

Waste Plan Schedule of Modifications – Updated January 2019

Red strike-through and underline: LPA modifications

Green text: Inspector’s modifications

Modification reference number	Para/Policy Of Pre-Submission Draft WP 2017	Change
MM2.1	Paragraph 2.13, second bullet point	<p>Delete final sentence</p> <p>For the purposes of the Waste Plan, commercial and industrial waste includes agricultural waste i.e. all wastes that are discarded from agricultural premises except on farm animal and plant wastes, which fall outside the scope of the Waste Plan.</p>
MM2.2	Paragraph 2.17	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘Bournemouth Borough Council, Dorset County Council and Borough of Poole are all Waste Planning Authorities. This means that they are responsible for determining planning applications for waste development in their respective areas. The three authorities have worked together to prepare this joint Waste Plan for the entire area. The Waste Planning Authorities are responsible for determining planning applications for waste development in their respective areas. This plan has been jointly prepared and is the statutory Waste Plan for the entire area, sharing the same geographical extent as Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership and Dorset Local Nature Partnership.’</p> <p>‘...Planning applications are judged against the statutory development plan, which includes the adopted Waste Plan, along with national policy <u>and any relevant local planning policy documents.</u>’</p>

MM3.1	Paragraph 3.13	Amend paragraph as follows: ‘The Waste Plan has established a suite of planning policies and site specific allocations for facilities to recycle, or recover or dispose of our waste in a sustainable manner, contributing towards the aim of a zero waste economy...’
MM3.2	Policy 1 – Sustainable waste management	Amend first paragraph of policy as follows: ‘When considering development proposals, the Waste Planning Authority will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will work proactively with applicants <u>to promote the circular economy and</u> find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved where appropriate to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.’
MM3.3	Paragraph 3.22	Amend first sentence as follows: ‘Co-location of waste management facilities with <u>complementary activities</u> end-users of outputs from waste processing is also encouraged.’
MM5.1	Spatial Strategy	Insert additional sentence at the end of paragraph titled Strategic recycling facilities , as follows: <u>‘Insets 7 to 10 also make provision for the management of non-hazardous waste, which could include the management of recyclates.’</u>
MM5.2	Spatial Strategy	Amend paragraph titled Local recycling facilities , as follows: ‘Several of Dorset’s existing household recycling centres, transfer stations and waste management centres <u>dealing with local authority collected waste</u> are unsuitable and in need of improvement or relocation to bring them up to modern standards and/or serve growing local communities...’
MM5.3	Spatial Strategy	Amend sub-heading of Site specific allocations as follows: Site specific allocations (Insets 2-6):
MM5.4	Spatial Strategy	Amendment paragraph titled Food waste treatment as follows: ‘Food waste treatment – It is estimated that there may be a shortfall in energy recovery capacity for food waste of up to 57,000tpa <u>59,000tpa</u> by the end of the Plan period.’
MM5.5	Spatial Strategy	Insert additional sentence at the end of paragraph titled Food waste treatment , as follows:

		<u>'Insets 7 to 10 also make provision for the management of non-hazardous waste, which could include the management of food waste.'</u>
MM5.6	Spatial Strategy	Amendment to paragraph titled Residual waste management as follows: 'Residual waste management – Landfill capacity in Dorset is diminishing and existing treatment capacity for residual waste is insufficient to meet our projected needs. At the end of the Plan period it is estimated that there will be a shortfall of approximately 227,000tpa <u>232,000tpa</u> of capacity for managing non-hazardous waste.'
MM5.7	Spatial Strategy	Amendment to paragraph titled Inert waste management as follows: 'Increased levels of inert waste arising in the Plan area, along with the expiration of temporary planning permissions for recycling and landfill, means that by the end of the Plan period there could be a shortfall in capacity for managing this type of waste. The estimated shortfall is around 272,000 tpa <u>235,000tpa</u> of non-recycling capacity...'
MM6.1	Paragraph 6.4	Amend first sentence as follows: 'The relevant policies of this Plan and the information set out in the Insets, including the proposed <u>allocated</u> uses and development considerations....'
MM6.2	Paragraph 6.6	Amend third sentence and add in additional three sentences as follows: Insets 1 - 13 <u>2</u> include maps showing the site boundaries and other relevant information such as including details on appropriate waste uses <u>the allocated uses</u> and the relevant development considerations. <u>Insets 1 – 6 are allocated for the development of local waste management facilities. The specific allocated uses for each site are stated in the insets and include household recycling centres, waste transfer facilities and waste vehicle depots. Insets 7-10 are allocated for intensification and redevelopment, including the management of non-hazardous waste. This may include facilities to manage residual waste, recyclates and food waste.</u> The locations and boundaries of the Allocated Sites are also shown on the Policies Map.
MM6.3	Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development	Amend policy as follows: 'The Waste Plan identifies Allocated Sites, as identified on the Policies Map, for waste management development to address the shortfall in waste management capacity and identified needs for new and improved waste management facilities, <u>as set out in the Spatial Strategy.</u> Proposals within the Allocated Sites, <u>listed below, will be permitted where they are accordance with the allocated uses for the proposed</u> set out in Insets 1 – 13 <u>12</u> , <u>are acceptable in principle</u> and <u>will be permitted</u> where it is demonstrated that they meet all of the following criteria:...' <p>Add in sub-heading after criterion d:</p>

		Allocated Sites
MM6.4	Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development	Amendment as follows: Inset 1 - <u>Area of search at</u> Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross
MM6.5	Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development	Amendment as follows: Inset 3 - <u>Land Area of search</u> at Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham
MM6.6	Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development	Insert additional text: <u>'The following site is also allocated for the development of a facility for the management of bulky waste: Inset 1 – An area of search at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross'</u>
MM6.7	Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development	Amendment to remove allocated site as follows: The following sewage treatment works are <u>is</u> allocated for expansion of existing activities: Inset 12 – Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works, Common Mead Lane, Gillingham Inset 13 <u>12</u> - Maiden Newton Sewage Works, south of Maiden Newton...'
MM6.12	Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development	Amend final two paragraphs as follows: 'Applications on Inset 1, <u>Inset 8</u> and Inset 10 should include Phase 2 surveys for species typical of the European Sites (in particular nightjar, woodlark and Dartford warbler) that must assess the effects of development on the populations on site and in surrounding areas. If it is shown that the development proposals would have a significant effect on species listed in Annex I of the Birds Directive (those for which SPAs may be designated) then <u>avoidance</u> /mitigation to

		<p>ensure there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites reduce this to non-significant levels must be designed in to any development in order for it to take place.'</p> <p>Applications on Inset 7, Inset 8, Inset 9 and Inset 10 should include studies that demonstrate that emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European sites. If it is shown that the development proposals would have a significant effect on the critical pollutant load/level of the European sites then avoidance/mitigation to ensure there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites reduce this to non-significant levels must be designed in to any development in order for it to take place.'</p>
MM6.8	Inset new paragraph after 6.9	<p>Insert paragraph as follows:</p> <p><u>'It is noted, for example, that the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan is currently under review and options are being considered for the growth of Dorchester, including provision for employment land. This plan was not at a sufficiently advanced stage at the time of preparing the Waste Plan for the WPA to explore the possibility of finding another alternative site option for a new household recycling centre (HRC) to serve Dorchester. The Waste Plan has instead allocated a site at Loudsmill (Inset 5) close to the existing facility which offers the only realistic opportunity of delivery (as at June 2018). However, the WPA recognises that in future it is possible that a suitable alternative option for an HRC could emerge once the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan reaches a sufficiently advanced stage. This could support the overall approach in the plan of providing a sufficiently flexible strategy to cope with changing needs or circumstances over the plan period such as in the event that the allocated site does not come forward''</u></p>
MM6.9	Paragraph 6.11	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>'In the event that there are suitably located Allocated Sites but these are not available or are otherwise unsuitable for the proposal...'</p>
MM6.10	Policy 4 – Applications for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	<p>Amend criterion a. as follows:</p> <p>'a. there is no suitable allocated site capable of <u>available site allocated for</u> serving the waste management need that the proposal is designed to address or the non-allocated site provides advantages over the allocated site;'</p>
MM6.11	Policy 4 – Applications	Amend paragraph as follows:

	for waste management facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	In the case of composting and anaerobic digestion, Waste management facilities proposals may be suitable within an agricultural setting where the proposed use and scale is compatible with the setting, and provides opportunities to utilise outputs from the process in the locality and provides advantages over the locations specified in criteria e – g.																														
MM7.1	New Paragraph after 7.2	Insert additional paragraph as follows: ‘The interchangeable nature of the waste arisings is also recognised within this chapter. This leads to the need for flexible site allocations that can manage a range of waste streams and react to the needs of the Plan area.’																														
MM7.2	Box after paragraph 7.8	Amend as follows: ‘Local authority collected waste in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole is projected to grow at an average rate of: 1%0.9%’																														
MM7.3	Box after paragraph 7.8	Amend as follows: ‘Commercial and Industrial waste is projected to grow at an average rate of: 1.2%1.4%’																														
MM7.4	Box after paragraph 7.8	Amend as follows: The local economic forecasting model (2015 2016/2017) was used as a basis for the projections and it is projected that arisings will grow at 85% the rate of economic growth by 2033.																														
MM7.5	Table 2	Amend table as follows: Table 2 Total Waste Arisings (tpa) <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015/16</th> <th>2018/19</th> <th>2023/24</th> <th>2028/29</th> <th>2032/33</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Municipal Waste</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>449,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local authority collected waste</td> <td>387,000</td> <td>394,000</td> <td>414,000</td> <td>433,000</td> <td>453,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial & Industrial Waste*</td> <td>447,000</td> <td>461,000 468,000</td> <td>492,000 497,000</td> <td>520,000 532,000</td> <td>555,000 572,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>834,000</td> <td>855,000 862,000</td> <td>906,000 911,000</td> <td>954,000 965,000</td> <td>1,004,000 1,025,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2015/16	2018/19	2023/24	2028/29	2032/33	Municipal Waste					449,000	Local authority collected waste	387,000	394,000	414,000	433,000	453,000	Commercial & Industrial Waste*	447,000	461,000 468,000	492,000 497,000	520,000 532,000	555,000 572,000	Total	834,000	855,000 862,000	906,000 911,000	954,000 965,000	1,004,000 1,025,000
	2015/16	2018/19	2023/24	2028/29	2032/33																											
Municipal Waste					449,000																											
Local authority collected waste	387,000	394,000	414,000	433,000	453,000																											
Commercial & Industrial Waste*	447,000	461,000 468,000	492,000 497,000	520,000 532,000	555,000 572,000																											
Total	834,000	855,000 862,000	906,000 911,000	954,000 965,000	1,004,000 1,025,000																											

		<u>* It has not always been possible to directly compare capacity and waste arisings as some existing facilities are capable of managing recyclates and/or residual waste</u>
MM7.6	Paragraph 7.10	Amend paragraph as follows: 'The total waste arisings in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole are estimated to grow by approximately 170,000 <u>191,000</u> tonnes per annum (tpa) by the end of the Plan period'.
MM7.7	New Paragraph after 7.16	Insert additional paragraph as follows: <u>'There are two dirty materials recovery facilities, Canford Recycling Centre and SUEZ at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, that currently manage waste from the commercial and industrial sector. This can be recyclates or residual waste, or a combination of both. A degree of judgement is needed when making assumptions about the apportionment of capacity between recyclates and residual waste as these facilities tend to be flexible and the waste managed can change to reflect market conditions or contracts. Hence these sites may contribute towards managing recyclates. For the purposes of this Plan Mannings Heath is allocated for non-hazardous waste management, so its existing recycling capacity has not been accounted for.'</u>
MM7.8	Paragraph 7.17	Delete first paragraph and amend as follows: 'There are two MRFs in Poole that currently deal mainly with waste from the commercial and industrial sector: Canford Recycling Centre and SUEZ at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate. A MRF facility at Binnegar Environmental Park, near Wareham, provides additional capacity; however this site is currently not in operation. There is also a cardboard recycling facility in Poole.'
MM7.9	New Paragraph after 7.19	Insert additional paragraph as follows: <u>'In addition, there are a number of sites within the Plan area that act as transfer facilities with limited sorting capabilities for recyclates and residual waste from the commercial sector. These facilities perform a helpful function facilitating the onward movement of recyclates for further treatment and reprocessing. This capacity has not been counted in our existing capacity assessment (Table 3) as accurately apportioning capacity between recycling or residual waste is not possible and because their use in pushing waste up the hierarchy is limited.'</u>
MM7.10	Paragraph 7.20	Amend paragraph as follows: 'The amount of materials capable of being recycled is projected to increase by almost 80,000-90,000 tonnes per annum by the end of the plan period. Table 3 <u>highlights a significant potential shortfall in capacity for the management of recyclates of over 250,000 tpa assuming one of the two permitted MRF's is built. If both facilities are developed, the</u>

		shortfall in capacity for managing recyclates would be significantly reduced. also shows that there is no shortfall in capacity available for managing recyclates during the Plan period. This is assuming that one of the permitted material recovery facilities becomes operational.'																														
MM7.11	Table 3	<p>Replace existing Table 3 with the following amended version:</p> <p>Table 3 Capacity and Need – Recycling (tpa)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2023</th> <th>2028</th> <th>2033</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Projected arisings / Need</td> <td>340,000</td> <td>358,000</td> <td>379,000</td> <td>403,000</td> <td>430,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Permitted capacity</td> <td>107,000</td> <td>107,000</td> <td>177,000</td> <td>160,000</td> <td>160,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Identified capacity gap</td> <td>-233,000</td> <td>-251,000</td> <td>-202,000</td> <td>-243,000</td> <td>-270,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Potential MRF capacity Note that total capacity is shown in both recyclates and residual waste for illustrative purposes only.</td> <td>c.150,000</td> <td>c.150,000</td> <td>c.150,000</td> <td>c.150,000</td> <td>c.150,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	Projected arisings / Need	340,000	358,000	379,000	403,000	430,000	Permitted capacity	107,000	107,000	177,000	160,000	160,000	Identified capacity gap	-233,000	-251,000	-202,000	-243,000	-270,000	Potential MRF capacity Note that total capacity is shown in both recyclates and residual waste for illustrative purposes only.	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000
	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033																											
Projected arisings / Need	340,000	358,000	379,000	403,000	430,000																											
Permitted capacity	107,000	107,000	177,000	160,000	160,000																											
Identified capacity gap	-233,000	-251,000	-202,000	-243,000	-270,000																											
Potential MRF capacity Note that total capacity is shown in both recyclates and residual waste for illustrative purposes only.	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000																											
MM7.12	New Paragraph after Table 3	<p>Insert additional paragraph as follows:</p> <p><u>'There is potential capacity at Canford Recycling Centre amounting to about 150,000 tpa that may also be available to manage recyclates, which could partly address the identified shortfall. As this site could also manage residual waste, this potential capacity is shown separately in Table 3. As explained in paragraph xx additional capacity also exists in other facilities in the Plan area for the transfer and limited sorting of recyclables which may also address some of the capacity shortfall. Table 3 shows that there is a shortfall in capacity for managing recyclates throughout the Plan period. It is assumed that the existing MRFs and other transfer facilities described above are addressing this need, along with facilities out of the county.'</u></p>																														
MM7.13	New paragraph after 7.21	<p>Insert additional paragraph as follows:</p> <p><u>'In addition, Insets 7 to 10 are existing waste management facilities allocated for intensification including the management of non-hazardous waste. This could include the management of recyclates.'</u></p>																														
MM7.14	Identified Need 1	<p>Additional sentence to the end of paragraph as follows:</p> <p><u>'Insets 7 to 10 also make provision for the management of non-hazardous waste, which could include the management of recyclates.'</u></p>																														

MM7.15	Table 4	Update projected arisings/need – Green waste (tpa) in 2018 as follows: ‘90,000 91,000’																								
MM7.16	Paragraph 7.48	Additional sentence to the end of paragraph as follows: ‘Planning permission also exists for an additional AD plant at Parley. This capacity has not been included in our assessment of existing capacity, since indications from the operator are that this facility will not be built <u>and the operator has proposed alternative waste management facilities on the site.</u> ’																								
MM7.17	Paragraph 7.50	Amend paragraph as follows: ‘The amount of food waste arisings suitable for treatment is projected to increase by about 16,000 <u>18,000</u> tonnes per annum at the end of the Plan period.’																								
MM7.18	Table 6	Update table as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2015</th> <th>2018</th> <th>2023</th> <th>2028</th> <th>2033</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Projected arisings / Need</td> <td>67,000</td> <td>70,000 <u>71,000</u></td> <td>74,000 <u>75,000</u></td> <td>78,000 <u>80,000</u></td> <td>83,000 <u>85,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Permitted/operational recovery capacity</td> <td>26,000</td> <td>26,000</td> <td>26,000</td> <td>26,000</td> <td>26,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Identified shortfall</td> <td>-42,000</td> <td>-44,000 <u>-45,000</u></td> <td>-48,000 <u>-49,000</u></td> <td>-52,000 <u>-54,000</u></td> <td>-57,000 <u>-59,000</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2015	2018	2023	2028	2033	Projected arisings / Need	67,000	70,000 <u>71,000</u>	74,000 <u>75,000</u>	78,000 <u>80,000</u>	83,000 <u>85,000</u>	Permitted/operational recovery capacity	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	Identified shortfall	-42,000	-44,000 <u>-45,000</u>	-48,000 <u>-49,000</u>	-52,000 <u>-54,000</u>	-57,000 <u>-59,000</u>
	2015	2018	2023	2028	2033																					
Projected arisings / Need	67,000	70,000 <u>71,000</u>	74,000 <u>75,000</u>	78,000 <u>80,000</u>	83,000 <u>85,000</u>																					
Permitted/operational recovery capacity	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000	26,000																					
Identified shortfall	-42,000	-44,000 <u>-45,000</u>	-48,000 <u>-49,000</u>	-52,000 <u>-54,000</u>	-57,000 <u>-59,000</u>																					
MM7.19	Paragraph 7.52	Amend paragraph as follows: ‘The recovery of organic waste is encouraged in order to move waste up the waste hierarchy. The Waste Plan allows for this through a criteria based policy (see Chapter 9). The operational capacity for the management of food waste will be monitored. <u>In addition, Insets 7 to 10 are existing waste management facilities allocated for intensification including the management of non-hazardous waste. This could include the recovery of organic waste.</u> ’																								
MM7.20	Identified Need 8-6	Additional sentence to the end of paragraph as follows: <u>‘Insets 7 to 10 also make provision for the management of non-hazardous waste, which could include the management of organic waste.’</u>																								
MM7.21	Paragraph 7.55	Amend paragraph as follows:																								

		‘Residual waste arising in Dorset is currently managed through a combination of <u>transfer stations</u> , recovery facilities and landfill (disposal) sites.’
MM7.22	Paragraph 7.58	Amend paragraph as follows: ‘A proportion of residual waste arisings from Poole is sent to an energy from waste <u>facilities outside Dorset facility in Slough</u> . It has been assumed that this movement of waste <u>will also could</u> continue to the end of the contractual period.’
MM7.23	Paragraph 7.59	Amend <u>fourth</u> sentence and add additional paragraph to the end of paragraph as follows: ‘...It is hoped <u>expected</u> that this facility can be developed during the Plan period to manage RDF/SRF arising within the Plan area. <u>This capacity has not been counted, as this facility will only manage pre-treated waste.</u> ’
MM7.24	New paragraphs after 7.59	Insert additional paragraphs as follows: <u>‘As referred to in paragraph xx, planning permission has been granted for two materials recovery facilities in Poole to manage recyclates. It is acknowledged that there is unlikely to be a need for both of these facilities to be developed. This may provide the potential for one of the sites to manage other non-hazardous wastes including residual waste, subject to satisfying the policies of this Plan.</u> <u>As explained earlier, Canford Recycling Centre and SUEZ at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, manage waste from the commercial and industrial sector. This can be recyclates or residual waste, or a combination of both. For the purposes of this Plan Manning Heath is allocated for non-hazardous waste management, so its existing capacity has not been accounted for.</u> <u>In addition, there are a number of sites within the Plan area that act as transfer facilities with limited sorting capabilities. These facilities manage recyclates and residual waste from the commercial sector. These facilities perform a helpful function facilitating the onward movement of residual waste for further treatment. Existing capacity in such facilities amounts to some 135,000 tpa. However, since such facilities have a limited function in pushing waste up the hierarchy, their capacity has not been included in the assessment.</u> ’
MM7.25	Paragraph 7.62	Amend second sentence as follows: ‘...The amount of residual waste arisings suitable for treatment is projected to increase by approximately 52,000 <u>57,000</u> tonnes per annum at the end of the Plan period.’
MM7.26	Table 7	Replace existing Table 2 with the following amended version: Table 7 Capacity and Need – Non-hazardous residual waste (tpa)

			2015	2018	2023	2028	2033
		Projected arisings / Need	300,000	304,000	320,000	339,000	359,000
		Capacity (recovery and landfill) all facilities	214,000	167,000	142,000	125,000	125,000
		Identified shortfall	-86,000	-137,000	-178,000	-214,000	-234,000
		Potential MRF capacity Note that total capacity is shown in both recyclates and residual waste for illustrative purposes only.	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000	c.150,000
MM7.27	New Paragraph after 7.65	<p>Inset new paragraph as follows:</p> <p><u>'As explained in this chapter, there may be the potential for additional residual waste management capacity to come forward on sites previously designed for the management of recyclates. Potential capacity amounting to circa 150,000 tpa (at Canford Recycling Centre) may also be available to deal with residual waste. This potential capacity is shown separately in Table 7. This is firstly because the site could also manage recyclates and secondly because waste managed would currently require onward transfer for further treatment.'</u></p>					
MM7.28	Paragraph 7.66	<p>Delete paragraph</p> <p>Alternatively, facilities outside the Plan area would need to be relied upon for managing majority of Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole's residual waste. There is no guarantee that such facilities have the capacity to manage our projected arisings (aside from the two recovery facilities we already have contracts with). This would also go against the guiding principles of proximity, whereby waste should be managed as closely as possible to where it is produced, and self-sufficiency. The capacity of facilities for the treatment of residual waste in England, particularly in the south, will be kept under review. If it appears that there are facilities with surplus capacity that could deal with Dorset's residual waste, this option will be considered in the context of cost and impacts of transporting waste. The Waste Infrastructure Delivery Programme (WIDP) was set up to address the expected shortfall in residual waste treatment capacity needed in order for England to meet its share of the UK's Landfill Directive targets. As part of monitoring progress towards meeting EU Landfill Directive targets, it has been estimated that sufficient residual waste treatment infrastructure is</p>					

		coming forward to meet our Directive obligations. Other reports suggest that constructing new waste processing plants is held back because of a lack of available finance, which could have an impact on treatment capacity. The capacity of facilities for the treatment of residual waste in England, particularly in the south, will be kept under review. If it appears that there are facilities with surplus capacity that could deal with Dorset's residual waste, this option will be considered in the context of cost and impacts of transporting waste. Whilst this does not sit well with the aim of self sufficiency, it makes little sense to build additional facilities where existing facilities have surplus capacity.
MM7.29	Paragraph 7.67	Amend first, second and third sentences of this section as follows: 'The Waste Plan allocates three specific sites for the provision of new facilities for the management of residual waste, plus additional capacity at the existing MBT facility at Canford Magna (Insets 7 to 10). Total potential capacity within the four Allocated Sites <u>amounts to some 385,000 tpa</u> , exceeding the identified needs of the Plan area. However, this approach ensures that the Plan remains flexible in the event that one or more of the allocations cannot <u>does not</u> come forward <u>for the treatment of residual waste...</u> '
MM7.30	Identified Need 7	Amend first sentence as follows: 'There could be a shortfall of approximately <u>232,000tpa</u> 227,000tpa in capacity for managing non-hazardous residual waste at the end of the Plan period...'
MM7.31	New Paragraph following Identified Need 8	New paragraph as follows: <u>'If new facilities are not brought forward in Dorset, facilities outside the Plan area would need to be relied upon for managing large quantities of Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole's residual waste. There is no guarantee that such facilities have the capacity to manage our projected arisings (aside from the two recovery facilities we already have contracts with). This would also go against the guiding principles of proximity, whereby waste should be managed as closely as possible to where it is produced, and self-sufficiency. The capacity of facilities for the treatment of residual waste in England, particularly in the south, will be kept under review. If it appears that there are facilities with surplus capacity that could deal with Dorset's residual waste, this option will be considered in the context of cost and impacts of transporting waste. Whilst this does not sit well with the aim of self sufficiency, it makes little sense to build additional facilities where existing facilities have surplus capacity.'</u>
MM7.32	Box following paragraph 7.69	Amend text within box as follows: ' Inert waste is projected to grow at an average annual rate of 3.7% <u>3.1%</u> This is based on the assumption that inert waste arisings will grow in line with projected growth in Value Added for the construction sector. Growth in the construction sector is projected using the Local Economic Forecasting Model (2015 <u>2016/17</u>), based on a 'planned growth scenario' (taking into account planned housing growth from adopted local plans).

		Recycling rate: It is assumed that 80% of inert waste arisings will be recycled.'
MM7.33	Paragraph 7.70	Amend paragraph as follows: 'There is a relatively good network of facilities in the Plan area for managing inert waste materials, comprising both recycling operations and landfill sites. There are 23 <u>25</u> sites managing inert waste, nine <u>ten</u> of which are inert landfill sites and fourteen <u>fifteen</u> of which are recycling facilities. Together they provide just under 990,000 <u>3 million</u> tpa of capacity (around 80 <u>60</u> % of which is recycling capacity). There is also an additional permission for inert landfill that is not operational. <u>The Waste Planning Authority is also aware of other active mineral sites where inert material may be required for restoration, providing additional recovery capacity (subject to planning permission).</u> '
MM7.35	Paragraph 7.71	Amend text as follows: 'Inert landfill sites tend to be within quarries and provide an important function in their restoration. Estimated total void capacity at the end of 2016 was 1.85 <u>2</u> million m ³ .'
MM7.36	Paragraph 7.73	Amend first two sentences as follows: 'There are fourteen <u>fifteen</u> inert waste recycling facilities within the Plan area providing capacity of just over 796,000-910,000 tpa. Just over 60% <u>half</u> of the recycling facilities are permanent. Some of the permanent facilities are co-located with other treatment facilities...'
MM7.37	Paragraph 7.74	Amend text as follows: 'Total existing recycling capacity is around 796,000-910,000 tpa, whilst annual throughput is just under 580,000tpa <u>around 500,000tpa</u> , suggesting there is currently significant spare capacity at existing facilities.'
MM7.38	Paragraph 7.75	Amend text as follows: 'It is assumed that the recycling capacity will reduce over time as the temporary permissions cease. At the end of the Plan period, the remaining recycling capacity will be around 377,000 <u>400,000</u> tpa if no new facilities are brought forward.'
MM7.39	Paragraph 7.76	Amend text as follows: 'The amount of inert waste arisings that require management is forecast to increase at an average annual rate of 3.7 <u>3.1</u> %. Over 1.3 <u>1.2</u> million tonnes per annum is forecast to arise annually by the end of the Plan period.'
MM7.40	Table 8	Replace existing Table 8 with the following amended version: Table 8 Capacity and Need – Inert waste (tpa)

		<u>2016</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2028</u>	<u>2033</u>	
		<u>Total projected arisings of inert waste</u>	<u>691,000</u>	<u>711,400</u>	<u>847,400</u>	<u>998,000</u>	<u>1,175,800</u>
		<u>Projected arisings expected to be recycled</u>	<u>552,800</u>	<u>569,100</u>	<u>677,900</u>	<u>798,400</u>	<u>940,700</u>
		<u>Permitted capacity (recycling)</u>	<u>914,100</u>	<u>914,100</u>	<u>429,100</u>	<u>399,100</u>	<u>399,100</u>
		<u>Identified surplus/shortfall (recycling)</u>	<u>361,300</u>	<u>345,000</u>	<u>-248,800</u>	<u>-399,300</u>	<u>-541,500</u>
		<u>Projected arisings for recovery/disposal</u>	<u>138,200</u>	<u>142,300</u>	<u>169,500</u>	<u>199,600</u>	<u>235,200</u>
		<u>Remaining permitted landfill void</u>	<u>2,685,00</u> <u>0</u>	<u>1,731,80</u> <u>0</u>	<u>422,400</u>	<u>125,000</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>Identified surplus/shortfall (non-recycling)</u>	<u>2,547,80</u> <u>0</u>	<u>1,589,60</u> <u>0</u>	<u>252,900</u>	<u>-74,600</u>	<u>-235,200</u>
MM7.41	Paragraph 7.82	Amend final sentence as follows: '...The need for recycling capacity later in the Plan period is also partly met through the allocation of the White's Pit recycling facility in the Mineral Sites Plan (Inset 8 of the Mineral Sites Plan) as a permanent facility (<u>Inset Map RA01 of the Mineral Sites Plan</u>).'					
MM7.42	New Paragraph after 7.83	Insert new paragraph following paragraph 7.83 as follows: ' <u>An initial assessment has been made to determine how much potential capacity for managing inert waste could be available through the restoration of sites allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan. Responses were received in relation to most sites. The potential within these sites could be in excess of 4.5 million tonnes, with one additional operator suggesting that two sites alone could address a substantial proportion of the shortfall. These figures should be treated with extreme caution as it will very much depend on further consideration of appropriate restoration schemes and the impacts of importing material onto sites. However, subject to planning consent, the information suggests that there are plenty of opportunities for the recovery of inert waste within the Plan period.</u> '					
MM8.1	Paragraph 8.5	Add an additional sentence to the end of paragraph as follows: '... <u>This can be derived from local authority collected waste or mixed wastes contained in skips from the building trade.</u> '					
MM8.2	Paragraph 8.12	Addition of text to the end of paragraph as follows:					

		<u>'Shredded bulky waste may need to be mixed with black bag waste in order to prepare RDF or SRF. Facilities producing RDF or SRF would be classed as recovery facility and therefore would need to comply with the relevant criteria of Policy 6 'Recovery Facilities.'</u>
MM8.3	<i>Paragraph 8.15, 2nd sentence</i>	Amend second sentence as follows: 'For the purposes of this Plan, materials recovery facilities that deal with <u>recyclables</u> (recyclates) only are covered by Policy 5...'
MM9.1	Identified Need 7	Amend text within Identified Need 7 as follows: ' Identified Need 7: We estimate that there could be a shortfall of approximately 227,000tpa <u>232,000tpa</u> in capacity for managing non-hazardous residual waste at the end of the Plan period...'
MM9.2	Paragraph 9.11, 2 nd sentence	Amend second sentence as follows: 'For sites that have been allocated only for the preparation of SRF/RDF, or where applications are received for such proposals elsewhere, it should be demonstrated that RDF or SRF is managed through recovery as opposed to disposal wherever practicable.'
MM9.3	Paragraph 9.26	Amend paragraph as follows: 'It is estimated that there could be a shortfall of approximately 227,000tpa <u>232,000tpa</u> in capacity for managing non-hazardous residual waste at the end of the Plan period. This shortfall is addressed through the allocation of four sites for the management of non-hazardous waste, through the intensification or re-development of existing facilities (<u>see Insets 7-10</u>).'
MM9.4	Paragraph 9.27	Amend paragraph as follows: 'The Waste Plan allocates suitable sites for the provision of facilities for the management of non-hazardous waste which are considered acceptable for a range of waste recovery technologies. <u>This could include recycling of non-hazardous waste</u> . Policy 3 sets out the Allocated Sites, with details provided in the Insets (see Appendix 3).'
MM9.5	Paragraph 9.28	Add three new paragraphs following paragraph 9.28 as follows: <u>The development of energy from waste facilities involving incineration within the allocated sites (Insets 7-10) has the potential to adversely affect European and internationally protected sites, given the allocated sites' proximity to these</u>

		<p><u>habitats. The level of detail available at the Plan making stage has not enabled Likely Significant Effects to be ruled out for this type of technology.</u></p> <p><u>The Waste Planning Authority considers that there are other residual waste treatment technologies, such as advanced thermal treatment, where adverse effects may be able to be ruled out with much greater confidence.</u></p> <p><u>Due to the sensitive locations of the allocated sites (Insets 7-10) all applications for waste development will need to provide sufficient evidence to the Waste Planning Authority to enable proposals to be screened and if necessary to enable Appropriate Assessment to be carried out. Proposals will not be approved unless the WPA is satisfied that there will be no adverse effects upon the integrity of European and internationally protected sites, in accordance with Policy 18.</u></p>
MM9.6	Paragraph 9.29	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘...Proposals for unallocated sites will need to demonstrate that Allocated Sites are not suitable <u>available</u> in accordance with Policy 4...’</p>
MM9.7	Paragraph 9.30	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘Applications for recovery facilities should accord with Policy 6. <u>An explanation of how the proposal supports the delivery of the spatial strategy and addresses the needs of the Plan area should be provided. Proposals should also and should</u> show how proposals <u>they</u> will provide for the use of low-carbon energy onsite and offsite, where there is surplus energy generation.’</p>
MM10.1	Box – What are the needs?	<p>Amend final sentence of Identified Need 9 as follows:</p> <p>‘It is proposed to achieve this through a criteria based policy (Policy 8) and <u>through the allocation of sites</u> in the Mineral Sites Plan.’</p>
MM10.2	Paragraph 10.1	<p>Amend second sentence as follows:</p> <p>‘This includes disposal to landfill, or waste treatment without the recovery of energy <u>and waste treatment with energy recovery that does not meet the criteria of the R1 energy efficiency formula.</u>’</p>
MM10.3	Paragraph 10.2	<p><u>‘The introduction of the 2018 Circular Economy package sets a requirement to reduce the amount of municipal waste being landfilled to a maximum of 10% by 2035.’</u></p>
MM10.4	Paragraph 10.19	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p>

		'...This gives a potential non-hazardous landfill requirement of up to 88,000tpa <u>89,000tpa</u> during the Plan period.'
MM10.5	Paragraph 10.20	Amend third sentence as follows: 'The two existing landfill sites in Dorset have <i>recently</i> been mothballed and <i>at the time of adoption</i> it <i>was is currently</i> not known whether either site will re-open as this will depend on viability and market conditions. It is understood that neither landfill operator has plans to create additional cells for the disposal of non-hazardous waste, beyond what is already permitted. To encourage self-sufficiency, both sites are safeguarded <i>until expiry of their planning permissions throughout the Plan period</i> . Safeguarding will ensure that the Waste Planning Authority is consulted on applications for non-mineral development in the vicinity of the existing landfill sites which could have an impact on future operations (see Chapter 13). This approach should ensure that landfill capacity is available locally, should the need arise, during <i>much of</i> the Plan period.'
MM10.6	<i>Paragraph 10.22, 2nd sentence</i>	Amend second sentence as follows: 'It has been assumed that Dorset will continue to send a consistent, albeit small, quantity of waste to Blue Haze, near Ringwood, <i>and Walpole, near Bridgwater, in the short term throughout the Plan period</i> .
MM10.7	Policy 7	Amend final paragraph as follows: 'In the case of landfill, gas should be used <i>and as</i> an energy source...'
MM10.8	Policy 8	Amend criterion c. as follows: 'they will not prejudice the restoration of existing or permitted mineral <i>or waste</i> sites.'
MM11.1	Paragraph 11.30	Amend first sentence as follows: 'A work programme of decommissioning, restoration and closure is being undertaken by Magnox, who are working to achieve an interim-end-state (IES) <i>by 2023 before the end of the Plan period</i> .'
MM11.2	Paragraph 11.30, 4 th sentence	Amend fourth sentence as follows: 'The <i>NDA's</i> preferred IES is that the majority of the site is restored to natural heathland, with public access and the possibility of some commercial development where appropriate.' Additional sentence as follows: <i>'The Waste Planning Authority supports this approach to restoration of the site.'</i>
MM11.3	Paragraph 11.32	Additional sentence following first sentence, as follows:

		<u>'Magnox has indicated that in its preferred option some foundations/structures may be retained in the ground (in-situ), whilst some waste arising from the dismantling and decommissioning of the site may be managed on site (subject to the necessary approvals).'</u>
MM11.4	Para 11.35	Amend second sentence as follows: 'The LLWR is a finite resource and I through the service framework Magnox can access a variety of treatment and diversion facilities options , which may include some in-situ retention and/or on site disposal of LLW disposal that minimises the reliance on the LLWR this nationally important asset.'
MM11.5	Para 11.36	Amend first sentence as follows: 'It is the intention of Magnox that HAW (<u>comprising</u> ILW) and LLW not suitable for in-situ on-site disposal or disposal at the LLWR will be moved off-site.'
MM11.6	Para 11.39	Amend fifth sentence as follows: 'This may also include the back-filling of some sub-surface voids with <u>waste arising on site</u> on-site waste or other material.'
MM11.7	Para 11.40	Amend paragraph as follows: 'In-situ retention disposal and on-site recovery or disposal of waste could help to support the overarching waste management principles of the Plan, but should not compromise the restoration of the site to a condition to achieve IES or FES. The disposal of waste <u>arising from the decommissioning of Winfrith</u> on site should be restoration-led, enabling the land to be used more effectively for another use, and should use the minimum amount of waste to achieve the stated purpose. Consequently, waste that is not classified as inert would be expected to be managed off-site at a suitable licensed facility where this is the most practicable way of achieving IES or FES, <u>unless recovery or disposal on site is demonstrated to support the waste hierarchy and proximity principle; it would not compromise the intended site restoration and afteruse and would not lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment and amenity.</u> Notwithstanding this, the Waste Planning Authority recognises that that there may be situations where off-site treatment/disposal routes would not offer any practical environmental benefits and the quantity/nature of material would not compromise the intended afteruse of the site, either at IES or FES, or lead to any unacceptable environmental impacts.'

<p>MM11.8</p>	<p>Para 11.41</p>	<p>Amend first sentence and add additional sentence at end of paragraph:</p> <p>'It is possible that to achieve IES <u>The WPA recognises that Magnox is considering proposals to leave some sub-structures in the ground and/or dispose of LLW in some 'islands' of the site will need to be retained in-situ and which would then</u> remain under radioactive substances regulation until FES is achieved. Magnox's intention is that this should not undermine the overall intent of returning the majority of the site to heathland with public access. <u>The Waste Planning Authority seeks to ensure that the site will be restored to open heathland with public access and that FES will be achieved at the earliest practicable opportunity.'</u></p>
<p>MM11.9</p>	<p>Paragraph 11.44</p>	<p>Deletion of first and last sentence and addition of two paragraphs, as follows:</p> <p>'The Waste Planning Authority intends to prepare a supplementary planning document in partnership with Magnox to provide a structured framework that will assist with the interpretation and implementation of decommissioning in accordance with Policy 10 and other relevant policies of this plan. Effective engagement between Magnox and local authorities, regulators and communities and robust and transparent environmental assessment (including risk assessment) and monitoring arrangements will be critical. This will help to secure acceptable levels of public confidence <u>and support</u> that the restoration and the next use of the site is in the public interest, both in the short term and for future generations. This will require a comprehensive approach to the wider decommissioning programme so that matters such as Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) can properly inform planning decisions relating to the decommissioning programme. A comprehensive approach for the site which sets out the decommissioning programme, including phasing priorities, would be of great value and will inform both the EIA and the supplementary planning document.</p> <p><u>The Waste Planning Authority advocates the preparation of a masterplan as an effective tool for providing a clear and consistent framework for waste management development required during decommissioning of the site. This would be an iterative document that is kept up-to-date as decommissioning progresses and should include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>plans showing the layout and details of all structures and sub-structures of the site to be subject to decommissioning, above and below ground for the whole site</u> b) <u>the types and quantities of wastes arising from Winfrith and requiring management, including details of any planned waste management facilities where needed;</u> c) <u>the likely timing of waste management development required to enable decommissioning at the site;</u>

		<p>d) <u>the range of habitats to be created in restoring areas subject to waste management, and how they will relate to the site as a whole and public access to it; and</u></p> <p>e) <u>an explanation of how Environmental Impact Assessment requirements associated with the decommissioning project are to be managed in support of any subsequent waste-related planning applications.</u></p> <p><u>Consideration will be given to the preparation of a supplementary planning document (SPD), in partnership with the site license holder and the local planning authority, if this is considered necessary to assist with the implementation of decommissioning in accordance with Policy 10 and other relevant policies of this Plan. The SPD will be informed by the masterplan.</u></p>
MM11.10	Policy 10	<p>Amend Policy as follows:</p> <p><u>'The Waste Planning Authority will work constructively with Magnox, Purbeck District Council the site license holder, the Local Planning Authority, statutory regulatory bodies and the local community to support decommissioning the restoration of the former Winfrith Nuclear Research and Development Facility to its end state of and restoration to open heathland with public access, where this does not conflict with any on-going management responsibilities. In fulfilling this role <u>determining planning applications for waste management development at the former Winfrith nuclear research and development facility,</u> the Waste Planning Authority will have regard to the following objectives:</u></p> <p>a. For any waste disposal that is not destined for appropriate nuclear or other specialist off-site treatment or disposal routes, comprising principally inert waste, consideration should be given to The on-site reuse <u>recovery or disposal of waste originating from the decommissioning of the Winfrith facility will be permitted where it would demonstrably support the site's restoration to open heathland and public access, be in conformity with the waste hierarchy and the proximity principle on condition that this does not conflict with the site's intended end state or otherwise create and would not cause unacceptable adverse impacts on the environment and amenity.;</u></p> <p>a- b. <u>Proposals should be supported by a masterplan to provide a clear and consistent framework for the development and in order to put each waste management proposal in the context of the overall decommissioning for the Winfrith site.</u></p> <p>b- c. <u>The on-site storage of Low Level Waste and Intermediate Level Waste from legacy uses or decommissioning activities in existing or newly constructed safe facilities will continue until such times as the decommissioning</u></p>

		<p>programme and wider national waste management strategy allow for its movement to longer term storage, management or disposal facilities.;</p> <p>e. d. Use of the rail sidings should be maximised where it is <u>economically and logistically</u> feasible to do so, both for the exportation of <u>waste</u> materials and for the importation <u>and exportation</u> of equipment needed for decommissioning of the site, and their retention post-decommissioning should be considered in the interests of securing a long-term rail freight opportunity;</p> <p>d-e. The potential for <u>vehicular</u> access via Dorset Innovation Park should be investigated, in consultation with stakeholders, to minimise pressure from decommissioning traffic and waste movements upon Gatemore Road and to secure greater use of the A352, in the interests of highway safety and amenity. Restoration should also take account of how the site's configuration and access arrangements will establish a logical eastern boundary with Dorset Innovation Park; and</p> <p>e. f. The restoration programme should have regard to the opportunity for land at the northern end, which lies within the Dorset Innovation Park Enterprise Zone boundary, to be considered for uses which contribute to the Innovation Park's status as a strategic employment site. ; and</p> <p>f. All development development subject to Environmental Impact Assessment should involve substantive pre-application engagement with the Waste Planning Authority and should be informed by a masterplan.</p> <p>A Supplementary Planning Document will be produced by the Waste Planning Authority to provide further details, guidance and principles for the decommissioning of the whole site for its next planned use. This The Waste Planning Authority will seek sustainable outcomes for the local community in accordance with the policies of this Plan, having regard to the on-site designation and proximity of European designated nature conservation habitat, potential mitigation approaches, legacy opportunities and, if appropriate, any community benefits that are proposed.'</p>
MM11.11	Additional paragraphs to follow Policy 10	<p>Insert additional paragraph to follow Policy 10, as follows:</p> <p><u>'Community benefit schemes are separate from the planning process; they are not a material planning consideration and will not be taken into account by the Waste Planning Authority during the planning application process. Any community benefits package will be in addition to any mitigation secured through planning conditions or, where relevant, legal agreements.'</u></p>

MM11.12	Paragraph 11.46, 3 rd sentence	<p>Amend third sentence as follows:</p> <p>‘Any future proposals for <u>waste management</u> development at the Tradebe Inutec site would need to comply with Policy 9 and other relevant policies of this Plan.’</p>						
MM11.13	Paragraph 11.51	<p>Amendment to paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘Discussions with Wessex Water have concluded that the following two sites will require physical expansion to accommodate additional plant and apparatus within the early part of the Plan period. Extensions to these sites are An extension is allocated in the Waste Plan.’</p>						
MM11.14	Table following para 11.51	<p>Amendment to table as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="582 651 1335 963"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="582 651 1335 692">Allocated Site</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="582 699 887 826">Inset 12 – Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works, Common Mead Lane, Gillingham</td> <td data-bbox="887 699 1335 826">Expansion to service planned housing allocations in North Dorset</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="582 833 887 925">Inset 13 12 – Maiden Newton Sewage Works, south of Maiden Newton</td> <td data-bbox="887 833 1335 925">Extension to service catchment growth</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Allocated Site		Inset 12 – Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works, Common Mead Lane, Gillingham	Expansion to service planned housing allocations in North Dorset	Inset 13 12 – Maiden Newton Sewage Works, south of Maiden Newton	Extension to service catchment growth
Allocated Site								
Inset 12 – Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works, Common Mead Lane, Gillingham	Expansion to service planned housing allocations in North Dorset							
Inset 13 12 – Maiden Newton Sewage Works, south of Maiden Newton	Extension to service catchment growth							
MM11.15	Paragraph 11.56	<p>Amend final sentence as follows:</p> <p>‘Manures and slurries arising from agricultural activities and spread on land for agricultural benefit do not fall within the terms of the Waste Framework Directive and therefore are not considered as waste.’</p>						
MM11.16	Table 10	<p>Insert new paragraph to follow Table 10 as follows:</p> <p><u>‘Legislation* requires that agricultural slurry is collected and stored. Slurry comprises liquid or semi-liquid matter composed of excreta produced by livestock while in a yard or building and mixtures of livestock excreta, livestock bedding, rainwater and washings from a building or yard used by livestock. Proposals for slurry storage tanks, including lagoons, pits or towers, will be considered against the relevant development management policies of this Waste Plan and policies contained in the relevant local plans. Applicants are encouraged to discuss proposals with the Waste Planning Authority at the pre-application stage, in particular in relation to design and the screening of potential emissions, including ammonia.’</u></p>						

		<u>*The Water Resources (Control of Pollution) (Silage, Slurry and Agricultural Fuel Oil) (England) Regulations 2010</u>
MM11.17	Paragraph 11.29	Amend final sentence as follows: <u>'The site lies immediately adjacent to Dorset Innovation Park Enterprise Zone (near Wool), which occupies a previously decommissioned area of the former nuclear site. There are nationally and internationally designated habitats both within and adjacent to the area covered by Policy 10. These include the Winfrith Heath SSSI, the Dorset Heathland SPA and Ramsar site and the Dorset Heaths SAC.'</u>
MM12.1	Paragraph 12.29	Amend paragraph from fourth sentence as follows: The strategic and primary road route networks (shown on Figure 10), comprising trunk roads and other primary routes, and regional routes, is are generally suitable for HGVs since such routes are able to satisfactorily accommodate larger vehicles. Encouraging wWaste traffic should wherever practicable to use this higher quality network will to reduce environmental and safety problems on less suitable roads. It will be important to consider each proposal on its merits as some sections of the strategic network suffer congestion, junction capacity issues and community severance. Good design principles and planning conditions can also help to deliver an appropriate and acceptable solutions such as limiting the hours of HGV movements and <u>formal</u> routing agreements.
MM12.2	Policy 12	Amendment to criterion 'b' and second paragraph of policy as follows: 'b. the development makes provision for any highway and transport network improvements necessary to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of a highway the strategic, primary and/or local road network , railway, cycle way or public right of way. Where they are in the control of the developer, Improvements will be delivered in a timely manner <u>to the satisfaction of the relevant Highway Authority;</u> Where possible, proposals should have direct access or suitable links with the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Network. Where this is not possible, appropriate routes to the strategic road network should be utilised. Where necessary transport improvements will be provided to overcome any significant, adverse impacts, on the strategic, primary and/or local road network.
MM12.2A	Policy 12	Amend first sentence as follows: <u>'Proposals for waste management facilities which could have an adverse impact as a consequence of the traffic generated will be permitted where it is demonstrated, through either a Transport Assessment or a Transport Statement as appropriate that.'</u>

MM12.3	Paragraph 12.40	<p>Add additional sentence after third sentence of paragraph 12.40: <u>'Regard should be had to the frequency and intensity of any potential impact.'</u></p>
MM12.3A	Paragraph 12.49	<p>Amend first sentence as follows: The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that major developments should avoid nationally designated landscape areas – including AONBs <u>and National Parks and World Heritage Sites.</u></p>
MM12.4	Policy 14	<p>Amendments following criterion c as follows: 'Great weight will be given to conserving the <u>landscape and</u> scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, National Parks and the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site, and their settings. <u>Development affecting the World Heritage Site will be considered against Policy 19 and national policy on heritage assets.</u> Permission will only be granted for waste developments <u>where it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority</u> that <u>de they will</u> not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the special qualities that underpin the relevant designation. Proposals for major development in such areas will only be permitted <u>in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest, where. In satisfying these requirements, proposals must demonstrate that all of the following criteria are met to the extent that the benefits of granting planning permission outweigh any residual adverse impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <u>they would meet an identified need and</u> there are no suitable alternatives for meeting the need; (ii) <u>they have taken account of the AONB Management Plan objectives and policies when addressing criteria a-c of this policy; and</u> (iii) <u>there would be sustainability benefits of siting a development that meets a local need within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</u> <p>Consideration will be given to the sustainability benefits of siting a development that meets a local need within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p><u>Proposals should also demonstrate that it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the character of the undeveloped coast within the West Dorset Heritage Coast and the Purbeck Heritage Coast.</u></p>
MM12.5	Paragraph 12.58	<p>Additional text/amendment to paragraph as follows: <u>'Proposals for new waste facilities and enhancements to existing facilities should consider the inclusion of sustainable construction measures including Measures that can be taken include but are not limited to,...</u></p>

MM12.6	Paragraph 12.58	Additional sentence at the end of paragraph 12.58 as follows; <u>'Alterations to existing waste management facilities may also be required to ensure sites satisfy the requirements of other statutory regimes.'</u>
MM12.7	Policy 15	Amendment to Policy as follows: 'Proposals for built waste management facilities will be expected to demonstrate that the site design, layout and operation <u>make provision for take account of</u> climate change mitigation and resilience through.'
MM12.8	Policy 15 – Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	Additional sentence added to the end of Policy 15 as follows: <u>'Proposals to alter existing waste management facilities to enhance their operational efficiency and/or incorporate the above climate change mitigation and resilience measures will be encouraged where they do not result in unacceptable or cumulative impacts.'</u>
MM12.9	Paragraph 12.64	Additional sentence at the end of paragraph: <u>'Sealed drainage systems will often be required, due to the management of waste on site, in order to reduce impacts on the water environment.'</u>
MM12.10	Para 12.67	Amend third sentence as follows: 'It is expected that soil resources will be conserved wherever possible <u>and appropriate, and should be managed appropriately.*</u> and that s Soil quality in the vicinity of waste management sites will <u>should</u> be protected from adverse impacts from pollution. <u>* See Dorset County Council Natural Environment Team guidance sheet 'Soil in landscape and engineering projects' available at www.dorsetforyou.com</u>
MM12.11	Policy 16	Amendment to criterion c of Policy as follows: 'site soils would be adequately protected, <u>reused</u> and/or improved <u>as required</u> ; and
MM12.12	Policy 16	Amendment to criterion d of Policy as follows:

		‘there would not be a loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) unless the environmental, social and/or economic benefits of the proposal outweigh this loss and it can be demonstrated that the proposals has avoided the highest grades of land <u>wherever possible.</u> ’
MM12.13	Policy 17	Additional wording and amendment to Policy as follows: <u>‘Proposals for new waste management facilities should demonstrate that they have applied the Sequential Test in areas known to be at risk from flooding.</u> Proposals for new waste management facilities within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and of one hectare or greater within Flood Zone 1 must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). This must take into account cumulative effects with other existing or proposed developments <u>and climate change.</u> ’
MM12.13A	Paragraph 12.81	Insert the following after the first sentence: <u>‘Screening under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 will be undertaken in respect of European and other international sites to ascertain whether there would be harm to the integrity of those sites. With respect to nationally and locally designated sites, aAdverse impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity should be avoided.’</u>
MM12.13B	Paragraph 12.84	Amend paragraph as follows: <u>‘Various European Protected Species are present in the county and those found outside of a SAC/SPA or Ramsar site are the responsibility of the competent authority (i.e in waste planning matters the WPA). Where appropriate, These species are protected by the Habitats Regulations. Where there is a reasonable likelihood of species being present and affected by the development, applicants will be required to survey for these species before submitting an application. The WPA will consult with Natural England in determining applications. Where European Protected Species are a feature of European designated sites (SAC/SPA or Ramsar), they are the responsibility of Natural England, who must decide whether the proposal can be allowed to happen. It is expected that species both within and outside of designated sites will be protected.’</u>
MM12.14	Paragraph 12.90	Insert new paragraph to follow paragraph 12.90: <u>‘For sites of national importance, applicants must demonstrate that adverse impacts will be avoided, mitigated or compensated for, resulting in no net loss of biodiversity. It is expected that the same criteria will apply to sites of local importance, in acknowledgement of their importance to the wider ecological network in Dorset.’</u>
MM12.15	Policy 18	Amendment to Policy to include sub-headings:

		<p>‘Policy 18 – Biodiversity and geological interest</p> <p><u>Natura 2000 Sites</u></p> <p>Proposals for waste management facilities must not adversely affect the integrity of European or Ramsar or other internationally designated sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects, unless the tests set out under Article 6(4) <u>and Article 6(3)</u> of the Habitats Directive/Regulation <u>63 and</u> 64 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 are met.</p> <p><u>Sites of national and local importance</u></p> <p>Proposals for waste management facilities which do not adversely affect the integrity of European or Ramsar sites or other internationally designated sites will only be permitted where adverse impacts on biodiversity and/or geodiversity will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. avoided; or ii. where an adverse impact cannot be avoided, the impact will be adequately mitigated; or iii. where adverse impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, compensation will result in the maintenance or enhancement of biodiversity / geodiversity. <p>Wherever practicable, proposals should enhance biodiversity and geological interest.</p> <p><u>Development which adversely affects a Site of Special Scientific Interest will not normally be permitted, except where the benefits of the development at the site clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site.</u></p> <p><u>All relevant P-proposals</u> should be accompanied by an objective assessment of the potential effects of the development on features of biodiversity and/or geological interest, taking into account cumulative impacts with other development and the potential impacts of climate change...’</p>
MM12.16	Paragraphs 12.96-12.97	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>‘12.96 Waste development has the potential to adversely affect the historic environment, including through direct loss of assets, partial damage or degradation from the impacts of emissions or traffic for example. <u>The significance of a heritage asset is an important consideration as the severity of impact will depend on the nature and significance of the asset as well as the type of development proposed.</u> Additionally, impact on the setting of an historic asset must be taken into account. Consideration of a proposal’s impact on setting includes whether the development can be seen,</p>

		<p>heard, felt or smelt from an historic asset. Useful guidance on managing change within the settings of heritage assets is provided by Historic England and should be referred to where necessary. The significance of heritage assets is an important consideration as the severity of impact will depend on the nature and significance of the asset as well as the type of development proposed.</p> <p>12.97 In line with the National Planning Policy Framework, applications for waste development are expected to consider the effects of the proposal on the historic environment and demonstrate how these will be avoided or mitigated. Where heritage assets would be affected, <u>an assessment should be provided including a description of the significance of those assets, including any contribution made to their setting, and assessment of the effects of the proposal, including the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of those assets should be considered.</u> Applications should include a description of the significance of those assets, including any contribution made by their setting. Historic England guidance on this matter should be followed. (The Setting of Heritage Assets (2nd Edition) - Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (December 2017)The Setting of Heritage Assets: English Heritage Guidance (2011), available at: https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/setting-heritage-assets/) This exercise should include consultation of the Historic Environment Record and assessment of heritage assets using appropriate expertise where necessary. This should be taken into account in the proposal.'</p>
MM12.17	Paragraph 12.99	<p>Amend second sentence and add sentence to the end of the paragraph:</p> <p>'Applicants should give early consideration to whether there is the potential for archaeological interest on any site, seeking advice from the <u>council's Historic Environment team</u> to determine whether an archaeological assessment and/or evaluation is required. <u>Proposals that may affect archaeological remains should be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.</u>'</p>
MM12.18	Policy 19	<p>Amend the policy as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where it is demonstrated that heritage assets and their settings will be conserved and/or enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. Adverse impacts on heritage assets should be avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level. Where a proposal would result in significant harm to a heritage asset, it will only be permitted if it is demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances.</p> <p><u>Designated heritage assets</u> <u>Great weight will be given to the conservation (protection and enhancement) of Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole's designated heritage assets and their settings including listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest that are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments.</u></p>

		<p><u>Proposals resulting in harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will only be permitted if this is justified, having regard to the public benefits of the proposal and whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset.</u></p> <p><u>Non-designated heritage assets</u> <u>Where a proposal directly or indirectly affects non-designated heritage assets, the Waste Planning Authority will have regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.</u></p> <p><u>Where harm can be fully justified, archaeological excavation and/or historic building recording as appropriate will be required, followed by analysis and publication of the results.</u></p> <p>Proposals that may affect archaeological remains should be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.</p> <p>Where the presence of historic assets of national significance is proven, either through designation or a process of assessment, their preservation in situ will be required. Any other historic assets should be preserved in situ if possible, or otherwise by record.</p>
MM12.19	Paragraph 12.101	<p>Amend text as follows:</p> <p>‘As part of the aerodrome safeguarding procedure ODPM Circular 1/20037, local planning authorities are required to consult aerodrome operators on proposed developments likely to attract birds that are located within Airfield Safeguarding Areas. There are Airfield Safeguarding Areas within 13km of Bournemouth Airport and Yeovilton Aerodrome, <u>shown on the Policies Map</u>. The relevant aerodrome operator will consider the potential bird strike hazard of the proposed development.</p>
MM12.20	Para 12.101	<p>Additional section following para 12.101 as follows</p> <p><u>‘Proposals for waste development within airfield safeguarding areas should include an aviation impact assessment. An aviation impact assessment should comprise of the following information so that an assessment can be made, by the relevant aerodrome operator, to ensure the safe operation of aircraft;</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Wildlife Strike Risk</u> - <u>The storage of waste has the potential to create habitats that will encourage hazardous species of wildlife which may have a direct impact on Aerodrome Safeguarding. As a result, a wildlife strike risk assessment and mitigation plan will be required for relevant proposals. It may be necessary for proposals to prepare bird management plans and monitoring programmes to ensure on-site housekeeping is strictly managed and no waste is stored outdoors that would attract birds.</u>

		<p>2. Air Traffic Control (ATC)- Details of all lighting proposed should be made available and an assessment undertaken to ensure that there is no impact on sightlines from ATC or aircraft operating from or in the vicinity of the waste development.</p> <p>3. Air Traffic Engineering - Waste developments using radio communications for site wide coordination will need to provide the airport authorities with details to ensure there is no interference with critical equipment or communication frequencies.</p> <p>4. Obstacle Limitation Surfaces - Within 15km of an airport, there are a series of protected surfaces that should be kept clear of any upstanding non-frangible obstacles to ensure the safe operation of aircraft. This not only includes permanent structures but also temporary structures and tall plant such as cranes and stacks. Details of equipment and structures of this type should be included within proposals.</p> <p><u>Applicants are encouraged to undertake early engagement with airport authorities on developments situated within airfield safeguarding areas so that appropriate mitigation can be built into proposals to ensure safe operation of aircraft operating in the vicinity of waste developments.</u></p>
MM12.21	Policy 20	<p>Amendment to Policy as follows:</p> <p><u>'Proposals for waste management facilities partly or completely within an the Airfield Safeguarding Areas of Bournemouth Airport and Yeovilton Aerodrome, as shown on the Policies Map, may be the subject of consultation with the aerodrome operator.</u></p> <p><u>Proposals</u> will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate <u>through an aviation impact assessment</u> that the proposed development and, where relevant, restoration and afteruse of the site, will not give rise to new or increased hazards to aviation.'</p>
MM12.22	Paragraph 12.108	<p>Amend paragraph as follows:</p> <p>'A number of existing waste sites, including Eco Sustainable Solutions' operations at Parley and New Earth Solutions' operations at Canford Magna are located in the Green Belt and play an important part in the management of Dorset's waste. The Canford site is allocated as a 'Major Developed Site' in the Green Belt in Poole's Plan and therefore benefits from a positive policy relating to ancillary development on the site Policy SSA26 – Poole Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (2012) NB this term does not now appear in the NPPF. There are also a number of existing sewage treatment facilities and agricultural waste facilities located in the Green Belt that serve very specific local needs.'</p>
MM12.23	Policy 21	<p>Amendment to Policy as follows:</p>

		<p>Proposals for waste management facilities will only be permitted in the South East Dorset Green Belt where:</p> <p>a) they do not constitute inappropriate development; or</p> <p>b) they would serve to support an established waste facility and deliver operational and/or amenity improvements; and</p> <p>e) b) the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations to an extent that can demonstrate very special circumstances, including there is a need for the development to an extent that would be deemed by the Waste Planning Authority to demonstrate very special circumstances and that need cannot be met by alternative suitable non-Green Belt sites; and</p> <p>d) c) the restoration of the site, where relevant, is appropriate to the inclusion of land in the Green Belt and enhances the beneficial use of the Green Belt.</p>
MM12.24	Policy 22	<p>Amend criterion b as follows:</p> <p>b. incorporate adequate facilities <u>on-site</u> into the design that allow occupiers to separate and store waste for recycling and recovery <u>on-site</u>; and</p>
MM12.25	Policy 22	<p>Amendment to final paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘Financial contributions towards the off-site provision of adequate waste management infrastructure to accommodate a non-waste development may be required where the Waste Planning Authority considers this necessary, <u>in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended)</u>, unless it is demonstrated that existing waste management infrastructure serving the development is adequate.’</p>
MM12.26	Para12.119	<p>Additional paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘Although the Waste Plan has a strong commitment to reducing the amount of waste which is landfilled in accordance with the waste hierarchy, the Waste Plan acknowledges the continuing role of landfill for both pre-treated waste and inert waste albeit to a limited extent. In addition, there are a number of existing sites in Dorset that are likely to close during the Plan period. As a result, it is essential to ensure that landfill sites, together with any other temporary waste management facilities, are subject to appropriate restoration and aftercare regimes. Waste may be managed in a range of different types of facility, most of which will be permanent but some of which may be temporary.’</p>
MM12.27	Paragraph 12.126	<p>Amend last bullet point as follows:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a programme of aftercare: usually for five years following restoration of the site. Aftercare measures, <u>which include landscape establishment activities</u>, are required to ensure that the reinstatement is successfully completed.
MM12.28	Policy 23	<p>Amendment to Policy as follows:</p> <p>'Proposals should have regard to demonstrate how they comply with the Landscape Management Guidelines and contribute to the targets of the Dorset Biodiversity Strategy.'</p>
MM13.1	Table 11 Types of facilities safeguarded	<p>Amendment to the section of the table referring to 'Non-hazardous landfill sites' as follows:</p> <p>'Both existing sites safeguarded until expiry of planning permission throughout the Plan period.</p>
MM13.2	Policy 24	<p>Amend the second paragraph as follows:</p> <p>'The Waste Planning Authority will resist <u>The loss of or impact on Safeguarded Waste Facilities, through redevelopment or change of use, either on the site or with in the Waste Consultation Area, for any purposes other than waste management <u>will generally be considered is unacceptable and will be resisted by the Waste Planning Authority, unless there would be no adverse impact on the current or future operation of the Safeguarded Waste Facility <u>or one of the circumstances set out in criteria (b) to (d) are met.</u></u></u></p>
MM14.1	Paragraph 14.14	<p>Delete sentence 3 and 4 as follows:</p> <p>'The majority of policies contained in the Waste Plan are intended to cover the whole Plan period. Policy 3 'Sites allocated for waste management development' will remain relevant until all of the site allocations are built out. The only other policy that may have a shorter timescale is Policy 10 'Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith' this is because it is hoped that the decommissioning and restoration of the land covered by this policy to an Interim Ends State could be achieved by 2033. If this target is not reached the objectives set out in the policy will remain in place until restoration is complete.'</p>
MM14.2	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 2	<p>Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows:</p> <p>High <u>percentage proportion</u> of permissions not located with end users'</p>

MM14.3	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 3	Key Indicator <u>Actual housing completions</u> Target <u>Completions in line with planned housing</u> Implementation partners <u>Local planning authorities</u> Trigger point <u>Housing completions in excess of planned housing</u>
MM14.4	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 10	Amendment to 'key Indicator(s)' as follows: 'Production of SPD' <u>'Preparation of a masterplan to support applications'</u>
MM14.5	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 10	Amendment to 'Target' as follows: 'Achievement of interim end state by 2023'
MM14.6	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 10	Amendment to 'Implementation Issues' as follows: <u>'Policy relies on applicant preparing master plan'</u> Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: <u>Relevant application determined without a master plan</u> Change to target date for interim end state
MM14.7	Table 12	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows:

	Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 12	High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy'
MM14.8	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 13	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy'
MM14.9	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 14	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of permissions being granted within the AONB and/or World Heritage Sites
MM14.10	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 14	Amendment to 'Implementation issues' as follows: Given the high proportion of land (inc towns) in the county situated within the AONB applications are likely to come forward
MM14.11	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 15	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy'
MM14.12	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 16	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy' 'High <u>number proportion</u> of permissions on best and most versatile land'

MM14.13	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 17	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy' 'High <u>number proportion</u> of permissions stated in FZ3 and FZ2'.
MM14.14	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 18	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: 'High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy' 'High <u>number proportion</u> of refusals, or refusal on an allocated site, through failure to meet the requirements of this policy.'
MM14.15	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 19	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy'
MM14.16	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 20	Amendment to 'key Indicator(s)' as follows: <u>'Preparation of an aviation impact assessment'</u>
MM14.17	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework Policy 20	Amendments to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: 'High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy' <u>'Proposal partly or completely within an Airfield Safeguarding Area not including an aviation impact assessment '</u>
MM14.18	Table 12 Waste Plan Monitoring Framework	Amendment to 'Trigger point for correction and/or mitigation' as follows: High <u>number-proportion</u> of decisions not referencing this policy'

	Policy 21	
MM AS1.1	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Change references to this site throughout the document: 'Inset 1 – <u>Area of Search at</u> Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross'
MM AS1.2	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Amend first paragraph as follows: 'This site comprises <u>two a-parcels</u> of employment land that forms a southern <u>and eastern</u> extension to the existing Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, south east of Three Legged Cross
MM AS1.3	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Add additional sentences at start of second paragraph and amend paragraph as follows: <u>'There is a need for a transfer facility for local authority collected waste in East Dorset to bulk up recyclates and residual waste. There is also a need for a facility to manage bulky waste.'</u> An 'Area of Search' The site is allocated for waste transfer and/or the transfer or treatment of bulky waste <u>which should comprise no more than approximately 2ha of land.'</u>
MM AS1.4	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	Amend Development Consideration 1 as follows: <u>'1. The applicant must provide sufficient information to enable the Waste Planning Authority to carry out screening and, if necessary, Appropriate assessment at the planning application stage</u> in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. <u>This should include, as a minimum, Phase 2 Surveys for Annex 1 birds to inform an assessment of the effects of development on the populations on site and in surrounding areas.</u>

MM AS1.5	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 2 as follows:</p> <p>‘2. Application of the sequential test required as eastern borders flood zones 2 and 3. Consideration of an appropriate buffer from Flood zones 2 and 3.’ <u>Preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment to assess fluvial flood risk, other sources of flood risk and management of surface water. No built development should take place within flood zones 2 and 3.’</u></p>		
MM AS1.6	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	<p>Amend Development Consideration 3 as follows:</p> <p>‘3. Consideration of an appropriate buffer and mitigation to protect the <u>Dorset Heaths SAC, SPA and Ramsar, SSSI and SNCI.</u>’</p>		
MM AS1.7	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	<p>Additional Development Consideration 4 as follows:</p> <p><u>‘Depending on the precise location of development within the area of search and nature of the development the following mitigation may be necessary to reduce effects on European Sites to levels acceptable under the Habitats Regulations 2017:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Habitat enhancement works on land adjacent to the allocated site (including Woolsbridge Farm Carr SNCI</u> • <u>A managed habitat buffer between the development and the European sites’</u> 		
MM AS1.8	Inset 1 – Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	<p>Additional Development Consideration 5 as follows:</p> <p><u>‘Preparation of a landscape master plan for the site to mitigate landscape and visual impacts’</u></p>		
MM AS1.9	Inset 1 - Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, Three Legged Cross	<p>Amend 4th row of table:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="582 1117 1675 1155"> <tr> <td data-bbox="582 1117 922 1155"><u>Proposed</u> <u>Allocated</u> uses</td> <td data-bbox="931 1117 1675 1155">Waste transfer: up to c. 1ha required</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>Allocated</u> uses	Waste transfer: up to c. 1ha required
<u>Proposed</u> <u>Allocated</u> uses	Waste transfer: up to c. 1ha required			
MM AS2.1	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise	<p>Delete final sentence of third paragraph:</p>		

	Business Park, Blandford	'As such it is considered to present exceptional circumstances and sufficient public interest to justify a location within the AONB.'
MM AS2.3	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Amendment to Development Consideration 1 (bullet point 1) as follows: 'A dark skies strategy, <u>which shall</u> to demonstrate how <u>obtrusive</u> light spill into the AONB will be <u>avoided* minimised</u> .' <u>*having regard to the 'Guidance notes for the reduction of obtrusive light' (Institution of Lighting Professionals)'</u>
MM AS2.4	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Amendment to Development Consideration 1 (bullet point 2) as follows: <u>'b) Reduction of Means of reducing</u> the formation levels of the building to minimise its visual impact.'
MM AS2.5	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Amendment to Development Consideration 1 (bullet point 3) as follows: <u>'c) Structural native tree and shrub planting at an appropriate scale and size to achieve prompt screening and integration in keeping with landscape character. Consideration of wildflower/flowering meadow grass and verge areas.'</u>
MM AS2.6	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Amendment to Development Consideration 3 as follows: 1. Retention, protection and enhancement of <u>the all</u> tree/hedge belts <u>on the north-east and south-east field boundaries other than where removal is essential to provide access to the site. Any removal should be kept to a minimum and compensatory planting should be provided.</u> Details to be included in landscape management plan.
MM AS2.7	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Additional Development Consideration 8 as follows: <u>'Demonstration that the tests set out in paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met.'</u>
MM AS2.8	Inset 2 – Land south	Additional Development Consideration 9 as follows:

	of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	<u>'9. Hydrogeological/contaminated land risk assessment. Preparation of a drainage strategy.'</u>		
MM AS2.9	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Additional Development Consideration 10 as follows: <u>'10. A transport assessment should include consideration of impacts of HGV movements in the AONB and, if necessary, how such impacts would be managed.'</u>		
MM AS2.10	Inset 2 – Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	Amend fourth row of table as follows: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Waste management centre</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Waste management centre
<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Waste management centre			
Inset 3 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham				
MM AS3.1	Inset 3 – Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	Change references to this site throughout the document: 'Inset 3 – <u>Area of Search at</u> Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham.'		
MM AS3.2	Inset 3 – Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	Additional Development Consideration 8 as follows: <u>'An adequate buffer should be provided to protect the River Stour and Lodden'</u>		
MM AS3.3	Inset 3 – Brickfields Business	Add the following to Development Consideration 5: <u>'Any existing contaminated land would require site investigation, risk assessment and remedial options appraisal.'</u>		

	Park, Gillingham			
MM AS3.4	Inset 3 – Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	<p>Amend fourth row of table as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses</td> <td>Household recycling centre (HRC): around 1ha required Waste vehicle depot: up to 0.5ha required</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Household recycling centre (HRC): around 1ha required Waste vehicle depot: up to 0.5ha required
<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Household recycling centre (HRC): around 1ha required Waste vehicle depot: up to 0.5ha required			
Inset 4 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath				
MM AS4.1	Inset 4 – Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	<p>Amend second paragraph as follows:</p> <p>‘There is a need for a transfer facility <u>for local authority collected waste</u> in Purbeck for to bulking up recyclates and residual waste. There is also a need to re-locate the <u>Dorset Waste Partnership’s</u> existing waste vehicle depot which could be accommodated on this site.</p>		
MM AS4.2	Inset 4 – Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	<p>Additional paragraph following paragraph 2 as follows:</p> <p><u>‘If it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such a facility, transfer of C&I and/or CDE waste can be considered where this would be of a comparable nature.’</u></p>		
MM AS4.3	Inset 4 – Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	<p>Additional Development Consideration 4 as follows:</p> <p><u>‘4. Any existing contaminated land would require site investigation, risk assessment and remedial options appraisal.’</u></p>		
MM AS4.4	Inset 4 – Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	<p>Amend fourth row of table as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses</td> <td>Waste transfer facility Waste vehicle depot</td> </tr> </table>	<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Waste transfer facility Waste vehicle depot
<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Waste transfer facility Waste vehicle depot			

MM AS5.1	Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 3 as follows:</p> <p>'3. Comprehensive landscape masterplan for the site and the surrounding area, to include <u>consideration of building height and mass</u> and site layout <u>considerations</u> and boundary treatment to mitigate any landscape and visual impacts, taking into <u>consideration the setting of Mount Pleasant Scheduled Monument account the assessment of heritage assets (see Development Consideration 4).</u></p>		
MM AS5.2	Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 4 as follows, including re-numbering:</p> <p>'6. <u>4. Consideration-Assessment as part of the planning application</u> of the <u>potential impacts</u> of development on the <u>significance and setting of the Mount Pleasant and Conquer Barrow Scheduled Monuments and Kingston Maurward House and Park</u>. <u>Appropriate mitigation to respond to this assessment should be put in place, including provision of a suitable landscaping scheme to provide screening, including tree and shrub planting, around the outside of the site.</u></p>		
MM AS5.3	Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 7 as follows:</p> <p>'Development must include careful management of drainage and surface water runoff to avoid impacts on the water quality of the River Frome (SSSI). <u>This should include a buffer comprising wet woodland planting, of native species.</u>'</p>		
MM AS5.4	Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester	<p>Delete Development Consideration 9:</p> <p><u>9. Application of the sequential test required as northern edge is situated within flood zone 2.</u></p>		
MM AS5.5	Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester	<p>New Development Consideration as follows:</p> <p><u>'9. Any existing contaminated land would require site investigation, risk assessment and remedial options appraisal.'</u></p>		
MM AS5.6	Inset 5 – Loudsmill, Dorchester	<p>Amend fourth row of table as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="582 989 1680 1053"> <tr> <td data-bbox="582 989 940 1053">Proposed <u>Allocated</u> use</td> <td data-bbox="949 989 1680 1053">Household recycling centre - c. 0.5 - 1ha required</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed <u>Allocated</u> use	Household recycling centre - c. 0.5 - 1ha required
Proposed <u>Allocated</u> use	Household recycling centre - c. 0.5 - 1ha required			
MM AS6.1	Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester	<p>Amend first paragraph, second and third sentences, and add two additional paragraphs as follows:</p> <p>'There is a need for a transfer facility <u>for local authority collected waste</u> in the Dorchester area <u>for the to</u> bulking up of recyclates and residual waste from Dorchester and surrounding areas. There is also a need for a <u>local authority</u> vehicle depot for the storage of waste vehicles.</p> <p><u>If it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for such a facility, transfer of C&I and/or CDE waste can be considered where this would be of a comparable nature.</u></p>		

		<u>A transfer station would comprise a building within which to store and bulk up waste materials. A waste vehicle depot would comprise hard standing for the storage of waste vehicles and staff cars. Office accommodation, wash down and fuelling facilities and possibly a workshop could be provided.</u>		
MM AS6.2	Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 1 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Landscape-led masterplan approach to the design of the site to mitigate so that any adverse impacts upon the AONB are mitigated satisfactorily. The masterplan should take into account the following design considerations:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Maintaining the baseline position as far as practicable. To include retention of the existing façade of the southern elevation; and retention of and management of existing tree and shrub planting.</u> b. <u>Mitigation of any adverse landscape and visual impacts, taking into account the setting of Maiden Castle Scheduled Monument. To include minimising scale and mass of buildings; minimising light pollution and visual impacts of security fencing; use of suitable high-quality materials; and use of new soft landscape treatment to help integrate the development.</u> c. <u>and to provide enhancement opportunities. Achieve enhancement. To include review of signage and colour of southern elevation façade and design of gateway to site to provide enhancement opportunities.</u> 		
MM AS6.3	Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester	<p>Additional Development Consideration 4 as follows:</p> <p><u>4. Any existing contaminated land would require site investigation, risk assessment and remedial options appraisal.</u></p>		
MM AS6.4	Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester	<p>Additional Development Consideration 5 as follows:</p> <p><u>5. Site is in a more sensitive location on the Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation. Detailed risk assessment to accompany and inform application.</u></p>		
MM AS6.5	Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester	<p>Additional Development Consideration 6 as follows:</p> <p><u>Demonstration that the tests set out in paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met.</u></p>		
MM AS6.6	Inset 6 – Old Radio Station, Dorchester	<p>Amend fourth row of table as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses</td> <td style="width: 50%;"> Waste vehicle depot - up to 0.5ha required Waste transfer facility - around 1ha required </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Waste vehicle depot - up to 0.5ha required Waste transfer facility - around 1ha required
<u>Proposed Allocated</u> uses	Waste vehicle depot - up to 0.5ha required Waste transfer facility - around 1ha required			

MM AS7.1	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 1 as follows:</p> <p><u>'The applicant must provide sufficient information to enable the Waste Planning Authority to carry out screening and, if necessary, appropriate assessment at the planning application stage in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Where relevant, this should include studies that demonstrate that any emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European Sites'</u></p>
MM AS7.2	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Remove Development Consideration 3</p> <p>'Given the sites location, next to Aviation Park West, Bournemouth Airport and other large developments, opportunities for combined heat and power should be explored and if provided if practicable.'</p>
MM AS7.3	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 4 as follows:</p> <p>'The issues of appropriate stack height, <u>building orientation</u>, colour and lighting must be addressed with regards to aerodrome safeguarding (<u>including radar reflections and shadows</u>) and minimising landscape impacts'</p>
MM AS7.4	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p><u>Amendment to Development Consideration 9 as follows:</u></p> <p>'Development should demonstrate that there would be no further harm to the openness and purpose of the Green Belt. Given the site's location within the South-East Dorset Green Belt, applications will be considered against national policy and Waste Plan Policy 21. High standards of design and landscaping will be expected for development within the Green Belt.'</p>
MM AS7.5	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Amendment to Development Consideration 10 as follows:</p> <p>'Application of the sequential test required as small parts of the site are situated within flood zones 2 and 3. Preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment to assess fluvial flood risk, other sources of flood risk and management of surface water. No built development should take place within flood zones 2 and 3. Proposals should also demonstrate that there will be no adverse effects on flood risk mitigation measures required to develop the adjacent employment site.'</p>
MM AS7.6	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Additional Development Consideration 11 as follows:</p> <p><u>'Development must include measures to protect land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage.'</u></p>

MM AS7.7	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Additional Development Consideration 12 as follows:</p> <p><u>'Given the proximity of the site to the Airport, developments should demonstrate, through the preparation of a Bird Management Plan, that that there are no unacceptable bird strike hazards arising from proposals.'</u></p>		
MM AS7.8	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Additional Development Consideration 13 as follows:</p> <p><u>'Consideration should be given to the creation of a buffer zone in the south-east section of the site and a carefully designed surface water drainage system to help ensure no hydrological effects on the European Sites.'</u></p>		
MM AS7.9	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Amend 'Proposed Uses' row of table as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="582 571 1644 817"> <tr> <td data-bbox="582 571 1115 817"><u>Proposed Uses:</u> <u>Allocated Uses:</u></td> <td data-bbox="1115 571 1644 817"> <p>Opportunities for intensification <u>and redevelopment</u> of the site including the management of non-hazardous waste. <u>Waste management facilities, including incineration, that would lead to adverse effects upon the integrity of European Sites will not be acceptable.</u></p> </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Proposed Uses:</u> <u>Allocated Uses:</u>	<p>Opportunities for intensification <u>and redevelopment</u> of the site including the management of non-hazardous waste. <u>Waste management facilities, including incineration, that would lead to adverse effects upon the integrity of European Sites will not be acceptable.</u></p>
<u>Proposed Uses:</u> <u>Allocated Uses:</u>	<p>Opportunities for intensification <u>and redevelopment</u> of the site including the management of non-hazardous waste. <u>Waste management facilities, including incineration, that would lead to adverse effects upon the integrity of European Sites will not be acceptable.</u></p>			
MM AS7.10	Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions	<p>Amendment to 'Potential additional capacity' row of table as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="582 944 1644 1098"> <tr> <td data-bbox="582 944 1115 1098">Potential additional capacity</td> <td data-bbox="1115 944 1644 1098"> <p>Site has been assessment for its potential to manage circa 160,000tpa of residual waste.</p> <p><u>Exact capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals</u></p> </td> </tr> </table>	Potential additional capacity	<p>Site has been assessment for its potential to manage circa 160,000tpa of residual waste.</p> <p><u>Exact capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals</u></p>
Potential additional capacity	<p>Site has been assessment for its potential to manage circa 160,000tpa of residual waste.</p> <p><u>Exact capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals</u></p>			
MM AS8.1	Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna, Poole	<p>Delete reference to 'Major Developed Site in the Green Belt' from the text as follows:</p> <p><u>'This is an established facility, with dedicated access and with a relatively small number of sensitive receptors in the vicinity. The site is in the South-East Dorset Green Belt but is classed as previously developed land. is identified in Poole's Development Plan as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.'</u></p>		
MM AS8.2	Inset 8 – Land at Canford	<p>New Development Consideration as follows:</p>		

	Magna, Poole	<u>'The applicant must provide sufficient information to enable the Waste Planning Authority to carry out screening and, if necessary, appropriate assessment at the planning application stage in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. This should include as a minimum, Phase 2 surveys for Annex 1 birds to inform an assessment of the effects of development on the populations on site and in surrounding areas. Where relevant, this should also include studies that demonstrate that any emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European Sites'</u>	
MM AS8.3	Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna, Poole	Amendment to Development Consideration as follows: <u>'Ecological mitigation likely to be required due to extension of the site and given proximity of the SSSI. This should include the mitigation of any loss of wet habitat from future development and an appropriate buffer from the SSSI.'</u>	
MM AS8.4	Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna, Poole	Additional Development Consideration as follows: <u>'4. Given the site's location within the South-East Dorset Green Belt, applications will be considered against national policy and Waste Plan Policy 21. High standards of design and landscaping will be expected for development within the Green Belt.'</u>	
MM AS8.6	Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna, Poole	Amend wording in table as follows: Potential additional capacity	<u>Site has been assessed for circa 25,000tpa of additional capacity for residual waste management. Exact capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals</u>
MM AS8.7	Inset 8 – Land at Canford Magna, Poole	Amend Proposed uses row of table as follows: <u>Proposed Uses: Allocated Uses:</u>	<u>Opportunities for intensification and redevelopment of the site including the management of non hazardous waste. Waste management facilities, including incineration, that would lead to adverse effects upon the integrity of European Sites will not be acceptable.</u>
MM AS9.1	Inset 9 – Land at Mannings Heath	New Development Consideration as follows: <u>'The applicant must provide sufficient information to enable the Waste Planning Authority to carry out screening and, if necessary, appropriate assessment at the planning application stage in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats</u>	

	Industrial Estate, Poole	<u>and Species Regulations 2017. Where relevant, this should also include studies that demonstrate that any emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European Sites'</u>	
MM AS9.2	Inset 9 – Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole	Amend Proposed uses row of table as follows: <u>Proposed Uses; Allocated Uses:</u>	Opportunities for intensification <u>and redevelopment</u> of the site comprising the management of non hazardous waste through the preparation of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) or Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) . <u>Waste management facilities, including incineration, that would lead to adverse effects upon the integrity of European Sites will not be acceptable.</u>
MM AS9.3	Inset 9 – Land at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate, Poole	Amend 'Potential additional capacity' row of table as follows:	
		Potential additional capacity	Site has been assessed for its potential to manage up to 100,000tpa of residual waste through preparation of RDF/SRF . <u>Exact capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals</u>
MM AS10.1	Inset 10 – Binnegar Environmental Park	Amendment to Development Consideration 1 as follows: <u>'The applicant must provide sufficient information to enable the Waste Planning Authority to carry out screening and if necessary Appropriate assessment at the planning application stage in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. This should include as a minimum, Phase 2 surveys for Annex 1 birds to inform an assessment of the effects of development on the populations on site and in surrounding areas. Where relevant, this should also include studies that demonstrate that any emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European Sites.'</u>	
MM AS10.2	Inset 10 – Binnegar Environmental Park	Additional Development Consideration as follows:	

		<u>‘Consideration must be given to adequate mitigation including the conservation management of adjacent areas or provision of additional habitats adjacent to the proposed development to mitigate impacts on species characteristic of the European sites.’</u>	
MM AS10.3	Inset 10 – Binnegar Environmental Park	Additional Development Consideration as follows: <u>‘Consideration will need to be given to an appropriate buffer from the River Piddle.’</u>	
MM AS10.4	Inset 10 – Binnegar Environmental Park	Amend ‘Proposed uses’ row of table as follows: <u>Proposed Uses: Allocated Uses:</u>	Opportunities for intensification <u>and redevelopment</u> of the site including the management of non hazardous waste. <u>Waste management facilities, including incineration, that would lead to adverse effects upon the integrity of European Sites will not be acceptable.</u>
MM AS10.5	Inset 10 – Binnegar Environmental Park	Amend ‘Potential additional capacity’ row of table as follows: Potential additional capacity	Site has been assessed for its potential to manage up to 100,000tpa of residual waste <u>Exact capacity will be assessed in connection with individual proposals</u>
Inset 11 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton			
MM AS11.1	Inset 11 – Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	Amendment to Development Consideration 1 as follows’ ‘The scale, height, mass and overall design of all structures, boundary features and other infrastructure, including lighting, should respect the site's overall open character and help to minimise landscape and visual impacts <u>including providing protection to the historic character of Piddlehinton Camp, as appropriate.</u> ’	
MM AS11.2	Inset 11 – Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	Amendment to Development Consideration 3 as follows: <u>‘Vehicles accessing the facility should, wherever possible, come from the road network in the south unless it is impractical to do so.</u> Access to the site should be via the existing Piddlehinton Enterprise Park, avoiding London Row.’	

MM AS11.3	Inset 11 – Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	Amend fourth row of table as follows: <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Proposed Allocated use</td> <td>Green waste composting</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed Allocated use	Green waste composting
Proposed Allocated use	Green waste composting			
MM AS12.1	Inset 12 – Gillingham STW	Delete Site Allocation		
MM AS13.1	Inset 13 – Maiden Newton	Re-number Inset 13 as 'Inset 12 – Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works'		
MM AS13.2	Inset 13 – Maiden Newton	Amend fourth row of table as follows: <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Proposed Allocated use</td> <td>Sewage treatment works (extension to existing facility)</td> </tr> </table>	Proposed Allocated use	Sewage treatment works (extension to existing facility)
Proposed Allocated use	Sewage treatment works (extension to existing facility)			
MM AS13.3	Inset 13 – Maiden Newton	Additional development consideration as follows: <u>Demonstration that the tests set out in paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework are met.</u>		