

## Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Mineral Sites Plan

Submission by D.K. Symes Associates on behalf of Woodsford Farms Ltd

### Session 19

#### AS-19: Woodsford Quarry Extension, Woodsford

Q133	The basis for the 'very significant adverse impacts' on surface waters is not understood as no 'Main Rivers' are affected with a wide buffer to the River Frome. Also, the outline development proposals show that the ditches that cross the site will be left undisturbed with appropriate margins for support, to protect any ecological interests as well as the roots of trees, etc.
Q135	Informal discussion was held with Mr. Gudgeon (owner of Sculpture by the Lakes) on the extent of the area of AS-19 as well as mitigation. As a result the northern boundary was moved south (further away) and a wide belt of tree planting was put in. (See attached statement from Chris Miele of Montagu Evans).
Q136 Q137	The impacts on the Heritage Assets has been addressed by Chris Miele of Montagu Evans and his statement is attached.
Q138	The proposed design of the operation seeks to maintain and protect the existing mature trees and hedgerows and the associated ditches. This was part of the March 2015 submission with illustrative plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concept Development Plan 91077/NE/CD/1 v2</li> <li>- Completed Restoration Plan 91077/NE/CR/1 v2</li> </ul> copies attached.
Q139	The SSSI is the River Frome only (i.e. not the banks or the flood plain) and improvement works have been done in association with the Environment Agency (see Montagu Evans report).
Q140	The DGs already refer to this.
Q141	An extended Phase 1 Ecological Assessment was conducted in December 2014 which noted,  Otter - 'Whilst habitat immediately adjacent to the site is known to support otter, the onsite habitat is considered to have a <b>low potential</b> to support otter'.  Water Vole - 'Whilst there are a number of offsite records of water vole and there is some habitat linkage between the site and the River Frome, the suitable onsite habitat is limited in extent and therefore the site is considered to have a <b>low</b>

	<p><b>potential</b> to support a viable water vole population'.</p> <p>This conclusion appears to be supported by the lack of concern for these species on the adjacent site AS-26.</p> <p>The DGS require a full assessment of all ecological impacts which will require the appropriate Phase 2 surveys of protected species as well as agreeing detailed mitigation as part of the application process. Therefore there is no need to be more specific in the DGS.</p>
Q142	Whilst a specific reference in the DGs to the use of a conveyor is not considered necessary, there is no objection to it being added if so decided.
Q143	As 'sand and gravel' extraction is classed as water compatible so can take place in Flood Zone 3, the sequential / exception tests do not apply.
Q144	See above.
Q145	The apparatus of statutory undertakers is protected by other legislation so does not need to be 'doubly' protected by the DGs. Further, planning restrictions to protect statutory apparatus could remove the legal right to compensation.
Q146	The phasing / sequencing of development should be added to avoid cumulative impacts with AS-26.







