p>Government guidance is that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land as Green Belts, which is to maintain openness. Mineral working can be acceptable provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.</p>
<p><b>7 Impact on nearby Epiphany Primary School</b></p>	<p>There is unlikely to be any unacceptable impact on local schools from either the lorry traffic or the mineral workings itself.</p>
<p><b>8 Impact on nearby residential properties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Impact on property prices</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zone from nearby houses.</p> <p>In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.</p>
<p><b>9 Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads cannot cope with the extra traffic from the development</li> <li>• Impact on Strategic Road Network in particular the A31 and particularly during the summer months and in the lead up to the Olympics</li> <li>• Accidents, particularly at access point</li> <li>• Cumulative impact with airport expansion and possible Ferndown Urban extension</li> <li>• Afteruses should not be such that the site generates traffic movements</li> </ul>	<p>Concern has been expressed by the Highways Agency at the level of additional congestion on the A31(T) that this development and other long term proposals in the area would generate.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments. Possible impact on this potential route will need investigation.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land traversed by the line of the potential Castle Lane Relief Road and this should not be jeopardised.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>10 Inert waste</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volumes are falling as recycling increases therefore extended development life</li> <li>Restoration with inert waste may not provide the type of restoration that is compatible with green infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<p>Concern over the source and sufficiency of inert fill is shared and further information on the source of fill will be sought from the developer.</p> <p>The impact of the use of inert fill material on any provision of green infrastructure needs examination.</p>
<p><b>11 Concern that this site may become a household landfill site</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health impacts of landfill</li> </ul>	<p>It is not proposed to infill this site with household waste.</p> <p>It is considered unlikely that there would be any health impacts resulting from infilling with inert waste. However, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>12 Flooding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site lies within the floodplain</li> <li>Increased risk of flooding residential areas downstream of the development is of concern if this development destroys the function of the floodplain</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken.</p> <p>A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>Although sand and gravel workings are deemed to be 'water compatible development' (Annex D2 of PPS25) and generally considered to be appropriate within the floodplain should the actual working area encroach within Zones 2 &amp; 3 under PPS25 there is a requirement to demonstrate application of the Sequential test. Processing plant and ancillary infrastructure should be sites outside of Zones 2 &amp; 3. Demonstration of the Sequential Test relies in part upon a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. An adequate buffer (around 30 metres) between the working area and the River Stour should be maintained</p>
<p><b>13 Water resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-porous inert fill would reduce water drainage</li> <li>Pollution/contamination of the River Stour</li> </ul>	<p>There are unlikely to be pollution issues if only clean uncontaminated inert waste were used as fill material. Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.</p>
<p><b>14 Bird Strike issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the inert waste</li> <li>Attracted to the body of water that the quarry will create</li> </ul>	<p>This is a potentially high risk site in terms of birdstrike due to its proximity to Bournemouth Airport. Any extraction at this site would require the most careful consideration and robust safeguards at every stage of working and restoration. Although the aspiration is</p>

	<p>restoration to farmland, the interim stages may contain water lagoons, there is likely to be temporary ponding and the site may serve as a refuge for birds driven from the airport from which they can quickly return.</p> <p>There is concern over source and sufficiency of inert fill and further information on the source would be sought from the developer to ensure a satisfactory and timely restoration can be achieved.</p>
<b>15 Loss of agricultural land</b>	It is intended to restore the majority of this site back to agriculture therefore loss will be temporary.
<b>16 Archeologically interest</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic landfill</li> </ul>	There is a historic landfill located along the south eastern edge of the proposed allocation, advice from the Environment Agency is that this is in association with the Muscliffe Purification Works. If this site is taken forward this landfill should be considered and dealt with appropriately.
<b>17 Impact on Listed Buildings and their setting</b>	Impacts on nearby Listed buildings and their setting will be considered if this site is progressed.
<b>18 Recreation &amp; Amenity Value</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Popular location for river walks</li> <li>• Loss of this land would put pressure on nearby sensitive heathlands</li> <li>• Impact on nearby tourist attractions</li> <li>• Impact on Stour Valley Nature Reserve</li> </ul>	<p>The importance of this area for recreation is acknowledged as is its value in attracting visitors away from protected heathland. This will be a very important factor when considering the suitability of this site.</p> <p>Potential impacts on the Stour Valley Nature Reserve will need to be investigated.</p>
19 Site should not be worked concurrently with other sites in the area.	

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

• West Parley Residents Association	• Barrack Road Residents Association
• Highways Agency	• Campaign to Protect Rural England
• Holdenhurst Village Action Group	• Christchurch Borough Council
• Throop Muscliffe Strouden Townsend and Holdenhurst Area Forum	• Environment Agency
• East Dorset District Council	• Hurn Parish Council
• English Heritage	

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

None

### Observations

Six comments were classified as “observations”. Points raised are adequately covered above.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bournemouth Airport</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dorset Wildlife Trust</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Natural England</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Royal Society of the Protection of Birds</li></ul>

Petitions/Standard Responses: None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Philliois Farm</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS12</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>

### Site Description

This site is situated about 3km south east of Bere Regis. It is suggested for the extraction of 1.5 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of six years. This 67 hectare site is being promoted by Aggregate Industries and is currently in agricultural use. It is suggested that material would be extracted and transported through Philliois and Bere Heath for processing at Tatchells Quarry.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<b>1 The site was deleted from the last Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan and this decision should be maintained</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The impact from the latest proposal will be greater than before as the proposal is to extract more than 4 times the previous amount from a smaller area requiring deeper excavations.</li></ul>	<p>All sites are being revisited therefore it is not appropriate to uphold the decision made in the late 1990s.</p> <p>The disparities between the consultation draft and the deposit draft documents needs investigation. However it is not intended to extract beneath the sand and gravel to remove further sand and so it is not accepted that the proposal is to extract more than four</p>

	times the previous amount. It is agreed that the tonnages require further investigation.
<p><b>2 Visual intrusion and impact of existing landscape character.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screening bunds would not acceptably mitigate long distant views of any mineral extraction or short views from residents living in close proximity</li> <li>• Earth bunds themselves are an eyesore</li> <li>• There are not sufficient details of the mitigation measures</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact and mitigation measures.
<p><b>3 Noise from excavations and associated traffic</b></p>	If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.
<p><b>4 Impact on residents who live in close proximity to the site</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stress</li> <li>• Quality of Life</li> <li>• Concern that residents who rent properties cannot object to the proposal for fear of losing their tenancy</li> <li>• Need for detail regarding minimum distance, from properties, excavations will take place &amp; the details of the stand-offs or noise mitigation scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>It is accepted that there would be adverse impact on residents if the development took place.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan a number of assessments including a Heath Impact Assessment would be undertaken. As with other sites adverse impacts will need to be balanced against the need to find sand and gravel reserves.</p> <p>We are aware that the tenants may be reluctant to object to proposals by their landlord. Impacts on inhabitants will be taken into account whether or not the occupants object.</p> <p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include working distances from properties and screening proposals.</p>
<p><b>5 Impact on biodiversity is of concern and its proximity to Natura 2000 sites could contravene the Habitats Regulations.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on flora and fauna</li> <li>• Proximity to SSSIs</li> <li>• Proximity to Philliols Coppice SNCI</li> <li>• Impact on Fairy Shrimp, protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act situated in ephemeral pond located north of Philliols Farm</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites. Any ecological assessment would include both the haul road and the site area.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on wildlife including nightjar, otters, water voles</li> <li>• Impact on parts of Philliols Heath and Bere Heath (within Wareham Forest) to the North due to the location of the haul road</li> </ul>	<p>The impact on the Fairy Shrimp and associated ephemeral pond will need to be investigated should this site progress to the next stage. Although indications are that it could be possible to work the site without adverse impact on the ephemeral pond and wildlife in the area. Impacts on biodiversity will need to be investigated in greater detail.</p>
<p><b>6 Water Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage of the Hyde Bog damaging its ecology interest.</li> <li>• Pollution of the SSSI Bere Stream and River Piddle harming important salmonid spawning grounds in both (as above).</li> </ul>	<p>The potential impact on salmonid spawning grounds will need to be investigated if the site is to be progressed.</p>
<p><b>7 Flooding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As much of the land is low lying and close to a flood plain.</li> <li>• After mineral working land unlikely to be suitable for agriculture</li> <li>• Loss of income for tenant farmers.</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p>
<p><b>8 Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased lorry traffic along Bere Road considerably.</li> <li>• Danger from traffic to pupils and parents of Bere Regis First School</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents on Bere Road.</p> <p>However it is not thought that the increase in traffic along Bere Road would be considerable.</p>
<p><b>9 Dust</b></p>	<p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<p><b>10 Amenity and Recreation in Wareham Forest</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage to bridleways</li> <li>• Danger to walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</li> </ul>	<p>If the development were to go ahead there would inevitably be some impact on recreational use and amenity of this part of Wareham forest.</p>

	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan, impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for their diversion.
<b>11 Destruction of habitable homes</b>	It is understood that there is no intention to demolish properties, although this will need to be confirmed.
<b>12 Impact on nearby listed buildings</b>	If this site is to be progressed the impact on listed buildings and their setting will need to be considered in more detail.
<b>13 Loss of “best and most versatile land”</b>	It is intended to restore the majority of this site back to best and most versatile quality, therefore any loss should be temporary.
<b>14 Impact on property values</b>	In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.
<b>15 Preference should be made to utilising existing sites rather than opening up new areas for mineral extraction (for example in Chapter 5 paragraph 7).</b>	Whilst there are often benefits from extending existing operations, there is still a need to identify new sites in order to meet the need for sand and gravel.
<b>16 Need</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for the gravel due to the economic downturn</li> <li>• Sand and gravel in low priority and there is plenty of supply throughout the country</li> <li>• Existing sites should be fully exploited and restored before this new site is considered.</li> </ul>	<p>Despite the downturn in the economy, the apportionment figures proposed by Government and the Regional Planning Body still apply. An economic downturn is likely to mean that existing reserves will last longer and the requirement for replacement sites will be deferred (but will not disappear).</p> <p>Construction aggregates should ideally be extracted as close as possible to their market, so the existence of supplies much farther away elsewhere in the country is not a consideration. There are benefits, including a reduction in carbon emissions, to be gained by using materials extracted locally. Sand and gravel is a low value product and transportation costs are proportionately high.</p>
<b>17 Impact on tourism and tourism businesses</b>	Any adverse impact on tourism would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral.
<b>18 Impact on local livery/equine businesses</b>	Any adverse impact on local businesses would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral.
<b>19 Against DCC policy on extraction of river valleys</b>	The Adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan contains no such policy. The document currently being prepared will consider whether or not such a policy is appropriate..

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

• RAGE in the Piddle	• Bere Regis First School
• Purbeck District Council	• Campaign to Protect Rural England
• Wareham St Martin Parish Council	• Environment Agency
• Arne Parish Council	

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
1 Any ecological and landscape concerns could be mitigated and would be addressed in a planning application.	Any ecological or landscape concern would need to be addressed during the Plan process and preparation of any planning application.
2 Survey work should be undertaken to establish if sand lizards are present along the proposed access track.	An ecological survey would need to be undertaken to establish the presence or otherwise of sand lizards and other protected species.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;  
Herpetological Conservation Trust

### Observations

Eight comments were classified as “observations”. Additional comments not adequately covered above are as follows;

Observation	DCC Response
1 The Bournemouth to Waterloo Main Line is within proximity to the majority of these sites which may present an opportunity for more sustainable transportation of minerals	There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel is feasible.
2 Restoration should consider the potential for biodiversity gain and heathland elements	Agree
3 It is National Grid policy to seek to retain existing overhead lines in-situ because of the strategic nature of the national network	It is not intended to move the pylons within the site.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

• Lower Winterborne Parish Council	• Bere Regis Parish Council
• Highways Agency	• Natural England

• Dorset Wildlife Trust	• Royal Society Protection of Birds
-------------------------	-------------------------------------

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

There were no petitions submitted for this site.

A large percentage of the comments submitted to this site included a list of reasons for objection included in the response received from RAGE in the Piddle.

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Land at Roeshot</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS13</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>0</b>

### Site Description:

The proposed site is located to the north of Christchurch. It lies on agricultural land, c. 400m to the east of Burton. It is bordered to the south by a railway line and to the east by the Dorset-Hampshire border.

It is proposed to progressively extract and restore the site over a rolling programme of approximately 15 years. The site would adjoin another site directly to the east in Hampshire, if this goes ahead as a preferred area in Hampshire. The Roeshot proposed site would be run as an extension to this. The site would be progressively restored to agriculture at a slightly lower level.

Site area is 74 ha. approximately. Estimated reserve 3.5 mt of sand and gravel. Estimated annual output is 200,000 to 250,000 tpa (tonnes per annum) approximately. Proposed life of operation is 15 years. Current land use is agriculture, proposed restoration is to a mixture of agriculture and nature conservation. Access is proposed via a haul route to the south-east of the site, running across land owned by the proposer within the New Forest National Park. Leads to/from an existing access onto the A35, close to the Cat and Fiddle junction. Estimated lorry movements are 160 per day (80 in/80 out).

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

<b>Reason For Disagreement</b>	<b>Dcc Response</b>
<p><b>1. Traffic/Vehicle Access Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic, esp. HGVs , leads to increase in accidents</li> <li>• Existing road infrastructure already inadequate, addition of HGVs will cause greater congestion and regular gridlock</li> <li>• Drivers will use small country lanes as rat runs – extremely dangerous, will cause damage to these minor roads not intended to carry lorries</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts.</p> <p>Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guarantees that this will not happen are essential</li> <li>• Dirt/mud on road – increased risk of accidents</li> <li>• Dangerous to other road users – esp. children travelling to local schools</li> <li>• Proposed access onto A35 dangerous</li> <li>• Further assessment of potential access points to the site should be undertaken</li> <li>• Increased congestion will reduce response times of emergency services – already lower than they should be</li> <li>• New Forest National Park ‘ban’ on lorries will make most of them go into Dorset</li> <li>• Railway embankment is already unstable – proposed extraction will make this worse</li> <li>• Full Transport Assessment will be required</li> <li>• Use of the Hampshire access to work Dorset area will extend potential impacts on Hampshire/New Forest National Park</li> <li>• Further discussions between DCC, HCC and Christchurch BC needed to address highways issues</li> </ul>	<p>to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>As access is proposed to be onto the A35 in Hampshire it is highly unlikely that any mineral traffic will use the local country lanes unless delivering to a local customer. The majority of mineral traffic from the site will head into Dorset as the main market for the material is the south east Dorset conurbation. In any case, if mineral did not come from this site it is likely that it would come from Hampshire along the A35 into Dorset.</p> <p>Although the access is proposed from the pick-your-own junction we are aware there may be alternatives which will be considered as part of the TA.</p> <p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted the stability of the railway embankment would be assessed prior to the development of the site. In any case the route of the water main north of the railway embankment would necessarily involve a reasonable standoff from the embankment toe.</p> <p>There will be close liaison between the highway and planning authorities of Dorset and Hampshire throughout the development of this Plan.</p>
<p><b>2. Environmental Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Dust</li> <li>• Light (if late working)</li> </ul>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds, appropriate standoff and use of appropriate equipment.</p> <p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CO<sub>2</sub> emissions</li> <li>• Air/water pollution (dust, emissions, sediment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul> <p>Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>3. Wildlife impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (especially regarding protected species – e.g. sand lizards on Burton Common)</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required.</p>
<p><b>4. Landscape/Visual Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open landscape, long range views across proposed site, will be lost when screened</li> <li>• Site is gateway to New Forest National Park – both road and rail – and the proposal will impact this role</li> <li>• Site will be very visible from trains</li> <li>• Impacts on setting of National Park</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact. This would include consideration of possible impacts on the New Forest National Park and its setting.</p>
<p><b>5. Loss of agricultural land</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valuable agricultural land will be lost, cannot be fully restored</li>   <li>• Impact on livelihood of tenant farmer</li> </ul>	<p>It is intended to restore some of this site back to agriculture therefore some of the loss would be temporary. However, there is likely to be pressure to restore this site for other purposes such as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and nature conservation which is likely to be encouraged.</p> <p>Any adverse impact on tenant farmers would be one of the issues to be carefully balanced against the need for the mineral. The site promoter has said that when land is taken out of agriculture for mineral working the farming tenant would be fully and fairly compensated.</p>
<p><b>6. Health Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dust – asthma</li> <li>• Vehicle emissions are also carcinogenic – increased impacts on vulnerable groups e.g. children, elderly, those with respiratory problems</li> <li>• Need to carry out health studies – and publicise findings (along with other impacts studies)</li> <li>• Development will affect both mental and physical health</li> </ul>	<p>Although health risks are considered unlikely, a Health Impact Assessment will be undertaken if this site is progressed. The Planning Authority will continue to work closely with Environmental Health Officers and the Environment Agency.</p>
<p><b>7. Cultural Heritage</b></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has potentially high archaeological importance – this will be lost</li> <li>• Archaeology needs to be taken into consideration</li> <li>• A long-distance alignment crosses the site</li> <li>• Mude local valley was used historically as a smuggling trail, to get goods inland, due to its narrowness and steep sides – proposal would change Local landscape and remove ability to discern this use of the valley</li> <li>• Impacts on setting of listed buildings in Burton – also Conservation Area in Burton</li> <li>• Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monuments</li> </ul>	<p>There may be archaeological features present on this site. If this site were to be progressed archaeological assessment and evaluation would be undertaken.</p> <p>Impacts on Listed buildings and their setting and the Burton Conservation Area will be considered if this site is progressed.</p> <p>There are no Scheduled Monuments that are likely to be affected by this development.</p>
<p><b>8. Loss of amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tranquillity/peacefulness reduced</li> <li>• Quality of life/desirability of the area reduced</li> <li>• Overall impact on community – impacts on local recreation opportunities (e.g. football at Waterman’s park south of A35 – if local team folds, greater anti-social behaviour)</li> <li>• Impact on schools, home for the elderly in area</li> <li>• Housing development to south will need access to nearby green space, and simultaneous development of mineral extraction will make this land unavailable when housing is being developed</li> <li>• Site has potential to act as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, especially for the proposed housing development to south of railway</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that development would affect the character of the area including its tranquilly and peacefulness.</p> <p>There is unlikely to be any unacceptable impact on local schools, residential homes or football at Watermans Park from either the lorry traffic or the mineral workings itself.</p> <p>The potential for the site to act as a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace, following extraction, will be encouraged if deemed to fit with the timescale of proposed housing development in the area.</p>
<p><b>9. Impact on Residential Properties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in property values</li> <li>• No compensation is available</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zones from nearby houses.</p> <p>Sufficient stand off from houses in Burton will be necessary.</p> <p>In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would</p>



	<p>have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.</p>
<p><b>10. Impacts on Rights of Way/countryside access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of countryside access, rights of way</li> <li>• Loss of open space</li>   <li>• Reduction of opportunities for access to National Park</li> <li>• Increased pressure on National Park</li> </ul>	<p>If the development were to go ahead there would inevitably be some impact on existing recreational use.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths on the site would be considered including the opportunities and acceptability for their diversion.</p> <p>The adjoining area of the National Park is intended for increased recreational use.</p>
<p><b>11. Restoration proposals unclear</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will it be restored to – lack of clarity causing concern</li> <li>• Need for farmland – but restored farmland never as good</li> <li>• Fear of household waste landfill – and accompanying impacts (gulls, vermin, litter)</li> <li>• Do not want lakes</li> </ul>	<p>As described in the background paper, it is proposed that the site would be progressively restored to agriculture, using inert fill, at a slightly lower level. It is also proposed to encourage biodiversity close to the River Mude and other margins. If the site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan process, further details on restoration proposals would be required from the site promoter. This would include the possibility for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and nature conservation.</p> <p>Due to the increased importance of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace and nature conservation it is likely that some agricultural land would be lost if this development were to be allocated and permitted.</p> <p>It is not proposed to infill this site with household waste.</p>
<p><b>12. Cumulative Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall size of the proposal, including Hampshire area, is too large</li> <li>• Mineral extraction, simultaneous with housing development to south of railway (also with proposed housing for Christchurch and East Dorset – 9,850 starts proposed) is too much for the area</li> <li>• Length of time to work the overall Roeshot site is too much.</li> </ul>	<p>It is proposed that extraction within Dorset would follow extraction in Hampshire. As the gravel deposit here is fairly shallow progressive restoration would follow quickly. Therefore minimum areas of land would be disturbed at any one stage reducing the size and scale of the operation.</p>

	<p>Cumulative impact from various forms of development including housing on the area in general and road network in particular is agreed to be an important consideration and will be taken into account as part of the various assessments that would need to be undertaken.</p>
<p><b>13. Impacts on Tourism/Local Economy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts (especially increased HGV traffic, increased congestion) on local economy including farming, tourism</li> <li>• Congestion will have knock-on effects on local economy – tourists will not want to return</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered mineral working at this site would have only limited impact on tourism. Any adverse impact on local businesses and tourism would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral.</p>
<p><b>14. Impacts on Hydrology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on watercourses – silting/pollution of Mude, and silting of Christchurch Harbour)</li> <li>• Impacts on water table – may lead to slip faulting/pollution</li> <li>• Flooding risk will be increased – is in Flood Risk Zone 2&amp;3 (Flood Risk Zone 1 has the lowest probability of flooding)</li> <li>• Mineral operations are likely to be affected by flooding – however the excavation does have potential for attenuation of flooding on the Mude through Christchurch</li> <li>• Flood risk does not preclude gravel extraction – but appropriate safeguards and working practices must be demonstrated</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed there is a potential issue regarding hydrology with the high water table in this area which will need investigation.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>With regards to contamination, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>15. Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should demonstrate national need for the mineral before proposal can go ahead</li> <li>• Need to consider alternative sites elsewhere – there must be other sites which do not impact residential areas to such an extent</li> <li>• Timescales – the site would not be required within the plan period</li> <li>• Dredge the gravel – from Solent or Poole Harbour</li> </ul>	<p>This site could make a valuable contribution to Dorset’s need for aggregates and if allocated would help Dorset meet its ‘apportionment’. The apportionment is a target figure placed on Dorset by Government and the Regional Planning Body and must if at all possible be met.</p> <p>Other sites are also being considered in order to identify the most suitable sites to meet Dorset’s need for aggregates.</p> <p>With regards to timescales, it is anticipated by the site operators that the Roeshot site within Dorset will need to come forward by 2021 – 2022 to enable continuous production. Therefore it is considered appropriate to consider the development of this site now.</p>

	Marine dredged gravel is currently landed at Southampton and Poole but there is still a need for land won gravel.
<p><b>16. Cross boundary Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not make it clear that an area in Hampshire is also proposed in addition to Dorset site</li> <li>• Need to re-examine all previous comments made to Hampshire County Council</li> <li>• Demonstrate proposals are coherent with strategies of neighbouring authorities DCC is requested to oppose HCC proposal</li> <li>• Start date of Dorset side dependent on Hampshire side start date/period of working</li> </ul>	<p>The site information summary contained in the consultation document did state that 'land further to the east within Hampshire has been identified as a preferred area for gravel extraction within the emerging Hampshire Minerals Plan'. If this site is progressed further consultation documents will make it clearer through the use of a line on a plan.</p> <p>Comments made to Hampshire County Council (HCC) will not be re-examined as all issues should be covered by responses made to the Dorset Minerals Site Allocations Document. Regular discussions will be made between officers of DCC and HCC.</p> <p>Agreed. DCC has been consulted at all stages in the development of the Hampshire Minerals Plan but has not objected</p> <p>As it is proposed to work the Dorset site after extraction within Hampshire it is agreed that the start date will depend on when extraction begins in Hampshire.</p>
<p><b>17. Planning Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will be setting precedent for the area</li> </ul>	Historically this area has not been worked for gravel. However it represents a substantial resource for which there is a need.
<p><b>18. Bird Strike</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of wetlands leads to risk of attraction of waterfowl, esp. along with Hampshire area, and this should be avoided for risk to airport</li> <li>• Where will the necessary amount of inert material be found to backfill?</li> </ul>	<p>If the site is progressed working and restoration proposals will need ensure any risk from bird strike is avoided.</p> <p>There is concern over the source and sufficiency of supply of inert fill and further information will be sought from the developer.</p>
<p><b>19. Other constraints</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oil pipeline and water-main cross the proposed site – need up to 5m way leave (water main)</li> <li>• Proposal for a new burial ground in the area</li> </ul>	The oil pipeline crosses the site within Hampshire rather than Dorset and so it will be a matter for that authority to consider. The Water

	<p>mains running along the southern edge of the site will need to be protected should extraction take place.</p> <p>We are not aware of any proposal for a new burial ground affecting this site; the respondent may be referring to a site at Walkford Farm in Hampshire.</p>
<p><b>20. Human Rights</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed development will affect the human rights to enjoyment of property – of local residents</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that there will be no contravention of legislation relating Human Rights if this proposal were to be progressed.</p>
<p><b>21. Inappropriate development in Green Belt</b></p>	<p>The fact that the site lies wholly within Green Belt is not in itself contrary to Government Guidance on, and therefore does not necessarily preclude, mineral working.</p>
<p><b>22. Misunderstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning application has been submitted</li> <li>Proposed development cannot be closer than 750m to dwellings</li> </ul>	<p>No planning application has been submitted for extraction in either Hampshire or Dorset.</p> <p>It is not clear where this standard has been taken from. DCC did not state this distance in any of its published consultation material. An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include proposals for buffering from nearby houses. If this site were to be allocated and permitted, development would be closer than 750m from dwellings.</p>

**The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site:**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Christchurch Local History Society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highcliffe Residents' Association</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Somerford Partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burton Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walkford &amp; Roeshot Against Gravel Extraction</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Christchurch Borough Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Forest National Park Authority</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bournemouth &amp; West Hampshire Water Plc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Twynham Rangers F C</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kids Club Xplosiv</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage</li> </ul>

**The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site:**

None of the bodies commenting in this consultation exercise have specifically supported this proposal

**Observations**

13 comments were classified as “observations”. The points raised in these observations are adequately covered above.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

• RSPB	• Government Office for the South West
• Environment Agency	• Highways Agency
• Natural England	• Hampshire County Council
• Bournemouth Airport	• New Forest District Council

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site:**

None

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

No petitions received to mineral extraction at Roeshot. A number of responses contained standard comments/requests (e.g. reconsider all earlier comments made on the Hampshire proposal) but no overall standard comment wording noted.

After the close of the consultation period a petition was submitted to Christchurch Borough Council signed by 545 individuals. This petition concerned the consultation process rather than the site itself.

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Sturminster Marshall</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS14</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>2</b>

### Site Description

This site is situated about 1km south east of Sturminster Marshall, north of the A31. It is suggested for the extraction of 3 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 15 years. This 70 hectare site is proposed to be worked by Cemex and is currently agricultural land. Restoration is proposed to lakes.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A31 at Henbury heavily used and congested</li> <li>• 80 lorry movements per day would be disruptive and dangerous</li> <li>• Queues (stationary and barely moving) common</li> <li>• More heavily used during 8 non-winter months</li> <li>• Vehicles turning off A31 here (e.g. into Henbury Farm) cause long tail backs</li> <li>• A large number of HGVs and wide loads already use this section of road</li> <li>• Lorries waiting to turn would cause more frequent queues and tailbacks</li> <li>• Junctions on A31 already overloaded</li> <li>• At this point, A31 is at its busiest and narrowest</li> <li>• Poor quality section of road in terms of width and alignment</li> </ul>	<p>The Highways Agency would have serious concerns if this site were to come forward for mineral extraction requiring access directly onto the A31 (T). The Agency would object due to an additional 80 movements per day into a stretch of the Strategic Road Network which is already operating above capacity.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>The many detailed concerns over the use of the A31 (T) are noted and will need to be addressed if this site is to be progressed further.</p>

- A31 is main arterial road from Ringwood to Dorchester
- Impact on traffic on A350, main north-south access to Poole for port and commuter traffic
- Cumulative implications on function and capacity of A31 with proposed urban extensions at Wimborne, Ferndown and Corfe Mullen
- 2012 Olympics will see an increase in traffic on A31
- Road sweepers would cause further delays
- Afteruses should not be such that the site would generate a large number of trips
- Contractor and employee vehicles would further add to congestion
- Not quite as congested a stretch of road as Ferndown and Wimborne bypass
- Developer should contribute to improvements to A31 (i.e. widening/upgrading/building turning lanes)
- Road has already required constant repair and resurfacing due to volumes and weight of traffic
- Road repairs not currently satisfactory
- Proposer should be liable for full costs of upgrading A31 to the same width standard as Wimborne bypass
- 40mph speed limit enforced by average speed check cameras should be introduced if site goes ahead
- Hold-ups cause cars to divert through Corfe Mullen, however larger vehicles need to divert along the A350 or via Gravel Hill to get onto the Upton bypass
- Impact on emergency vehicles
- Concern over use of Sturminster Marshall as a fast through-route for vehicles entering or exiting the gravel site
- Increased road vibration

If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance and improvements would be sought from the developer.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning permission for the Henbury House development took many years to approve, mainly due to additional traffic on A31 (11 years for 50 movements)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Road Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor forward visibility due to narrow road with hedgerows and trees on edges, bends and changing grades</li> <li>• Accidents on this stretch of A31 common, including recent fatalities</li> <li>• Dangerous section of A31</li> <li>• Lorries waiting to turn could increase accident rate</li> <li>• Proposed access would be unnecessarily hazardous</li> <li>• Road floods in adverse conditions</li> <li>• Road prone to black ice</li> <li>• Mud on the road could cause further hazards</li> <li>• Risk to pedestrians and cyclists</li> </ul>	<p>As above</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p>
<p><b>3. Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access would be likely to hamper operation of this critical primary route</li> <li>• Access to the site should not be from the A31</li> <li>• Access should be located to the east of the site to minimise delays to through traffic</li> <li>• Alternative access via A350 also prone to traffic disruption</li> <li>• Alternative access to the industrial site in the village will devastate the village</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the access proposed gives rise to serious concern. Alternative accesses via the A350 or via the industrial estate have not been proposed by the promoters however they would be considered within the Transport Assessment.</p>
<p><b>4. Access points along the A31 (T)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are several accesses to various developments along this stretch of road, making it particularly hazardous, including access to Henbury Farm, Henbury House Gardens and Vines Farm shop</li> <li>• Drivers forced to turn left to roundabout before turning back towards Wimborne</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that proximity to existing access points along the A31 (T) is of concern and again would need to be considered within the Transport Assessment.</p>

<p><b>5. Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including deer, badger, snakes, birdlife all found around Henbury House Gardens</li> <li>• Safeguards for wildlife must be included in any approval for this site</li> <li>• Wildlife could be affected by changes in hydrology</li> <li>• Potential impact on ordinary watercourses and associated wetlands should be assessed in terms of biodiversity</li> <li>• Impact on SNCI and its ancient woodland. This should be protected.</li> <li>• Natural flood plain supports a diverse ecosystem</li> <li>• Adverse impact on hedges associated with old railway line</li> <li>• Impact on heathland through loss of SANG</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required.</p> <p>The woodland copse at the south east corner of the site and Henbury Farm Wood SNCI should be retained and provided with an appropriate buffer.</p> <p>There are important hedges on the site. Wherever possible these should be retained and protected.</p> <p>It is agreed that if extraction resulted in removal of the railway embankment this could limit the value of the site for public access and its potential as SANG.</p>
<p><b>6. Flood Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partly located on Stour flood plain</li> <li>• At least part of the land located in extreme flood risk zones</li> <li>• Surface water lies for long periods on agricultural fields</li> <li>• Loss of flood storage area</li> <li>• Equivalent flood storage area would have to be found, affecting other low lying areas of Stour Valley</li> <li>• Extreme flood event would have serious consequences downstream in terms of deposition of sand and grit in affected houses, gardens and roads</li> <li>• Significant part of the site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3</li> <li>• Any processing plant and ancillary infrastructure should be located outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3. Flood Zone 1 has the lowest probability of flooding.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to modifying the site boundary to avoid encroachment on Flood Zones 2 and 3</li> </ul>	<p>Although the EA has no objection in principle in terms of flood risk, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken.</p> <p>A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>The effect on flood storage capacity as a result of gravel extraction will need to be investigated.</p> <p>Details of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include the extent of encroachment on Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p>
<p><b>7. Water</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High groundwater levels</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a detailed hydrogeological impact assessment would be undertaken</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would result in a fall in local groundwater levels</li> <li>• Environmental Impact Report expected to be produced</li> <li>• Pollution event could impact water quality of River Stour</li> <li>• Wessex Water bore holes located close to proposed site</li> <li>• Public water supply abstraction could be affected</li> <li>• Extraction could increase turbidity issues affecting water quality</li> <li>• Upstream of drinking water abstraction point at Longham</li> <li>• Danger of contamination of water resources</li> <li>• Eastern part of site falls within groundwater source protection area of the Corfe Mullen pumping station</li> <li>• Site situated on a Major Aquifer and within Source Protection Zones I, II and III of a public water supply and other licensed abstractions</li> <li>• Detailed environmental/hydrogeological impact assessment would be required</li> <li>• Stringent working best practices would be required</li> <li>• Groundwater likely to be at a shallow depth</li> <li>• Dewatering may impact upon local wells and water supplies</li> <li>• Site is within an area of groundwater classified as 'over licensed' at low flows by the Dorset Stour CAMS, which should be taken into account in the assessment of the site</li> </ul>	<p>to investigate whether there would be an impact on licensed abstractions or any water interests in the area including the important public water supply to the east.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment would need to accompany any planning application for mineral extraction.</p>
<p><b>8. Impact on agriculture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of prime agricultural land</li> <li>• Fall in groundwater levels would impact surrounding crop yields</li> </ul>	<p>Only a limited area of the site is likely to be best and most versatile land. It may be possible to restore the land to a similar quality.</p> <p>On the information currently available it is unlikely that extraction on this site would impact on surrounding crop yields.</p>
<p><b>9. Impact on residents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on property values</li> <li>• Compensation for property owners for loss of value demanded</li> <li>• Quality of life would be adversely affected</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on village community</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include an indication of buffer zones from nearby houses.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 31 properties at Henbury House Gardens, 300m from site access</li> <li>• Location of plant opposite entrance to Henbury House Gardens</li> <li>• Impossible to access amenities from Henbury House Gardens without going onto the A31</li> <li>• Proximity to Bailie Cross Cottages (350 yards)</li> <li>• Close to village</li> <li>• Would affect lives of many more people than previous works</li> <li>• Road vibration – damaging to roadside cottages</li> </ul>	<p>In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.</p> <p>With regards to plant location this would be subject to further discussions if the site were to be progressed.</p>
<p><b>10. Impact on health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including psychological impact</li> <li>• Stress</li> </ul>	<p>Although health risks are considered unlikely, a Health Impact Assessment will be undertaken if this site is progressed. The Planning Authority will continue to work closely with Environmental Health Officers and the Environment Agency.</p>
<p><b>11. Noise</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including from traffic to the site</li> <li>• Noise would travel a significant distance over flat terrain</li> <li>• Disturbance to residents of Sturminster Marshall and Henbury House Gardens</li> <li>• Wind is predominantly up valley, taking noise towards the village</li> </ul>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p>
<p><b>12. Dust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that there would be a lot of dust since company proposes dust suppression measures</li> <li>• Impact on asthma sufferers</li> <li>• Dust on local roads</li> <li>• Dust would be carried towards village by prevailing winds</li> </ul>	<p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<p><b>13. Loss of amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valuable rights of way would be lost or affected and become unattractive to use</li> </ul>	<p>It is accepted that were extraction to take place there would be an adverse impacts on exiting rights of way including Wareham Forest Way. However opportunities may be created to provide new routes.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk to former Somerset and Dorset Railway line (EDDC Policy RODEC9), intended as a continuation of trailway from Corfe Mullen and to provide a safe cycle route to Corfe Mullen, Wimborne and Poole. Parts of the railway line have already been developed and opened.</li> <li>• The trailway would provide a safe route for young people from the village to cycle to their schools</li> <li>• Impact on Wareham Forest Way – no indication of how this route and its attractive quality would be maintained during and after working</li> <li>• Accessing Wareham Forest Way already dangerous due to necessity to cross A31, rerouting it may require pedestrians to also cross the A350</li> <li>• Proximity to golf course, fish farm and boating lake</li> <li>• Currently the area is a major tranquil recreational resource for the conurbation</li> </ul>	<p>With regards to the Somerset and Dorset Railway, the establishment of a right of way, as proposed in EDDC Policy RODEC9 is supported. This would need to be reflected in any working and restoration plan for the site.</p> <p>Any need for the Wareham Forest Way to be diverted across the A350 is considered unlikely.</p> <p>There is unlikely to be major adverse impact on the golf course and/or existing lakes.</p> <p>This area is not considered to be “a major tranquil recreational resource” in view of its location and access onto and across the site is limited to rights of way.</p>
<p><b>14. Loss of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old railway is a SANG</li> <li>• Loss of potential SANG which could form part of Stour Valley Green Infrastructure, needed for proposed urban extension at Pardy Hill.</li> </ul>	<p>This site including the old railway does not currently function as a SANG but does have potential to do so in future.</p>
<p><b>15. Concern shown to the use of this site as a household landfill site following extraction of gravel.</b></p>	<p>It is not proposed to infill this site with household waste and the nature of the site (e.g. within a flood plain, adjacent to a river) would preclude this.</p>
<p><b>16. Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper Stour Valley landscape, currently undisturbed, would be affected, effect on tranquillity</li> <li>• Adverse impact on views from A31 and A350</li> <li>• Impact on views from high ground to north (e.g. Pamphill)</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact. However the existing landscape is already disturbed by various activities and is not considered to be a particularly tranquil environment.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Processing plant and spoil heaps would be visible from a great distance due to the flat open nature of the countryside</li> <li>• Impact on views from Stour Valley Way</li> <li>• Impact on view from White Mill (NT) and from Wareham Forest Way</li> <li>• Change in rural outlook of the area</li> <li>• Impact on landscape ambience</li> <li>• Proposer should be liable for full costs of erecting screening adjacent to site to shield it from drivers on the A31</li> <li>• Landscape would be destroyed forever</li> <li>• Area would be widely visible from surrounding slopes, particularly historic preserved landscape around Kingston Lacy (NT) and Shapwick</li> <li>• Spoil view to Badbury Rings</li> <li>• There is no natural boundary foliage to screen area</li> <li>• Wire fencing would be unsightly</li> </ul>	<p>Impacts on views from the surrounding area and especially from high ground to the north, including Badbury Rings, would need investigation.</p> <p>The cost of any screening required as part of any future planning permission would be borne by the operator.</p>
<p><b>17. Intrusion of Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would cause unacceptable interruption of openness</li> <li>• Create a scar on beauty of Stour Valley</li> <li>• Industrial development on Green Belt unacceptable</li> <li>• Could set a precedent for other developments</li> <li>• Concern that Green Belt status would be lost</li> <li>• Why is this development allowed in Green Belt when local applications often fail?</li> </ul>	<p>Government guidance is that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land as Green Belts, which is to maintain openness. Mineral working can be acceptable provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.</p> <p>Extraction would not affect Green Belt Designation of the land.</p>
<p><b>18. Big businesses can go ahead but small businesses are turned down for minor applications</b></p>	<p>This is not a consideration for this document.</p>
<p><b>19. Inappropriate level of industrial activity in an agricultural setting</b></p>	<p>Mineral extraction can only take place where the mineral exists and this is often on agricultural land.</p>
<p><b>20. Impact on archaeology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing archaeological remains on site</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed there would be the need for archaeological assessment and evaluation.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Absence of consideration of archaeology highlighted in National Monument Record</li> </ul>	<p>Although the discussion paper merely refers to impact on historical features within the site the background paper goes into further detail. Archaeology will be an important consideration if this site is to be progressed.</p>
<p><b>21. Proximity to school</b></p>	<p>It is not considered that development of this site would cause unacceptable adverse impact on the school.</p>
<p><b>22. Pollution caused by operations – air pollution, traffic pollution</b></p>	<p>Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.</p>
<p><b>23. Light pollution</b></p>	<p>Potential light pollution and means of mitigating this would depend on detailed proposals and would be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>
<p><b>24. Impact on local businesses</b></p>	<p>Any adverse impact on local businesses would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral.</p>
<p><b>25. Impact on tourism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area enjoys many visitors essential to livelihoods</li> <li>• Gateway to Purbecks</li> </ul>	<p>Any adverse impact on tourism would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral. However it is considered that there would be minimal impact on tourism.</p>
<p><b>26. Site next to National Trust land</b></p>	<p>Although National Trust land lies to the north it is not next to the site.</p>
<p><b>27. Impact on fishery adjacent to proposed site</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern over effect on fish and water levels</li> <li>• Would extraction cause lake to drain?</li> <li>• Impact on visitors due to noise etc</li> </ul>	<p>Were extraction to take place measures would need to be taken to ensure no adverse effect on water levels.</p>
<p><b>28. Impact on oil and gas pipelines running through site from Wytch Farm to Fawley</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive safeguarding zone would be required</li> <li>• Potential danger of disturbance to the pipeline</li> </ul>	<p>Whether the pipelines will remain in situ or be diverted would be a matter for agreement between the promoters of the site and BP and Transco.</p> <p>If the pipelines are to remain in situ, adequate measures would need to be taken to ensure their safety and stability.</p>
<p><b>29. Restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional wetland and recreation areas not necessary</li> <li>• Already have River Stour, lakes, golf club and various footpaths</li> </ul>	<p>If extraction were to take place the opportunity should be taken for restoration to the most appropriate uses which may well include recreation areas and wetland.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of a lake would not contribute to reducing pressure on heathlands</li> <li>• Wetland restoration should form part of Stour Valley Green Infrastructure rather than be a result of mineral extraction</li> <li>• Open water recreational uses would cause noise disturbance for residents in the future</li> </ul>	
<p><b>30. Location of plant</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location at the west of the site is close to properties</li> <li>• Location is opposite entrance to Henbury House Gardens</li> </ul>	The need to locate the plant to the west of the site is a result of the need to avoid locating it in the Flood Zones 2 & 3 and to allow access to the A31. If this site is ultimately worked planning conditions would ensure plant would be appropriately screened.
<p><b>31. Working hours</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous site worked until 10:30pm, which is unacceptable</li> <li>• Concern that site would be worked 24 hours a day</li> </ul>	If the site were to be worked planning conditions would specify appropriate working hours. Normal working hours set out in existing DCC policy are 7am until 6pm and 7am until 1pm on Saturdays.
<p><b>32. Is there damage limitation proposed by the developers?</b></p>	Expected adverse impacts and proposed mitigation for these would need to be incorporated in any planning application and working scheme and through the imposition of planning conditions.
<p><b>33. Odours</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be carried towards village by prevailing winds</li> </ul>	It is considered unlikely that any smells will result from mineral extraction. However, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.
<p><b>34. Lack of security</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including attracting young people, gang burglars</li> </ul>	Whilst this is primarily a matter for the operating company, modern quarries are likely to be secure.
<p><b>35. Build up of commercial enterprises around site</b></p>	There are already commercial enterprises around the site.
<p><b>36. Potential damage to underground sewage pipes</b></p>	Steps will need to be taken by the operator to identify and protect underground utilities.
<p><b>37. Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impact on setting of Grade II listed Henbury House</li> <li>• Potential damage to Henbury House (recent gravel extraction caused observable settlement at Henbury House).</li> </ul>	Impact on Henbury House and its setting is an important consideration to be addressed should this site be progressed to the next stage of the Plan.



<p><b>38. Life of operation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration works would add a further five years to the proposed 15 year operation</li> <li>• Long life having an impact on people for a long time</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that current proposals would result in extraction over a 15 year period with further 5 years to complete restoration and aftercare.</p>
<p><b>39. Site operations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mineral must be conveyed by conveyor belt to an on-site processing plant rather than by dumper truck as this would increase air, noise and possibly soil pollution</li> </ul>	<p>The method of transporting excavated material to plant site would be included in a planning application. However the benefits of using conveyors over dump trucks are acknowledged.</p>
<p><b>40. Previous extraction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road surfaces and culverts were destroyed and never reinstated</li> <li>• Restored fishing lakes are closed off to the public</li> <li>• Caused fissures to open up across local fields where water courses were disturbed</li> <li>• Noise disturbance, dirt-polluted air and dirty roads were experienced</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be permitted for working up to date planning conditions would be applied. These points are noted and will be considered if any planning application was to be submitted for this site.</p>
<p><b>41. Cumulative impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already a mineral extraction site within the Parish at Henbury</li> <li>• Properties would be 'sandwiched' between proposed site and White's Pit</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged that there is a mineral site at Henbury but it is considered that this is generally well screened from land to the north. It is suspected that the reference to Whites Pit should have referred to Henbury Pit as Whites is a considerable distance away.</p>
<p><b>42. Risk of subsidence of surrounding land including A31 (T)</b></p>	<p>Any proposals would need to ensure there is no risk of subsidence to the A31 or surrounding land.</p>
<p><b>43. Discussion paper does not mention Henbury House Gardens community (quarter of a mile away from proposed site entrance)</b></p>	<p>Henbury Cottages is located relatively close to the site and was mentioned. Other properties further south including Henbury House Gardens were not specifically mentioned in the background paper but are shown on the base plan of the site.</p>
<p><b>44. Site does not contain ball clay which makes other sites more viable</b></p>	<p>Government guidance requires the provision of aggregates through the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. Sites are required for the extraction of sand and gravel.</p>
<p><b>45. Pylons and overhead cables cross the site</b></p>	<p>Any extraction would take place around the pylons.</p>

<b>46. Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty</b>	Although the site is not located within the designated Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, its landscape value will still be taken into account as stated above.
<b>47. There would be no benefit to the local economy as profit will be realised by a multi-national company and landowners</b>	The operating company suggest that the site would directly employ six people and it would also provide a source of building material for local construction projects.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stour Ward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Nursery Wing Henbury House &amp; Henbury House Residents' Association</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vale of Allen Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset Community Partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>	

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
23 Potential for amphibian habitat to be created through restoration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior amphibian surveys should be undertaken</li> </ul>	Noted and would be of relevance if wetland areas were to be created. An ecological assessment would determine the presence of any important amphibian species.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEMEX Operations Ltd</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>
--	---

### Observations

Twelve comments were classified as “observations”. Points further to those above are detailed below.

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restoration would provide potential amenity value as SANG</li> <li>Minerals use may be long-term and might prevent areas being brought forward for public use in time to meet needs for alternative greenspace</li> </ul>	<p>The potential value of the site as SANG is noted. If this site is progressed it will be necessary to co-ordinate the timescales for restoration and the provision of SANG.</p>
<p><b>2. Somerset &amp; Dorset railway line should be retained</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Route is part of strategic network to mitigate impacts of development on heathland</li> </ul>	<p>As already stated, the potential to use the former Somerset &amp; Dorset railway line as a recreational route is acknowledged.</p>
<p><b>3. Bird strike</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wetland restoration with individual lakes smaller than 10ha, with perhaps some minor caveats, would be acceptable in terms of not increasing risk of bird strike at Bournemouth Airport</li> </ul>	<p>It is noted that any restoration proposals would need to ensure that lakes are smaller than 10ha in size.</p>
<p><b>4. Clarification on size of vehicles that would be used is needed</b></p>	<p>It is too early to say what sized vehicles would be used if the site were to go ahead.</p>
<p><b>5. Clarification on access needed i.e. would there be a roundabout, traffic lights, halt sign?</b></p>	<p>Details of the access would need to be agreed with the Highways Agency.</p>
<p><b>6. Power Lines</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overhead power lines would need to be retained in-situ</li> <li>Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times</li> </ul>	<p>The advice of National Grid will be taken into consideration. Pylons are likely to remain in situ.</p>
<p><b>7. Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration should be given for the access road from the A31 to be extended to the industrial site to relieve congestions on A350 and avoid necessity for HGVs to travel through Sturminster Marshall village</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, but it would seem unlikely that such an extension to gain access to the industrial site could be achieved.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sturminster Marshall Parish Council</li> </ul>
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Purbeck District Council</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• National Grid</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bournemouth Airport</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RSPB</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Natural England</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The National Trust</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dorset Wildlife Trust</li></ul>	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Tatchell's</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS15</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>3</b>

### Site Description

The proposed site would be an extension to the existing Tatchell's Quarry, located north west of Wareham. The proposed extension directly adjoins an existing, non-operational sand and gravel pit. Directly to the north is Tatchell's Pit where sand and gravel is currently worked and the void is infilled with waste materials. The site is currently identified as a preferred area for gravel extraction only in the Dorset Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted in 1999). The site is suggested for the extraction of 380,000 tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 3-4 years. The 2.5 hectare site is currently used for agriculture. Restoration is proposed to return the land to agricultural use.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1. Traffic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic on Bere Regis – Wareham road</li> <li>• Cumulative traffic impact with recent increase in HGV movements due to landfill site</li>   <li>• Deterioration of roads already occurring</li>   <li>• Dirt on roads</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents.</p> <p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance and improvements would be sought from the developer. A financial contribution towards the Purbeck Transport Strategy may be required.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is an issue regarding dirt being deposited on Bere Road. If mud and material is being deposited</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on road safety</li> </ul>	<p>this could lead to enforcement action being taken against the operators.</p>
<p><b>2. Regularisation of existing site is required</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently no regulated working hours</li> </ul>	<p>Permitted working hours were agreed under the review of old mineral planning permissions in 2006. For the area north of Carey Road, these are 6am-7pm Monday-Friday and 6am-1pm Saturdays. Permitted working hours for the pit south of Carey Road are 8am-6pm Monday-Friday and 8am-1pm Saturdays. If hours are not adhered to, this could lead to enforcement action being taken against the operators.</p>
<p><b>3. Impact on residents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative impact with new landfill site</li> <li>• Deteriorating quality of life</li>   <li>• Noise</li>   <li>• Smells</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that cumulative impact from various forms of development, including the landfill site, on the area in general and road network in particular is an important consideration and will be taken into account.</p> <p>If this development were to be found acceptable through the planning process and permitted, planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment.</p> <p>It is considered that there are unlikely to be any smells resulting from mineral extraction or infilling with inert waste. However, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency, with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.</p>
<p><b>4. Long term and detrimental impacts on landscape</b></p>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact and appropriate mitigation measures.</p>

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

None

**Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site**

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<b>24 Extension of existing site</b> a. Small extension b. Would make use of existing plant and infrastructure	It is agreed the existing haul roads and processing plant would be used.
<b>25 Site already identified in Dorset Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted 1999)</b>	

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purbeck District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggregate Industries UK Ltd</li> </ul>	

**Observations**

Eleven comments were classified as “observations”. Points further to those above are detailed below.

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<b>1. Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider impact on Strategic Road Network</li> <li>• Would need to be supported by Transport Assessment</li> <li>• Potential increase in traffic on A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown</li> <li>• Potential increase in traffic on C6 through Winterborne Kingston</li> </ul>	<p>See comments above relating to traffic.</p> <p>There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail transport may present a sustainable alternative to road transport due to proximity to Bournemouth to Waterloo main line.</li> <li>• No vehicle wash at existing site</li> <li>• Debris carried onto C7 by current site traffic</li>   <li>• HGV traffic must not use Carey Road</li>   <li>• Consider option of internal haul road to take traffic going from Trigon to Tatchell's south of Bere Road and onto the metalled BP road in order to minimise impacts on residents and rural roads.</li> </ul>	<p>There is a wheel wash present on the site. However, as mentioned above if mud and material is being deposited on the road this could lead to enforcement action being taken against the operators.</p> <p>Agreed, if this site were to be allocated within the plan and granted permission, Carey Road should only be used as a crossing to the processing area in the north.</p> <p>This option is unlikely to be feasible as the access for the Trigon site is in place and there would be land ownership issues. This option would not reduce the need for traffic from Tatchell's to access the Bere Road.</p>
<p><b>2. Impact on tourism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five caravan parks located in vicinity</li> </ul>	<p>Any adverse impact on tourism would need to be balanced with the need for the mineral.</p>
<p><b>3. Impact on amenity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road used by pedestrians, horseriders and cyclists – impacted upon already by existing sites</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for their diversion.</p>
<p><b>4. Restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration should be to heathland as opposed to agriculture</li> <li>• Site will probably go to landfill before restoration</li> </ul>	<p>No final decisions have yet been taken regarding final restoration. It is not proposed to landfill this site.</p>
<p><b>5. Flooding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within Flood Zone 1</li> <li>• May be one or more ordinary watercourses flowing through the site</li> </ul>	<p>As work on the preparation of the Plan continues it will include a strategic flood risk assessment of the county area. A more</p>



	detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.
<b>6. Water</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should be given to any possible impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels.</li> <li>• Site is within an area classified as ‘no water available’ at low flows by River Piddle CAMS unit</li> </ul>	As work on the Plan continues remaining sites will be subject to a full hydrological and hydrogeological assessment, including consideration of issues such as these raised here.
<b>7. Impact on biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sand lizards and other reptiles are present</li> <li>• No or limited measures are in place to protect reptile species, despite offers for habitat management from Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required. An ecological survey would need to be undertaken to establish the presence or otherwise of sand lizards and other protected species.
<b>8. Little need for the sand and gravel</b>	Government guidance requires Mineral Planning Authorities to provide for the supply of aggregates.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wareham St Martin Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSPB</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>

### Petitions/Standard Responses

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Trigon Hill</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS16</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>4</b>

### Site Description

This site is situated about 2.5km north west of Wareham. It is suggested for the extraction of 600,000 tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 8 and a half years. The 43 hectare site overlies the majority of the existing Trigon ball clay pit. It is suggested that the sand and gravel is extracted in order to gain access to deeper ball clay deposits on the site. Restoration is proposed to agriculture, forestry or heathland.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<b>1 Proximity to residential property</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifically north Trigon farm</li> </ul>	An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zone from nearby houses.
<b>2 Access</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access route should be shown</li> </ul>	Agree, if this site is to be progressed the proposed access route will be shown on the plan.
3 Impact on Lilly pond (north of proposed site)	Potential impact on this pond will need to be investigated.
<b>4 Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on wildlife and wildlife habitat</li> <li>Loss of Trigon Hill SNCI (footprint of mineral site should be pulled back to that of the existing site)</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed, an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.
<b>5 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that heathland restoration and linkages would not be achievable if sand and gravel removed.</li> <li>If sand and gravel was removed there would be the need to bring in material to achieve good restoration.</li> </ul>	If this site is to be progressed it will be necessary to receive further information from the site promoter on how it is intended to work and restore the site. Concern is shared that enough material is retained on site in order to create a satisfactory restoration.

	We are not aware of any intention to bring in material in order to achieve a good restoration.
<b>6 Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excessive traffic movements in addition to existing movements associated with landfill</li> <li>Accidents</li> <li>Dirt on roads</li> <li>Impact on Wareham/Bere Regis road</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.
<b>7 Need</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The county is short of gravel and most material at Trigon is sand.</li> </ul>	More detailed information is required in order to establish the reserve at this site.
<b>8 Landscape Character</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long term detrimental impacts on the landscape</li> </ul>	There may be an issue of cumulative landscape and visual impact in relation to this site and adjacent existing workings. The visual impact of mineral working is an important consideration particularly as the site is likely to be visible from the AONB.
<b>9 Impact on tourism</b>	It is considered mineral working at this site would have only limited impact on the tourism industry.
<b>10 Recreation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of forest for recreational purposes</li> </ul>	As the majority of this site is already being worked for ball clay there would only be a very small loss of woodland. It is not considered that the loss of recreational space from this development would be significant.
<b>11 Impact on Scheduled Monuments</b>	There is a Scheduled Monument located to the east of this site. Any impacts on its setting should be assessed.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>English Heritage</li> </ul>
---	--

#### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
----------------------	--------------

26 Extraction of sand and gravel is supported if there is a clear restoration plan that does not significantly alter the landform in this area.	If sand and gravel were to be extracted from this site the landform would be permanently altered. It should a requirement to maintain enough material on site to create a satisfactory landform.
<b>27 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heathland restoration would be supported</li> <li>• Retention of the heath habitat and sand lizard colony at the race track at Trigon Hill and the retention of all designated sites</li> </ul>	See comments on restoration above. It is proposed to incorporate heathland into the restoration scheme.
28 The ability to jointly recover sand and gravel in association with Ball Clay would be supported	Although there may be benefit from extracting sand and gravel concurrently with ball clay, there are implications for landform, traffic and other matters raised in comments received.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purbeck District Council</li> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
---	---

### Observations

Eight comments were classified as “observations”. Those comments not adequately covered above are;

Observation	DCC Response
<b>1 Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic on the A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown and C6 through Winterborne Kingston</li> <li>• May be an impact on the SRN along the A35 to the north</li> </ul>	As stated above, if this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts.
2 Potential impact of the existing landfill should be considered	Impact on the existing landfill will be examined.
3 Site is within an area classified as ‘no water available’ at low flows by the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy this should be considered should any abstraction licences be regived.	Agree, this should be taken into account if this site is progressed.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”.

• Lower Winterborne Parish Council	• Highways Agency
• Bere Regis Parish Council	• Wareham St Martin Parish Council
• Arne Parish Council	• Natural England
• Environment Agency	• Royal Society for the Protection of Birds

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Uddens Plantation</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS17</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>3</b>

### Site Description

The site is situated approximately 1.5km east of Wimborne Minster and lies immediately north-west of the A31. It forms part of Ferndown Forest and adjoins Cannon Hill plantation to the south west. This 115 hectare site is suggested for the extraction of 1.5 million tonnes of building sand over a 7-15 year period. Restoration to woodland using inert fill to achieve original land contours with some doming is proposed.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p><b>1 Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of birds such as woodpeckers, gold crest nightjars etc</li> <li>• Land contains badger sets</li> <li>• Site adjoins a Natural Nature Reserve and SAC (Holt Heath)</li> <li>• Area includes SSSI habitats</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required together with assessment under the Habitats Regulations of the impact on nearby Natura 2000 sites.</p>
<p><b>2 Impact on landscape character</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undulating area will never be restored as such</li> <li>• Destruction of woodland</li> </ul>	<p>It is accepted that the forest is attractive and appreciated by those who use it. This will be important factor when considering the suitability of this site.</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact.</p> <p>With regards to destruction of woodland, much of the site is commercial woodland which would be felled in any case although</p>

	re-planted more quickly than if mineral extraction was to take place.
<p><b>3 Traffic &amp; Access</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uddens Drive is an inappropriate access</li> <li>• Significant impacts on the Strategic Road Network</li> <li>• Additional traffic on overloaded A31 and Canford Bottom Roundabout</li> <li>• Danger from HGV's on Middlehill Road</li> <li>• Consider access of the roundabout serving the Ferndown industrial estate and police HQ</li> <li>• Cost implications from the damage to roads</li> </ul>	<p>Concern has been expressed by the Highways Agency at the level of additional congestion on the A31(T) that this development and other long term proposals in the area would generate.</p> <p>All HGV traffic would need to access the site only from the A31 either at Uddens Drive or preferably Ameysford Roundabout the roundabout</p> <p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts. Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant. A TA is likely to include an assessment of any increased risk of accidents and cumulative impact of other developments.</p> <p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance would be sought from the developer.</p>
<p><b>4 Amenity/Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of important recreational area</li> <li>• Regularly used for exercising, riding horses, bikes and walking</li> <li>• Likely to increase pressure on nearby designated heathland sites</li> <li>• Impact on existing function as SANG</li> </ul>	<p>The importance of this area for recreation is acknowledged as its value in attracting visitors away from protected heathland. This will be very important factor when considering the suitability of this site.</p>
<p><b>5 Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for the gravel due to the economic downturn</li> </ul>	<p>Despite the downturn in the economy the apportionment figures proposed by Government and the Regional Planning Body still apply but the reserves will last longer.</p>
<p><b>6 Bridleways and footpaths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is criss-crossed with bridleways and footpaths including Castleman Trailway</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan impact on bridleways and footpaths would be considered including the opportunities for their diversion. The importance of the Castleman Trailway is accepted.</p>

<b>7 Pollution</b>	Pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.
<b>8 Too near residential properties</b>	An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include buffer zone from nearby houses.
<b>9 Dust</b>	Dust concerns can usually be addressed through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<b>10 Noise</b>	If this development were to be allocated and permitted planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment
<b>11 Too near to schools</b>	If this development were to go ahead, there is not considered to be any unacceptable impact on local schools from either the lorry traffic or the mineral workings itself.
<b>12 Concern that the site may have potential for future landfill</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health risks</li> <li>• Vermin</li> </ul>	If this site were to go ahead, it is proposed to infill with inert waste. There is no proposal to infill this site with household waste. Although health risks are considered unlikely, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely with.
<b>13 Water Issues</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on ground water levels</li> <li>• Impact on Uddens Water (one of the head waters of the Moors river)</li> <li>• Impact on Moors River SSSI</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application. Impact on Uddens Water, the Moors River SSSI and groundwater will need investigation.



	With regards to contamination, pollution prevention is the responsibility of the Environment Agency with whom the Mineral Planning Authority will work closely.
<b>14 Concern shown to where the inert fill would come from</b>	Concern over source and sufficiently of inert fill is shared and further information on the source of fill will be sought from the developer.
<b>15 Impact on property values</b>	In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest
<b>16 Increase in flood risk</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify the red line boundary to show no encroachment on Flood Zones 2 &amp; 3</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This could include no encroachment on flood zones 2 and 3 if considered appropriate.</p>
<b>17 Cultural heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on archaeology</li> </ul>	Scheduled Ancient Monuments on the site would need to be protected by leaving a suitable area un-worked around them.
<b>18 Loss of Greenbelt</b>	<p>Government guidance is that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land as Green Belts, which is to maintain openness. Mineral working can be acceptable provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.</p> <p>Green Belt designation is considered relatively extensive in south east Dorset.</p>
<b>19 Cumulative impact of development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern shown of the cumulative impact of mineral development in addition to extra housing, radio masts etc</li> </ul>	Cumulative impact from various forms of development including housing on the area in general and road network in particular is

	agreed to be an important consideration and will be taken into account.
<b>20 Against Forestry Commissions Mission Statement</b>	This matter was raised at the exhibitions and is to be investigated.
<b>21 Site should remain as a commercially viable forestry operation</b>	Much of the site is commercial woodland which would be felled in any case although re-planted more quickly than if mineral extraction was to take place.
<b>22 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should not be restored to a use that would generate large numbers of vehicle movements</li> </ul>	It is agreed that there is an issue with the level of congestion on the A31(T). Restoration to woodland as proposed would not generate large numbers of vehicle movements.
<b>23 Consider Bournemouth Airport Safeguarding with particular emphasis on the birdstrike aspect.</b>	The importance of ensuring birdstrike hazards are not created is acknowledged. The use of inert fill should avoid this risk.
<b>24 Assess the combined impact of Uddens and Cannon Hill</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If both worked the development would continue for 40 years in addition to restoration time.</li> </ul>	Although possible, it is considered very unlikely that both Uddens and Cannon Hill would be worked together. If both sites were to be allocated and permitted it is likely that they would be worked in phases with progressive restoration.
<b>25 Impact on tourism</b>	It is considered mineral working at this site would have only limited impact on tourism.

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wimborne Minster Town Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Dorset District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ferndown Town Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Dorset Community Partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wimborne Civic Society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vale of Allen Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>East Dorset Youth Council</li> </ul>	

#### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
----------------------	--------------

29 Acceptable due to the proximity of the A31	See comments on traffic above.
30 There are new reports of smooth snakes on and adjacent to the Ferndown By-Pass, retention of this limited area as heathland would be essential.	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required. If important biodiversity interest were found the protection of these areas should be considered and build into the working scheme.
31 Little residential impact	Although the site is further from properties than Cannon Hill, there are properties to the north of the site, for which regard would need to be taken.
32 Need for the gravel and opportunity for landfill	Although a need for gravel is agreed, this site is not considered suitable for anything other than inert landfill required for restoration.

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

The Herpetological Conservation Trust

**Observations**

Eight comments were classified as “observations”. All these comments have already been addressed in the responses above.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

• Lower Winterborne Parish Council	• Holt Parish Council
• Bournemouth Airport	• Royal Society for the protection of birds
• Environment Agency	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None

**THIS SITE HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN AND WILL NOT BE PROGRESSED TO THE NEXT STAGE OF THE PLAN**

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Wimborne Minster</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS18</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>630</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>10</b>

**Site Description**

The site is located on land to the south of the A31 at Wimborne and north of Canford School and the River Stour. It is suggested for the extraction of 1.3 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of five years. The 67 hectare site is currently used for agriculture. Following extraction, it is proposed to construct a 1690m long rowing lake together with land for amenity and/or agricultural use.

**Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site**

<b>Reason for disagreement</b>	<b>DCC Response</b>
<p><b>1. Traffic Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unacceptable level of additional HGV movements</li> <li>• Additional heavy goods traffic being brought onto local roads</li> <li>• Old Ham Road is a small country lane already with high traffic volumes, used as a ratrun, with a blind corner due to unmaintained verges - HGV movements would increase risks</li> <li>• Catastrophic effect on road network and Canford Bottom roundabout</li> <li>• Increased risk of accidents</li> <li>• Road surface improvements that have been made to A31 would be ruined</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A31 and Canford Bottom roundabout congestion is notorious especially for six summer months – this issue is holding up other developments in area</li> <li>• A31 trunk road is at full capacity</li> <li>• A31 has a particularly bad accident record with regular fatalities</li> <li>• Increased stress to road users</li> <li>• Proposed access points not acceptable - HGV movements through Little Canford would affect residents' quality of life; access under A31 flyover may be inadequate for HGVs</li> <li>• Access under A31 provides better lines of sight for lorries</li> <li>• Access from Canford School would be far better</li> <li>• Need a decent road or flyover not more traffic</li> <li>• Major development of the road network would be required prior to any development</li> <li>• Cumulative traffic impact of mineral extraction sites with urban extensions at Wimborne Minster and Ferndown and expansion of Bournemouth Airport</li> <li>• Significant impacts on the SRN</li> <li>• Distraction for drivers on the bypass</li> <li>• Would make it impossible for local traffic to get out of Leigh Road and Middlehill Road onto roundabout</li> <li>• Lorries in urban areas not desirable</li> <li>• Traffic movements could be more than stated due to ancillary traffic and sale of materials to local builders</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. Flooding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located within Flood Zones 2 and 3</li> <li>• Site is on a natural flood plain with a high water table</li> <li>• Site floods twice a year</li> <li>• Loss of flood storage area</li> <li>• No clarity that there would be no increase in flooding</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific evidence that in the long term site could result in an improvement to flood levels</li> <li>• No reference to flooding mitigation i.e. buffer to minimise impact on river and its banks</li> <li>• Other areas of Wimborne could be flooded instead</li> <li>• Site is a water meadow</li> <li>• Altering streams that run into the river may cause Brookside Stream to flood – affecting a number of properties</li> <li>• Increased flooding at Little Canford</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. Landscape/Visual impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considerable and negative impact on existing Stour Valley landscape</li> <li>• Impact on open character of the area</li> <li>• Area of natural beauty</li> <li>• Loss of water meadow</li> <li>• Impact on view over river to Canford School</li> <li>• Impact on views from areas to the north such as Colehill</li> <li>• Loss of unspoilt land at a premium in the area</li> <li>• Gravel extraction would be a blot on the landscape</li> <li>• Eyesore for drivers on the bypass</li> <li>• Rowing lake would have a detrimental impact on the landscape</li> <li>• Highly visible from Wimborne and Colehill</li> <li>• Currently unspoiled landscape</li> <li>• Area forms part of setting of historic Wimborne Minster</li> </ul>	
<p><b>4. Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmland creates an important part of the Green Belt dividing Poole from Wimborne and Colehill</li> <li>• Further encroachment on delicate countryside, conurbation already stretches from Hamworthy to New Milton</li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Noise disturbance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to digging, grading machines, vehicle reversing beepers</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local neighbourhoods already suffer continuous and intrusive noise pollution from A31</li> <li>• Nothing to stop noise rising up the valley side</li> <li>• Prevailing winds would take noise to residential areas to the north</li> </ul>	
<b>6. Mud and dirt</b>	
<b>7. Air pollution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased CO2 production</li> <li>• NO2</li> <li>• Fly ash</li> </ul>	
<b>7. Impact on residential properties</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on quality of life</li> <li>• Negative impact on village of Little Canford and residents of Canford Magna, Canford School and Hayes area of Wimborne</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Dust</li> <li>• Increased traffic</li> <li>• Stress</li> <li>• Concern about housing buffers</li> <li>• Impact on ability to sell houses, reduced property values</li> <li>• Put properties at risk of flooding</li> <li>• Potential damage to properties due to vibrations</li> <li>• People on night shifts prevented from sleeping during the day</li> </ul>	
<b>8. Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of increased dust on people with asthma, could cause long-term lung implications</li> <li>• Danger to people from traffic movements</li> </ul>	
<b>9. Loss of public amenity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site used for cycling, running, walking, dog walking, fishing, bird watching, horse riding and by children</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of rights of way</li> <li>• Castleman Trailway – well used public access route to Wimborne</li> <li>• Loss of important public open space</li> <li>• Valuable asset to local community</li> <li>• Riverside footpath is a local treasure</li> <li>• Boating would be affected</li> <li>• Loss of access to the river from Leigh Road</li> <li>• Area where people can walk without getting the car out</li> <li>• Green and pleasant amenity removed from area forever</li> <li>• Would result in need for people to drive away from the area for amenity/recreational space</li> </ul>	
<p><b>10. Restoration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration of old quarries to boating lakes has seldom been successful</li> <li>• Additional boating lakes not needed in the area as there are already world class boating and sailing facilities</li> <li>• No reference to parking facilities etc if area is to experience increased amenity usage post extraction</li> <li>• Access via Old Ham Road would remain an issue if restoration to a boating lake was taken forward</li> <li>• Restoration unlikely to produce a natural landscape</li> <li>• No benefit to local community</li> <li>• Main beneficiary would be Canford School</li> <li>• Restoration for water sports would be a radical departure from current agricultural use</li> <li>• Highways Agency would not support restoration uses that generate a large number of trips</li> <li>• Proposals for reinstatement cannot be relied upon</li> <li>• Location is too close to A31 and too noisy for a boating lake</li> </ul>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rowing lake would require buildings which would be obtrusive and might be inappropriate in Green Belt</li> <li>• Rowing lake would not provide public access</li> <li>• Would destroy the landscape</li> <li>• Would alter biodiversity</li> </ul>	
<p><b>11. Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Including wildlife along the river such as egrets, badgers, deer, slow worms, frogs, toads, bats,</li> <li>• Including protected species such as water voles and otters</li> <li>• Including birds such as kingfishers, heron, goldfinch, redwing, meadow pippet, skylark, kestrel, cormorants, nightjar, lapwings</li> <li>• Disturbance to natural habitat and flora</li> <li>• Impact of pollution on marine life</li> <li>• There has been work to encourage otters back into the area</li> <li>• Effect of displaced recreational activity onto Natura 2000 heathland sites would require Habitats Assessment</li> <li>• Impact on hedgerows</li> </ul>	
<p><b>12. Loss of strategic green space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stour Valley suggested as Strategic Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)</li> <li>• Area has been proposed for use a major country park as part of green infrastructure to serve conurbation</li> <li>• Loss of potential for land to be used for recreation</li> <li>• Loss of a water meadow refuge that offsets development at Wimborne and Merley</li> </ul> <p>Some of the land already functions as a SANG</p>	
<p><b>13. Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative impact on setting of Grade I listed Canford School</li> <li>• Impact on other listed properties in the area</li> <li>• Potential irreplaceable damage to listed buildings due to vibrations</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area forms part of setting of historic Wimborne Minster</li> <li>• Site could hold historic underground passages</li> </ul>	
<p><b>14. Water Quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pollution of River Stour</li> <li>• Site designated as a Minor Aquifer</li> <li>• Area is upstream of a drinking water abstraction point at Longham</li> <li>• There are a number of licensed abstractions both ground and surface water</li> </ul>	
<p><b>15. Concern that site may become a household landfill site</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of flooding on a waste site potentially polluting River Stour</li> </ul>	
<p><b>16. Negative impact on tourism in the Wimborne area</b></p>	
<p><b>17. Lorries would be passing a junior school</b></p>	
<p><b>18 Impact on Canford School</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbance to students</li> <li>• Rowing activities may be prevented</li> </ul>	
<p><b>19. Loss of agricultural land</b></p>	
<p><b>20. Air traffic safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential bird strike issues including with afteruse as a rowing lake</li> <li>• Area is immediately under flight path</li> </ul>	
<p><b>21. Infill</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would take another five years</li> <li>• Could not be contained due to rising water levels</li> </ul>	
<p><b>22. Material could be used from landslips instead of opening up new areas</b></p>	
<p><b>23. Cumulative impact of development in area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitating undesirable housing development that Dorset does not need or want</li> <li>• Area already over developed</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latest of a string of attacks on Wimborne – building of 1000 houses on green belt, Waitrose, expansion of Ferndown Industrial Estate</li> <li>• Concern that building on the land could occur post extraction</li> </ul>	
<b>24. Need for gravel</b>	
<b>25. Concrete production harmful to the environment</b>	
<b>26. Site undeliverable</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition from landowner</li> <li>• Conflicts with proposed major work to A31 corridor as part of RSS and LDF process</li> </ul>	

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wimborne Minster Town Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colehill Scout Group</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wessex Water</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ferndown Town Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vale of Allen Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset Community Partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queen Elizabeth School</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Dorset Youth Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stour Valley Properties (Dorset) Ltd</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep Wimborne Green</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage</li> </ul>	

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

Reason for agreement	DCC Response
<b>33 Proximity to demand</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate to extract commodity close to where it is used to reduce carbon footprint Most sand and gravel used in the BH conurbation</li> </ul>	
<b>34 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restoration to a lake would be an asset to the area</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space would be preserved for formal and informal recreation</li> <li>• Provision of a community facility</li> </ul>	
35 The area is barren and dull	
<b>36 Minimal visual and noise disturbance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A31 provides effective screen</li> <li>• Processing and selling would take place from an existing quarry</li> </ul>	
<b>37 Flood alleviation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extraction could assist flood alleviation</li> <li>• Restoration would provide additional flood water storage</li> </ul>	
<b>38 Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconsider road layout at Canford Bottom and remove bottleneck</li> <li>• An ongoing issue that should be resolved regardless</li> </ul>	
<b>39 Comparatively short five year life of proposal</b>	

The following statutory bodies/organisations agree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gleeson Developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
--	---

### Observations

Fifteen comments were classified as “observations”. Points further to those above are detailed below.

Reason for observation	DCC Response
<b>1. Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further information on impact on B3390 through Moreton and Affpuddle would be useful</li> </ul>	
<b>2. Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England considers that restoration should include public access and limited extraction to create wetland meadows would be most appropriate</li> <li>• Provisions for strategic green infrastructure should be included</li> </ul>	

<p><b>3. Biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site potentially supports significant populations of amphibians and reptiles. Survey and mitigation plan desirable.</li> </ul>	
---	--

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSPB</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purbeck District Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wimborne Civic Society</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bournemouth Airport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borough of Poole</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

There were no petitions submitted for this site.

A large percentage of the comments submitted to this site were identical through the use of a standard response form produced by an individual.

<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Woodsford</b>
<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>MSAD AS19</b>
<b>Number of disagreeing comments</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Number of observations</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Number of agreeing comments</b>	<b>0</b>

### Site Description

The site is situated 450m to the east of the village of Woodsford, approximately 6km east of Dorchester. It is situated north-east of a site at Woodsford that was granted permission in December 2007 and would form an extension to this site. The new area is suggested for the extraction of 2.1 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 10 years. This 90 hectare site is currently in agricultural use. Dry restoration would take place in the southern part of the site in order to return the land back to agriculture, whilst the northern area would be restored to low key water based uses such as angling and nature conservation.

### Summary of main reasons for disagreement for this site

Reason for disagreement	DCC Response
<p>1 Existing permission will run to 2029 – 2034 beyond the 2026 Plan end date therefore there is no need for the site to be allocated in this plan</p>	<p>Although the current permission is not due to expire until December 2027 (after the end of the plan period) it is likely that work such as advanced tree planting would be required within the plan period. Therefore it is considered appropriate to consider the development of this site now. Additionally, at a proposed rate of working the mineral would be worked by around 2022.</p>
<p><b>2 Impact on local residents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are two properties within the boundary of the proposed site</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Encirclement of Woodford Village by conveyors/service roads</li> <li>• Size and scale of operation unacceptable</li> </ul>	<p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This would include appropriate buffer zones from nearby houses. It is not intended to demolish any properties.</p> <p>As the gravel deposit here is fairly shallow progressive restoration would follow quickly. Therefore minimum areas of land would be disturbed at any one stage minimising the size and scale of the</p>

	operation and the area of land out of agricultural use at any one time.
<b>3 Flooding</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The northern edge of the proposed site encroaches on the flood plain Flood Zones 2 and 3</li> <li>Modify the site area to show no encroachment on flood zones</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan a strategic flood risk assessment would be undertaken. A more detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be required to support any planning application.</p> <p>An indication of the precise working area will be sought from the promoters of each site to be progressed to the next stage of the Plan. This could include no encroachment on flood zones 2 and 3 if considered appropriate.</p>
<b>4 Water resources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extraction so close to the water table and river likely effect groundwater and surface water</li> <li>Consideration needed to impact on groundwater recharge flows and levels</li> </ul>	The MPA will liaise closely with the Environment Agency to ensure there would be no adverse impacts on hydrology.
<b>5 Restoration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water meadows should be restored rather than creation of fishing lakes as proposed</li> </ul>	The possibility to restoring to water meadows will be investigated.
<b>6 Loss of agricultural land</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land should be returned to productive agricultural use.</li> </ul>	It is intended to restore some of this site back to agriculture therefore most of the loss will be temporary.
<b>7 Impact on landscape character</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Situated within the Frome and Piddle Valley Pasture Character Area in the West Dorset Draft Landscape Character Assessment 2008</li> <li>Open public views from the public highway to the south and north-west and long-distance views from the Crossways plateau to the south and the Puddletown Forest and Clyffe House to the north</li> <li>Existing hedgerows, woodlands and trees should be maintained for screening</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on landscape impact and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Where practical the retention of existing trees and hedgerows would be encouraged.</p>
<b>8 Traffic</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative impact of additional mineral traffic in addition to existing</li> </ul>	If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan further work will need to be undertaken on traffic impacts.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for infrastructure improvements should be paid for by the developer</li> </ul>	<p>Any planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA) undertaken by the applicant.</p> <p>If permission were granted it is likely that a contribution towards road maintenance and improvements would be sought from the developer.</p>
<p><b>9 Impact on biodiversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>River Frome SSSI</li> <li>Impact on water voles, otters and other protected species protected under Schedule 5 Section 9 (4) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981</li> <li>Survey for amphibians and reptiles would be beneficial</li> </ul>	<p>If this site were to be progressed to the next stage of the plan an ecological assessment would be required.</p>
<p><b>10 Dust</b></p>	<p>Dust concerns can usually be addressed through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- appropriate design and layout of the site</li> <li>- the management of the site</li> <li>- use of appropriate equipment, and</li> <li>- the adoption of appropriate control and mitigation measures (which can include separation distances, landscaping, screening and spraying haul roads within the site).</li> </ul>
<p><b>11 Noise</b></p>	<p>If this development were to be allocated and permitted planning conditions would restrict noise to acceptable levels and hours of working. Mitigation could include screening bunds and use of appropriate equipment</p>
<p><b>12 Cultural Heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on archaeology</li> <li>Impact on Scheduled Monument</li> </ul>	<p>If this site is to be progressed archaeological assessment and evaluation would be required. Significant prehistoric and Roman material has been found in this area in the past.</p> <p>There is also a Scheduled Monument to the north of the site. Development could affect the setting of this monument.</p>
<p><b>13 Impact on property values</b></p>	<p>In itself, the impact of proposals on property values is not a land use planning matter. Rather the issue is whether the development</p>



	would have unacceptable effects on amenities and existing use of land and buildings which should be protected in the public interest.
--	---

The following statutory bodies/organisations disagree with the development of this site;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodsford Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Dorset District Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage</li> </ul>

### Summary of main reasons for agreement for this site

None

### Observations

Twelve comments were classified as “observations”. Additional comments not adequately covered above are as follows;

Observation	DCC Response
1 Traffic issues particularly on the A31 between Bere Regis and Ferndown; and the C6 through Winterborne Kingston which is used a a 'ratrun'	See comments on traffic above
2 Consider the opportunity for more sustainable transportation of minerals such as rail	There are very limited economic and physical circumstances where the transport of sand and gravel by rail is feasible.
3 Consider the possibility of biodiversity gain through restoration to conservation rather than agriculture and angling lakes	It is agreed that the possibility of biodiversity gain should be encouraged.
4 The location of and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment should be a consideration	Agree.

The following statutory bodies/organisations made comments classified as “observations”

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Winterborne Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moreton Parish Council</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dorset Wildlife Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Campaign to Protect Rural England</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• National Grid</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Royal Society for the Protection Birds</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Herpetological Conservation Trust</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knightsford Parish Council</li></ul>	

**Petitions/Standard Responses**

None