

Statement for Minerals Planning Enquiry
in Response to the MIQ's 4 Sept. 2018

MIQ POINT 93

The decision to allocate seems either biased or ill researched.

AS-06 Great Plantation was withdrawn 'for reasons of sensitivity' at the time when AS-12 Phillide was re-instated (after being withdrawn) in the Mineral Sites Plan.

Please compare Criterion Gradings and comments where the ecological issues and protected species are very similar but the residential impacts very small for AS-06. For AS-06 much more research seems to have been done and mitigation is specified. For AS-12 Phillide less research seems to have been done and no mitigation specified.

Note that in AS-06 only Criterion 16 (Topic Air Quality) says that noise mitigation will be addressed at the planning stage. Is it thus expected that all mitigation will be addressed before?

Please also compare the Criteria and gradings C16-C19 relating to impact on residents. AS-06 has one residence at 500m; AS-12 has 11 residences within 50m. All the gradings for AS-12 should have a much higher negative impact.

MIQ POINT 93 Continued,

No one came to inspect the three (separately rated) residences in the Woodlands property to verify these negative impacts.

Please also compare the ~~the~~ gradings for Criteria C23 - C24. AS-12 Phillis has a much greater use for recreational activities: walkers, cyclists and riders around it than AS-06 which has 'low use compared with other sites' comment from Natural England 2014. It should have a more negative grading.

Finally:

It is significant that the two owners of the land on site AS-12 Phillis are both very powerful lobbyists. The one being ~~being~~ the largest landlords in the area from Wimborne to the Piddle Valley.

The other being the owners of a well known chain of Building Supply Merchants. The latter it seems requested the re-instatement of AS-12 Phillis into the Mineral Site Allocation against all recommendations.

Joy Constantinides