Report on comments to text and policies of the Draft Waste Plan and officer response – May 2016

917 responses were received to the consultation on the Draft Waste Plan (July 2015) from 197 contributing consultees (individuals/organisations), raising a range of different issues to be taken into consideration.

This report contains all comments made to the Draft Waste Plan during the consultation that took place during summer 2015. Where comments relate to the site options, please refer to a separate report that summarises the issues raised to the sites and provides an officer response for each issue.

Company / Organisation	Section of Document	Comment ID	Comment	DCC response - DCC Response
Resident	General Comments	WP148	First sentence says it all. The problem may be the general public has little appreciation of how big an issue waste actually is. (Beyond sniping at DWP for budget overspend, etc.). Waste is just "something someone else does" and that attitude has to change. Certainly this consultation document is itself somewhat unwieldy for the average Joe to get his head around and maybe a lot to take in and decide upon within a few week period. Nationally, we have the need to get up to speed fast - Not sure how much help the Government is providing in educating every one of us on the nitty-ritty and the urgency.	Your comments are noted
Resident	General Comments	WP173	Waste facility incinerator needed on the Island.	Given its remote location, there is no identified need for a waste treatment facility or incinerator on Portland.
Resident	General Comments	WP184	I think that the more waste sites that are available the better. If people live fairly close to a site there is less chance of fly tipping. I realise you have problems opening new sites with NIMBY's. Our waste and recycling centre at Somerford Christchurch is brilliant. The only other consideration I can think of is older people who don't drive any more; can it be easier for them to dispose of unwanted large items?	Your support for new waste facilities is welcomed
Resident	General Comments	WP189	Waste and minerals are both very important to tackle. We have to look to the future.	Your comments are noted
Resident	General Comments	WP273	Did I miss any references to cos t/ benefit analysis for each proposed site? You can only have what you can afford. Without the financial ' where-with - all' most of these proposals will stay as ' proposals only '. Pressure should be brought to bear on the manufacturers of waste at the factory gate to reduce packaging and waste by fining those who fail those fail to comply. Carrier bag legislation is a good example of non biodegradable waste reduction done at source.	When developing preferred sites for allocation in the Pre-Submission Waste Plan the WPA will need to undertake a viability assessment to ensure the preferred sites are deliverable. The Waste Plan is a long term planning strategy that identifies sites to address the identified needs. Specific funding is unlikely to be available for all but the very top priorities, however it is important to allocate sites to ensure sites are safeguarded to be brought forward during the plan period.

West Moors Parish Council	General Comments	WP301	West Moors Parish Council has concern that there are no costing's as part of the consultation. It appears that there has not been a cost benefit analysis carried out for each site.	When developing preferred sites for allocation in the Pre-Submission Waste Plan the WPA will need to undertake a viability assessment to ensure the preferred sites are deliverable. The Waste Plan is a long term planning strategy that identifies sites to address the identified needs. Specific funding is unlikely to be available for all but the very top priorities, however it is important to allocate sites to ensure sites are safeguarded to be brought forward during the plan period.
South Gloucestershire Council	General Comments	WP695	Thank you for consulting South Gloucestershire Council on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan & Draft Waste Plan. Apologies for the delay in responding. The Council has no comments to make at this stage.	Your comments are noted
Campaign to Protect Rural England	General Comments	WP525	FLY TIPPING There is no mention anywhere in the Plan about dealing with fly-tipping (please forgive me if I have missed it). I know that the main theme of the Plan is about building new facilities for waste but it it is very important that fly-tipping should always be cleared up promptly as it puts ideas in to other peoples heads. And the rubbish should be diligently searched for clues to the culprit who should be awarded a fixed penalty notice or, if appropriate, prosecuted in the Courts.	Fly tipping is a matter for the waste management authorities, Dorset Waste Partnership, Bournemouth and Poole. The role of the Waste Plan is to ensure that there are sufficient facilities for dealing with the County's waste. Fly tipping should be reduced by the provision of a network of well located, accessible HRC's.
Environment Agency	General Comments	WP639	Radioactive waste We welcome the inclusion of radioactive waste within the Plan. Our ability to provide for the management of such wastes (both solid and liquid) is important to a range of vital services both across the UK as well as locally within the south-west. Locally radioactive wastes will be generated as a result of the decommissioning and clean-up of the Winfrith nuclear site, the onshore oil production at Wytch Farm as well as a result of the use of radioactive substances for healthcare and medical services throughout the area. The Area also plays host to some key radioactive waste treatment facilities that provide vital components of a national radioactive waste infrastructure for the UK more generally (e.g. incineration services at Fawley and waste treatment services on the Winfrith site). Flood Risk: Paragraphs 12.61 and 12.62 refer to surface water drainage. The Local Planning Authority is reminded that for planning applications the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), which will be either Dorset County Council, Borough of Poole, or Bournemouth Borough Council, are now the consultee on matters related to surface water drainage. We no longer provide a consultation response on the surface water drainage arrangements for development proposals through our planning consultation role. Environment Permitting These are comments which apply to all of the sites: Sites undertaking activities included in the Environmental Permitting Regulations are, in many cases, required to have an Environmental Permit in place. It would be advised to check: If an Environmental Permit is in place. If so, check the compliance history for the site as poor performers pay higher subsistence fees and may be subject to enforcement actions including enforcement notices or permit revocation. This is outlined in our Enforcement and Sanction guidance. If an Environmental permit is not in place it may be worth considering if a site can meet the conditions for a Standard Rules permit or if a Bespoke Permit is required as the difference in application fees, variation fees and surrender fees will likely be higher for a Bespoke permit. If an Environmental Permit is not in place it should be noted that a permit application usually takes 3 months to process unless there are issues when it may take longer. It should also be noted that a permit application may also be refused. Infrastructure. Permits will require a certain level of infrastructure, especially if a Standard Rules permit is applied for, therefore it is advised that sites can meet these conditions before the site is operational. Infrastructure may include buildings, concreting surfaces, noise/odour/dust mitigation systems, drainage systems like interceptors, sealed tanks or connecting to foul sewerage system. Non-compliance with permit conditions may lead to enforcement action in line with our Enforcement and Sanction guidance. Other issues to consider: Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust, vehicle movements, etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes. Any sites in Flood Risk Zones or at risk of fire should have contingencies in place in case the site cannot be used. They should also consider preventative actions to reduce the risk. Reference should be made to the updated Fire Prevention Plan guidance concerning storage of waste and minimising fire risk.	Your helpful comments are noted and will be addressed as appropriate. Your support for the radioactive waste section is welcomed. Comments on surface water drainage will be sought from the Lead Local Flood Authority as appropriate. Impacts on amenity and the waste hierarchy will be considered and addressed as appropriate.

Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	General Comments	WP680	Thank you for consulting the AONB on your draft Waste Plan. I hope you are aware of the position taken by this AONB in response to planning applications for waste treatment and disposal in recent years. Looking through the document I see that Figure 8 and question 7 location numbers have been mixed up so they do not accurately inter-relate. Words are missing in policy 15, and in paragraph 12.76 English Heritage should now be Historic England. The Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB has been established under the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act to conserve and enhance the outstanding natural beauty of this area which straddles three County, one Unitary and five District councils. It is clear from the Act, subsequent government sponsored reports, and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 that natural beauty includes wildlife, scientific, and cultural heritage. It is also recognised that in relation to their landscape characteristics and quality, National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are equally important aspects of the nations heritage assets and environmental capital. The AONB Management Plan is a statutory document that is approved by the Secretary of State and is adopted by the constituent councils. It sets out the Local Authorities Objectives and Policies for this nationally important area. The national Planning Practice Guidance [Natural Environment paragraph 004] confirms that the AONB and its Management Plan are material considerations in planning. The National Planning Policy Framework states (paragraph 109) that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes which include AONBs. Furthermore it should be recognised that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not automatically apply within AONBs, as confirmed by paragraph 14 footnote 9, due to other policies relating to AONBs elsewhere within the Framework. It also states (paragraph 115) that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in these areas. More detailed information in connection with AONB matters can be found on the AONB web site where there is not only the adopted AONB Management Plan but also Position Statements and Good Practice Notes (Planning Related Publications). In particular when considering construction within the AONB I would draw attention to our Good Practice Note on Colour in the Countryside The AONB Management Plan is a material consideration and you rightly refer to it in section 12. However, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is not the place to import any waste materials for treatment or disposal. The purposes of designation are the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty so it is most unlikely that waste treatment or disposal activities would comply with those criteria. As waste management activities constitute major development NPPF paragraph 116 would apply. You rightly identify that the growth in waste activities, whether increases in recycling or disposal, are associated with the expanding urban areas. As you will see from the AONB boundary those urban areas are outside of this AONB. In order to be truly sustainable, by reducing the need for transportation, the treatment and disposal of waste should be close to the areas where they are generated.	Your comments are noted and will be addressed as appropriate in the final Plan.
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	General Comments	WP760	To conclude, we welcome the identification of Eco's site at Parley in the Site Options section of the Draft Waste Plan. Having regard to the size of the approved facility and the wide range of waste streams that it receives, the site is well placed to accommodate strategic facilities. In particular, we consider that the site can provide for the treatment of bulky waste through the SRF Processing Plant. The size of the Parley site and the variety of waste streams would make it a viable and sustainable location for the management of bulky waste. Further to this, it is submitted that the site is ideally suited to gasification or pyrolysis of SRF and RDF, which could be accommodated within the approved SRF Processing Plant building. Dealing with the SRF on-site means that it would not need to be exported off-site. The gasification of clean wood would also provide a sustainable solution for clean wood on the Parley site, as it would result in less emissions that a clean biomass burner. It is submitted that Eco's Piddlehinton site also offers scope for the location of further recycling activities, namely organic waste and/or bulky waste. We consider that the Piddlehinton site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood and green waste transfer station. The presence of the existing AD Facility would maximise resource efficiency at this location. In conclusion, we would respectfully request that you consider our comments in relation to the Draft Waste Plan. Should you require us to clarify any of the matters set out or in the planning documents pertaining to either of Eco's sites, please do not hesitate to contact us.	Noted, your comments are addressed elsewhere.
West Parley Parish Council		WP599	I can confirm that West Parley Parish Council have reviewed both plans and wish to make no comment on either plan.	Your comments are noted

Bridport Town Council	General Comments	WP679	The draft Waste Plan was reported to the Town Council and whilst the Plan, in terms of sites, did not seem to impact on Bridport, members noted that other sites in the area were being looked at. Bearing in mind the imminent opening of the new waste transfer facility at Broomhills, Bridport, it was emphasised that there was a need to ensure that Broomhills would be managed and resourced effectively, in the light of any proposed changes being made elsewhere. On related issues, members also commented on the changes to the mini recycling centres in Bridport, with those at West Bay and the town centre Coach Park closing, as from late October. Members were surprised to hear this and concerned in particular about the implications for West Bay, bearing in mind the number of visitors. There was also concern at the reported new charges to be introduced at recycling centres for some waste including £1.50 for DIY waste, £10 per sheet of plasterboard and £5 for a car tyre. Members were concerned at these charges, which it was felt would have an impact on domestic waste and lead to increase in fly tipping.	Your comments are noted and will be passed to the relevant authority
Gillingham Town Council	General Comments	WP546	I can confirm that the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste Plan was considered by Gillingham Town Council at a meeting on 14th September 2015. The Town Council agreed to support the draft document.	Your support is welcomed
Sherborne Town Council	General Comments	WP353	Sherborne Town Councils working group formed to consider both the Mineral and Waste Plans have now done so with the outcome that Sherborne Town Council does not wish to make any comments in relation to either document.	Your comments are noted
Resident	General Comments	WP369	General Comment This plan should not be read or proposed in isolation. It needs to be considered with the Minerals plan as many factors affect both developments.	Your comments are noted and agreed with.
Affpuddle & Turnerspuddle PC	General Comments	WP334	A general observation is that that the Parish Council found it hard to digest the 176 page document and is mindful that others may have the same difficulty. Members are concerned that this could lead to less feedback from the public and other bodies and as such may fall short of the full consultation you are seeking. It is the view of the Parish Council that good feedback can only lead to a more robust and rigorous consultation process. We would therefore like to suggest that a short, easy to read summary document could be prepared that sets out the principle issues and invites comment. The detail can then be put in other documents for those who have the time or special knowledge to read more. Specific comments: We can find no mention of opportunities to generate power from waste. There are various references to third-party initiatives to reduce the production of waste. Surely the Waste Management Plan should set out some specific proposals to reduce waste. You ask for comments on the location of sites without giving any financial information that may have a bearing on the decision. We can find no mention of how you will reduce the amount of roadside rubbish in the county at times this summer it has become intolerable. We can find no mention of the frequency of household waste collections an issue that most people have strong views about.	Your comments are noted, the WPA will consider publishing a summary document containing the key points to accompany future consultations. Opportunities for energy from waste production is supported and covered in Chapter 9 'Recovery' including a number of site options for the location of energy from waste facilities. Unfortunately, this is a land use planning document that is required to produce a strategy for the management of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole's waste. Where we are aware of other initiatives that are likely to increase the collection of recyclables, for example, this has been taken into consideration when projecting future waste arising's. When developing preferred sites for allocation in the Pre-Submission Waste Plan the WPA will need to undertake a viability assessment to ensure the preferred sites are deliverable. The Waste Plan is a long term planning strategy that identifies sites to address the identified needs. Specific funding is unlikely to be available for all but the very top priorities, however it is important to allocate sites to ensure sites are safeguarded to be brought forward during the plan period. The frequency of household waste collections is a matter for the waste management authority, Dorset Waste Partnership, Bournemouth and Poole.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	General Comments	WP775	Sometimes, when reading a point you make, hard to find the earlier paragraph you are referring to. Please add a few references in brackets for those of us who are professionals and who need to go through the document quickly.	Your comments are noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	General Comments	WP776	Please vary the map colours to clearly distinguish the site from other uses, as in some maps it is hard to distinguish, e.g. in ED 02, where rights of way obscure the site boundaries when looked at in smaller scale.	Your comments are noted and will be addressed in the next version of the Waste Plan

Devon County Council	1.1	WP24	Plan period In our response to the Waste Plan Issues Consultation (December 2013), the County Council queried whether the plan period set out (to 2030) would cover a sufficient timeframe by the time the plan is adopted, which at that time was expected to be during 2016. As a result, the County Council recommended that the plan period was extended to 2031 to align with the NPPFs preferred timeframe of 15 years (paragraph 157). Whilst the latest document adopts a plan period to 2031, the planned adoption date has slipped to spring 2017 and therefore the plan period continues to cover only 14 years. This also means there is little flexibility for any further slippage in the plan preparation timetable. This may be an issue which the authorities would like to consider.	Agree, the Waste Plan should have a life of 15 years and this will be updated in the next iteration of the Waste Plan.
Resident	1.1	WP161	In total agreement with the whole plan.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	1.1	WP164	There has to be an interim document for people to comment on - not many of us have the time to read a 178 page document! -it would be better to have at first a shorter document for people to comment on, then the whole one as an 'add on' for people who do have the time/expertise. What I'd like to comment on is- Supermarkets should have to have their own facilities to recycle packaging/waste as they are major generators of it. Householders could do with more positive info as to how to dispose/cut down on their own waste production rather than have ever bigger, and environment unfriendly containers given to them by LAs to deposit waste in to.	The WPA will consider the preparation of a summary document to accompany future consultations.
Resident	1.1	WP206	I agree with the first commentator - this is a very thorough and well prepared document but it is too long to expect the public to read. As a result the comments you receive will be weighted towards professionals (e.g. Devon County Council) or specifically interested parties; I'm afraid it fails as a public consultation. It also takes quite a time to register with you, filling in all the personal details required, getting login access and then getting back to this consultation page. I wonder why you demand that people register when they are clearly already Council Tax payers and you already have their email address...?	Your support for the Waste Plan is welcomed. The WPA will consider the preparation of a summary document to accompany future consultation. In order to log representations to a Plan we require contact details from respondents, either postal or email. This enables us to keep respondents informed on the progress of the Plan. There are a variety of ways in which representations can be made including in writing, by email or via our online consultation portal.
Resident	1.1	WP215	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	1.5	WP34	There has been much comment re DWP and failure to achieve budget. I assume the budgetary, financial and logistics aspects of the new plan will be addressed as rigorously as the practical, , policy, procedural and operational aspects of planning.	In developing our preferred options for waste facilities the WPA will consider aspects of financial viability. The Waste Plan is a long term planning strategy (15 years) and needs to consider the likely needs of the authority over that period and plan accordingly.
Resident	1.5	WP190	I think we need more education to the county as a whole to try and reduce the terrible amount of waste we produce.	Your comment is noted
Resident	1.5	WP214	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	1.5	WP326	There must be practical limits to what is recyclable. In India virtually everything is recyclable. In Switzerland, I hear they send it outside the borders. What is being done to actively seek markets for recyclable materials? Why is not garden refuse recycled by offering discounted bags of Ecomix etc. in return for quantity of green recyclables? Can society manage with less frequent collections?	Your comments are noted. Issues relating to the recyclates market and specifics of garden waste collection are outside of the scope of the waste plan.
Resident	1.7	WP191	I hope that we get all this sorted out without too much delay.	Your comments are noted

Devon County Council	1.9	WP32	The quality of figures and graphs in the background papers should be improved for clarity.	Your comments are noted
Resident	1.9	WP35	Agree with first commenter - there is a trend for use of pastel/pale colourations on contemporary web documentation - which makes for some difficulty in reading and comprehending some figures, especially for elderly, visually impaired. Content is good - style - not quite perfect.	Your comments are noted
Resident	1.9	WP149	Appendix 2 Section 6 deals with the physical and operational requirements for various activities. Throughout the report you place great emphasis on the need to minimise environmental impact of vehicle movements and I am sure most residents would support that concept. It seems to me self evident that the way to do that is to provide a facility where all 3 of the proposed activities (HRC, transfer and waste vehicle depot) are located in 1 place. (One of your staff at the road show agreed with that view, but pointed out that this would limit site options). Your own data states that at least at least 1-2 hectares are required for such a facility. I am unsure the extent to which the site requirements have taken into account your own growth data, but given the likely scenario in West Dorset, derived from your own report, it seems entirely reasonable to suggest that the site requirements is more likely to be at least 2 ha rather than 1ha.	There are certainly advantages of having HRC, transfer and waste vehicle depots located together. However, given the limited number of available site options it may not be possible to find a suitable site.
Verwood Town Council	1.9	WP601	Members felt that there was no reference to cross border working and that document 3 'Cross Border' did not seem to be available. The Town Council also felt that the information about what will happen under the new Waste Plan regarding cross border working was required.	Background Paper 3 - Cross Boundary Movements was made available during the consultation period.
Trigon Estate	2.1	WP281	I have read the Draft Waste Plan with interest. It is well set out and logical in its approach. I support the proposed policies numbered 1, 2 and 3.	Your support is welcomed
New Forest National Park Authority	2.2	WP715	The Authority is pleased to note that the New Forest National Park is clearly shown on Figure 1 (page 8); the Authority however, is disappointed to note that our previous comments made on the Issues Consultation document (our letter dated 12 February 2014 refers) have not been taken on board. This section again focuses solely on the Dorset environment and whilst mention has been made of the fact that the National Park is situated to the eastern boundary of the Plan area (para 2.5) there is no explanation of the implications of this for waste planning in Dorset. Thus the comments previously made by the Authority are still of relevance and are set out below; As you are aware, Section 62(2) of the Environment Act 1995 places a statutory duty for relevant bodies (including surrounding local planning authorities) to have regard to the two National Park purposes when considering proposals for development which might affect them. The two Park purposes are; To conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the National Park; and To promote opportunities for the public understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park. National Parks have also been recognised by Government as having the highest level of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty (paras 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework).	The Waste Planning Authority will add additional text to reflect the importance of the National in the Waste Plan.
New Earth Group	2.2	WP857	Chapter 2: Paragraph 2.7 NESG understand that the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Bournemouth Dorset and Poole will be published imminently. The SHMA will include commentary on the aggregated level of housing needed in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole over the life of the plan and beyond. Whilst commentary on distribution might well be limited to an east / west split; the figures set out in the SHMA will help to establish the wider context.	Agree, the WPA will seek to incorporate the findings of the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Bournemouth Dorset and Poole into the Waste Plan projections.
Resident	Figure 1	WP192	Ideally any new waste sites would be situated nearer to the built up areas for easy access. However I can see that there are some people who might not want to have a waste site near their house. It is a difficult situation.	Your comments are noted
Resident	Figure 1	WP327	There have been approved developments of circa 1000 dwellings in Wimborne (formerly Colehill) unless these are classified as North Christchurch. What about Poundland (aka Poundbury)? is that "Dorchester"?	Paragraph 2.7 of the Waste Plan will be updated as appropriate and the projections updated to appropriately build in planned housing.
Resident	2.8	WP193	The hazardous waste must always present problems with disposal. It is a decision that rests with those people who have the technical know-how.	Your comments are noted

Resident	2.2	WP6	I live in a block of flats and the issue of food waste caddies was poor left externally with directions not picked up by residents and maybe half taken away. Net result hardly any food waste in bins and many use non-biodegradable bags I notice the streets are clean and do not need road sweepers yet they go out every day at 0730 - must be a cost to be avoided. It would appear the local council is only following the County contract - the latter needs amending	Your comments are noted and will be passed onto the relevant authority.
Resident	2.2	WP44	Businesses such as small guesthouses and cafes, pubs, etc. - may generate a relatively disproportionate quantity of waste, clearly much of this being food (-contaminated) waste. In some areas and for some buildings, there is no adequate provision of collection/storage/bin space, and this may lead to some disadvantaging of those businesses required to pay extra for daily/approved/specialist removal of waste. Yet, for example small hotels and similar businesses may be heavily penalised for taking their waste to street bins, being accused of disposing of "industrial" waste into public receptacles (which, ironically, guests can safely and legally use for exactly the same purpose and the same category of waste!). If most or all LACW and CI waste is essentially non-hazardous though not necessarily inert, why penalise?	Your comments are noted
New Earth Group	2.21	WP858	Chapter 2: Paragraph 2.21 & figure 2 Is there more recent data (post 2009) on which to calculate the proportions of waste arising? NESG note that chapter 4 makes passing reference to the proportions as of 2012/13.	Agree, the WPA will update Figure 2, however it should be noted that this would involve the inclusion of projections for some streams of waste as up to date data on waste arising's is not available.
Resident	Figure 2	WP7	What do the various alphabetical figures mean - one can guess	The acronyms refer to the different waste streams, as discussed earlier in the Waste Plan. This will be clarified.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Figure 2	WP777	Figure 2 doesn't come out well online	Your comments are noted and the appearance of Figure 2 will be improved in further revisions of the Waste Plan.
Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural	Figure 3	WP681	Figure 3 is not particularly detailed but it does appear to show a disposal site within this AONB halfway between Blandford and Shaftesbury, to the eastern side of the A350. This appears to be some distance north of Down End Farm, at Stourpaine, but does not appear to be mentioned elsewhere in your document; clarification would be appreciated.	The site referred to is Ranston Quarry which is an inert disposal facility for small quantities of non-contaminated soils and sub soils.
New Earth Group	Figure 3	WP859	Chapter 2: Figure 3 Three existing recycling / recovery operations are co-located at Canford in Poole. However only two symbols are shown on figure 3 to denote NESGs MBT facility at the Site Control Centre, Commercial Recycling Limited MRF at the site control centre, Commercial Recycling Limited aggregates recycling facility at Whites Pit. Is a further symbol required?	Your comments are noted and will be updated as appropriate.
W H White LTD	Figure 3	WP714	Three existing recycling/recovery operations are co-located at Canford in Poole However only two symbols are shown on figure 3 to denote New Earth Solutions MBT facility at the Site Control Centre, Commercial Recycling MRF at the Site Control Centre, Commercial Recycling MRF aggregates recycling facility at Whites Pit. Is a further symbol required?	Your comments are noted and will be updated as appropriate.
Resident	2.25	WP91	Probably wrong, but I thought Veolia was French, Viridor also foreign-owned, not sure about Sita, Olympus, etc. - Who are the UK companies poised to leverage the £11billion or so of potential revenue?	The waste and recycling sector provides a significant number of UK jobs both in the private sector and within local government. Materials recovery also generates a significant proportion of value. There are also benefits to the tax payer as recycling reduces the overall cost of landfill.
New Earth Group	2.25	WP860	Chapter 2: Paragraph 2.28 NESG is pleased to see the economic role of waste management, including its contribution to the wider resource sector, recognised within the Plan. It might be worth adding that waste management practices also play a role in reducing exposure to the economic costs associated with climate change; and this is increasing reflected in the Corporate Social Responsibility policies of businesses and organisations.	Your comments are noted
New Earth Group	2.25	WP861	Chapter 2: Paragraph 2.30 NESG are pleased to see the diverse range of jobs within the waste management industry alluded to; other examples include contract managers, environmental managers, laboratory technicians, maintenance technicians. The support for reprocessing plants is duly acknowledged and supported.	Your support is welcomed and the list of jobs within the waste industry will be expanded as suggested.

New Earth Group	2.25	WP862	Chapter 2: Paragraph 2.31 The potential benefit derived from the operation of energy from waste facilities is duly recognised.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	2.25	WP716	Para 2.28 WH White's importance ascribed to the economic role of waste management, including its contribution to the wider resource sector is welcomed	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	2.25	WP721	Para 2.31 The benefits derived from the development and operation of energy from waste facilities is duly recognised and WH White considers the established and consented energy plant at the Site Control Centre present an exemplar of what can be achieved	Your comments are noted
Devon County Council	2.32	WP25	The County Council supports the conclusions drawn in section 2 of the Plan in relation to cross boundary movements of waste between Devon and Dorset and welcomes the inclusion of this information in the Waste Plan. The County Council would welcome the opportunity to comment upon Background Paper 3 Cross boundary movements when this document is available.	Your support is welcomed. Background Paper 3 - Cross Boundary Movements was made available during the consultation period.
Somerset County Council	2.32	WP497	Paragraph 2.35 A minor point simply to suggest that the waste imported from outside Dorset originates from other Waste Planning Authority areas , rather than the Authorities themselves. Might this paragraph be reworded with that in mind?	Your comment is noted and the Plan will be amended as appropriate
New Earth Group	2.32	WP863	Chapter 2: Paragraph 2.37 The observations regarding the reasons for waste exports are interesting and provide useful context, to the areas of opportunity.	Your comments are noted
Resident	2.32	WP415	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District would object to any principle requiring the importation of waste from outside the plan area to sustain the economic efficiency of proposed new facilities.	Your comments are noted. Cross boundary movements are inevitable, especially for specialist waste management facilities, however the waste management needs identified in the Waste Plan are based on the projected waste arising's of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole.
Hampshire County Council	2.32	WP431	Why the use of WDI 2011 data instead of 2013?	Your comments are noted and headline figures will be updated wherever possible.
Hampshire County Council	2.32	WP432	22% (325,000 tonnes) of waste managed in Dorset was imported into the County, this is different to the 22% (432,000 tonnes) cited within Background Paper 3 Cross Boundary Movements	The Draft Waste Plan refers to 2011 movements of waste whereas the Background Paper was updated to show 2013 data.
Hampshire County Council	2.32	WP433	As an observation, 2013 data shows a total movement of waste from Hampshire to Dorset to approximately 101,500 tonnes, approximately 43,500 tonnes of this was identified at Waste water movements to treatment works in Dorset, particularly Holdenhurst WWTW, leaving approximately 60,000 tonnes of solid waste exported to Hampshire from Dorset in 2013. Dorset exported to Hampshire approx. 97,500 tonnes of waste in 2013, approx. 10,000 of this was to WWTWs in Hampshire, indicating Dorset was a net exporter of solid waste (c. 27,500 tonnes) to Hampshire in 2013	Your helpful comments are noted
New Earth Group	3.5	WP864	Chapter 3: Paragraph 3.7 NESG welcome the reference to efficiency in determining whether WtE plants are a recovery or disposal operation.	Your support is welcomed

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	3.5	WP779	3.9 aim for zero waste We welcome this aim. It must be included in your policies. The Governments Waste Strategy for England says The key aim of the waste management plan for England is to set out our work towards a zero waste economy as part of the transition to a sustainable economy. This is on https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/265810/pb14100-waste-management-plan-20131213.pdf A 2010 presentation for Friends of the Earth is on http://www.foe.co.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/zero_waste.pdf . Zero Waste Europe shows how big reductions can be achieved. Its hardly rocket science. Their 3 key principles are to prevent waste, as mandated in the EU waste Framework Directive, to separate waste collection (they show that more bins pay dividends) and to make residual waste visible. No burn, no bury. See http://www.zerowasteeurope.eu/about/principles-zw-europe/ and also the pictures on http://www.zerowasteeurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/comparison.jpg and http://www.zerowasteeurope.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/costs-Priula-Veneto.jpg Since most large and many medium UK manufacturers, repairers and operators think lean these days, waste reduction is seen as a key factor in profit generation. Working on waste reduction with these stakeholders should be like pushing an open door.	Your comments are noted and largely agreed with. However, the Waste Plan must use the best available evidence to project waste arising's throughout the Plan period and seek to allocate appropriate sites for the management of the projected waste arising's.
Resident	Figure 4	WP92	Waste hierarchy puts prevention as topmost priority - Yet repeated requests to WPBC over nearly 8 years has failed to elicit direct and potentially cost-saving measures to prevent, for example, widespread dissemination of Portland Market Flyers (and similar flyers) - which at times contribute to significant levels of street litter, (Level c to level D) and presumably waste collection and street cleaning costs (a few years ago there was an estimate of over 200,000 market flyers per year "hitting the streets" in and around Weymouth. The response was always "insufficient resources to deal" - However, as top priority, one should question this view (strongly!) Potentially, a single phone call could have prevented all this mess and litter. Even today, in the rain, my car was targeted (along with hundreds of others - including mostly residents - who surely do not need or want market flyers anyway!)	Your comments are noted and will be passed to the appropriate authority.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Figure 4	WP420	The Waste Hierarchy is a very useful concise set of principles for the management of waste. The DWP probably does adopt the Waste Hierarchy but it should be seen to adopt it and present a great deal more publicity about it to the general public.	Your comments are noted and will be passed to the appropriate authority.
New Earth Group	Figure 4	WP865	Chapter 3: Paragraph 3.5 & Figure 4 Whilst largely repeating Government Guidance on the interpretation of the rWFD for planning purposes, NESG note the Waste Plans audience and welcome the helpful explanation. The Waste Hierarchy must be a cornerstone of the Waste Local Plan in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole.	Your comments are noted
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	3.1	WP205	Proximity principle is a good idea but there needs to be some guidance as to how close or far away a facility should be from its source of waste. This lack of information leads to conflict at the planning stage and is a get out clause for developers.	If would be difficult to provide specific guidance on how close or far away a facility should be from its source of waste as this depends on the type of waste and type of facility and should be considered on a case by case basis. For example, specialist hazardous waste facilities have far greater catchment areas than inert waste facilities.
Somerset County Council	3.1	WP498	Paragraph 3.10 Whilst we do not dispute the merits of local provision, the WFD requires Member States to establish a network of facilities that promote net self-sufficiency. So whilst the same approach can be taken at a local level, it may be appropriate to clarify that the us currently mentioned in paragraph 3.10 in this context is set at a national level.	Your comment is noted and the plan will be amended to reflect the concerns raised.
New Earth Group	3.1	WP866	Chapter 3: Paragraph 3.12 Whilst largely repeating Government Guidance on the interpretation of the rWFD for planning purposes, NESG note the Waste Plans wide audience and welcome the helpful explanation. Proximity principle should be a cornerstone of the Waste Local Plan in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole.	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 1 - Sustainable waste management	WP447	North Dorset District Council supports Proposed Policy 1	Your support is welcomed

Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Proposed Policy 1 - Sustainable waste management	WP560	Policy 1 Recommendation: We support the principles of the Waste Hierarchy and Proximity but advise that, to ensure sustainability, Proximity should over-ride Self-Sufficiency and use of facilities on neighbouring Local Authority boundaries should continue where this reduces transport distance and emissions.	Neither proximity nor self-sufficiency are intended to be over riding, applications should be considered on their merits taking into consideration both principles.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 1 - Sustainable waste management	WP867	Chapter 3: Proposed Policy 1 Sustainable Waste Management NESG support the overarching aims of Proposed Policy 1.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 1 - Sustainable waste management	WP722	W H White supports the identification of the waste hierarchy, self-sufficiency and proximity as key targets of the Plan. All of which are consistent with national and planning guidance	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities	WP448	North Dorset District Council supports Proposed Policy 2	Your support is welcomed
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Proposed Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities	WP561	Policy 2 Unacceptable cumulative impact on the local area is imprecise . Recommendation: Criteria to establish what is and is not acceptable should be set.	It is not considered appropriate to establish criteria. Whether or not a proposal is acceptable will be judged on a site by site basis. It might be helpful to explain some of the impacts of co-location, such as increased traffic, landscape and visual impact in the text that accompanies Policy 2.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities	WP868	Chapter 3: Proposed Policy 2 Integrated waste management facilities The substantive benefits arising from colocation are duly recognised in the preceding paragraphs and the qualified support for the co-location of complimentary activities in recognised.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities	WP723	WH White fully supports the intent and wording of the Policy. WH White passionately believes that integration provides flexibility and the opportunity to treat waste using the most appropriate technology helping to promote waste up the hierarchy towards recovery, recycling and ultimately re-use. Technology advancements mean that the boundaries between waste management activities and industrial processes are becoming blurred: thus we welcome the recognition given to the co-location of complementary activities.	Your support is welcomed
Purbeck District Council	Proposed Policy 2 - Integrated waste management facilities	WP931	Policy 2 (integrated waste management facilities): it is unclear what would constitute an unacceptable cumulative impact on the local area. If this means neighbour amenity, traffic, landscape, etc. it should probably say so, otherwise it is probably too broad and ambiguous at the moment.	Your comments are noted. It might be helpful to explain some of the impacts of co-location, such as increased traffic, landscape and visual impact in the text that accompanies Policy 2.

New Earth Group	3.22	WP869	Chapter 3: Paragraph 3.22 NESG acknowledge that site options are still being evaluated, but NESG is concerned at the omission of an accompanying policy to support the delivery of allocated sites and trust that this will be forthcoming.	Agree, once preferred site options are identified these will be accompanied by a policy to support their delivery
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	3.23	WP778	3.25 information required for a planning application The following information will be required as part of the planning application: the nature and origin of the waste to be managed; the levels of waste arising*; the existing or permitted operating capacity*; and · the potential shortfall in capacity or market need that the proposal seeks to address. Evidence that a suitable management plan has been prepared ** *latest figures should be drawn from published monitoring reports and other relevant information. ** this plan should include flooding and pollution risks, pollution control to air and water, carbon reduction, landscape, environmental and biodiversity enhancement, site safety, emergency procedures and transport interface with the roads network .	All the issues raised such as flooding and pollution are important and will need to be addressed by any planning application. Applications will be assessed against the relevant development management policies in the Waste Plan. The list contained in paragraph 3.25 is additional information that applications on unallocated sites will have to provide.
Northamptonshire County Council	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP158	Policy 3, criterion a: "there is no suitable allocated site capable of serving the waste management need that the proposal is designed to provide. In practice this may be difficult as industry may not be able to reach agreement with landowners of allocated sites and it may prevent other sites (that are just as good and possibly better than allocated sites) from coming forward. It is also likely to not reflect the nature of waste industry investment which can be quite fluid as it is not geographically restricted in the same manner that minerals planning and investment is. -	Your comments are noted, Policy 3 will be given further thought prior to publication of the final Waste Plan.
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP449	North Dorset District Council supports Proposed Policy 3	Your support is welcomed
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP682	Policy 3 appears insufficient to provide the appropriate protection for an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and so the Partnership here recommends that Policy 3 should explicitly exclude Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	The Waste Plan should be read as a whole, it is considered that appropriate protection is provided for the AONB within other policies, specifically Policy 13 - Landscape and design quality.

Somerset County Council	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP499	The current wording feels as though it will limit flexibility. This may be intended, to ensure certainty linked with the allocation process. However, there may be merit in reviewing the wording to ensure it does not have un-intended consequences such as setting by implication a cap on recycling capacity (especially when coupled with Identified Need 1 to allow for provision of facilities to manage materials suitable for recycling where there is a proven need within the Plan area). Conceivably any such risk(s) could be addressed by reviewing the wording of criterion (a), or perhaps softening the exceptions clause at the end of the policy.	Your comments are noted, Policy 3 will be given further thought prior to publication of the final Waste Plan.
Intelligent Land	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP553	There is also a lack of clarity between Proposed Policy 3 and Proposed Policy 5 dealing with Energy Recovery. The essential cross-referencing of these issues is missing.	Your comments are noted, Policy 3 will be given further thought prior to publication of the final Waste Plan.
Intelligent Land	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP552	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for Waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan provides criteria which is much too restrictive to accommodate positive initiatives in this respect. It is therefore suggested that the criteria list is expanded to include: g. where waste to energy plants are providing a local heat or energy sources related to a proposed development. f. in rural locations where proximity to the bye-product of farm waste is a material consideration.	Your comments are noted, Policy 3 will be given further thought prior to publication of the final Waste Plan.
Christchurch & East Dorset Councils	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP359	Both Councils object to the wording of Policy 3 Applications for Waste Facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan. The Councils consider that waste facilities should not always be directed to sites allocated for employment use where these form part of a clear strategy to support growth of key sectors of the local and sub-regional economy. The Councils therefore request that the second part of the policy be reworded as follows: Where there are sites allocated in this Plan for the proposed use, proposals on unallocated sites will only be permitted in the following locations: d. within allocated or permitted employment land which allows for Class B2 and/or B8 uses; e. within or adjacent to other waste management and/or complementary facilities where the proposed use is compatible with existing and planned development in the locality or f. on previously developed land suitable for industrial purposes, provided that this would not reduce the supply of allocated or identified employment land required to facilitate the growth of the local economy or likely to be attractive to key growth sectors.	Waste facilities are considered appropriate within employment land and on previously development land and should be given priority. In this respect criterion'd' and 'f' are consistent with the National Planning Policy for Waste, October 2014.

Resident	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP404	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District object to the wording of Policy 3 Applications for Waste Facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan. The BID consider that waste facilities should not always be directed to sites allocated for employment use, especially Blunts Farm, which was taken out of the Green Belt as an exceptional measure to provide much needed employment land to support the local economy. This site located in the A31 corridor is a preferred location for local business to grow not for any and all waste facilities. The BID therefore request that the policy be reworded removing this link to employment land.	Waste facilities are appropriate within employment land and should be given priority. In this respect criterion d is consistent with the National Planning Policy for Waste, October 2014.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP515	The emerging joint Local Plan for West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland adopts a broad definition of employment. The Local Plans strategic approach is to give greater protection to the more significant employment sites, which are identified as key employment sites and to allow greater flexibility on other employment sites. Local Plan Policy ECON2 will only allow uses other than the traditional B-class employment uses on key employment sites, if they would achieve economic enhancement over and above the B-class uses and would not prejudice the efficient and effective use of the remainder of the employment area. The proposal (in Proposed Policy 3) to direct waste facilities to locations within allocated or permitted employment land which allows for class B2 and/or B8 uses would also include these key employment sites. This approach may have an impact on their ability to generate sustainable employment for the local area and may undermine the economic strategy within the Local Plan. It may be difficult for it to be demonstrated that a waste facility on a key employment sites would be an economic enhancement over and above the site being used for B-class uses. Local Plan Policy ECON3 sets out the Councils approach to uses on other employment sites and allows greater flexibility. Directing waste facilities to such other employment sites in West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland would be a preferable approach, which would be less likely to undermine the employment strategy within the Local Plan.	Waste facilities are considered appropriate within employment land and on previously development land and should be given priority. In this respect criterion 'd' is consistent with the National Planning Policy for Waste, October 2014. Further discussion is likely to be necessary with regards to this policy and the allocated sites.
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP724	W H White considers the intent and detained criteria to be appropriate, offering flexibility without undermining the proposed spatial strategy	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP870	Chapter 3: Proposed Policy 3 The draft policy avoids undermining the spatial strategy, which providing appropriate flexibility to adapt to changes in circumstance. The criteria based approach and the provisions therein are clear in their intent and wording.	Your support is welcomed

Purbeck District Council	Proposed Policy 3 - Applications for waste facilities not allocated in the Waste Plan	WP932	Policy 3(d) (applications for waste facilities not allocated in the plan): the way this policy is worded would exclude waste facilities on any employment site with an existing B1 use. This might be a bit restrictive and inflexible - there are industrial sites that could be acceptable locations for a waste facility, but this policy would effectively rule them out if they contain an element of B1.	Your comments are noted and further though will be given to ensuring sufficient flexibility within this policy.
Trigon Estate	4.1	WP282	I accept the logic behind your assumptions on Growth scenarios. I note the Identified Needs no. 6 and no.7 relating to residual waste and no. 8 relating to Inert Waste.	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	4.1	WP871	Chapter 4: Paragraph 4.3 NESG welcome the engagement with the waste management industry and agree that we expect to see an increase in residual waste (LACW).	Your support is welcomed
Christchurch & East Dorset Councils	4.1	WP358	This is a joint representation on the Draft Waste Plan on behalf of Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council. The Councils welcome the opportunity to engage with the Waste Plan. The Councils do not propose to comment on the various growth scenarios for waste over the period to 2031, as the comments below in respect of site options will apply regardless of which growth scenario is followed.	Your comments are noted
Resident	Table 2	WP93	Food waste is an absolute nightmare for smaller food and accommodation provider businesses. One small green (or other colour) box for in-house temporary storage prior to collection is wholly inadequate for most establishments. (Requiring some to pay for authorised collectors). Especially for hotels and guesthouses, the levels of food waste are mostly determined by guests and essentially unpredictable and unavoidable (without introducing "petty dictatorships" which might discourage guests from returning!) Bigger food waste boxes available please, also on-street as well for those premises too small to house waste collections inside their curtilages.	Your comments have been passed to the appropriate authority
Resident	Question 1	WP36	A prudent course to follow	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 1	WP33	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 1	WP8	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 1	WP94	So difficult to predict - middle seems "safest", but of course there are cost implications if "best practice" minimum levels had been assumed instead.	Your support is welcomed

Resident	Question 1	WP109	Existing Policy and Planning Assumptions The existing adopted Waste Local Plan (adopted 30/06/2006) sets out a clear policy in terms of "Transport Impact", Policy 21, Clause 4.43 on Page 33 refers. Any proposed site selection should meet the criteria set out in that policy and I do not believe that some of the proposed sites are compliant with that policy. I draw your attention to some of the underlying assumptions set out in your own documents. West Dorset and Weymouth DC have the highest annual rate of increase. (Background Paper 1 Table 23 refers) It therefore seems reasonable to assume that the growth of rubbish generation in West Dorset will be at the upper end of the forecast you have provided in the background papers. Your own data suggest that a 1.66% increase per annum (med case), with a higher growth scenario of up to 2.70% per annum. Given the proposed growth in housing in West Dorset, a figure towards the upper end of 2.70% therefor looks entirely likely in this district.	Your comments are noted. With regards to the first point, the 2006 Waste Plan is being reviewed and will eventually be replaced by a new Waste Plan. The Draft Waste Plan included a proposed policy relating to Transport and access. The selection of sites and identification of preferred sites will be consistent with all relevant policies. The level of housing growth in Dorset has been built into the waste arsing forecasts. This will be reviewed as appropriate to ensure that the Plan reflects the most up to date housing projections.
Resident	Question 1	WP216	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 1	WP308	No, the Localism Bill introduced an opportunity for communities to plan for further development than that proposed by LA's. Blandford are planning for additional housing to be built in the area for the plan period up to 2031, in excess of 600 houses to that already proposed by the LA. Other Neighbourhood Plans could be planning for further growth too. Has this been taken into consideration? If not, the choice of the Medium Growth scenario has not considered all factors.	The level of housing growth in Dorset has been built into the waste arsing forecasts. This will be reviewed as appropriate to ensure that the Plan reflects the most up to date housing projections. The WPA will consider further whether additional housing being planned within Neighbourhood Plan should be accounted for, however given that there are very few plans at an advanced stage it would be difficult to estimate future levels of provision. This is likely to be an issue worthy of monitoring following adoption of the Waste Plan.
Pimperne Parish Council	Question 1	WP363	While the Medium Waste scenario is the best policy to follow, more pressure needs to be brought to bear on reducing waste at source.	Your support is welcomed
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 1	WP376	I agree that Medium Growth is a good a guess as any but it is impossible to be at all sure about such forecasts in view of the rather wide variations in the economy in recent years. Forecasts of the future economy have been consistently wrong and NOBODY forecasted the huge drop in the price of oil over the past year. As you rightly point out variations in the economy are reflected in the volume of waste produced.	Your comments are noted. Once the Waste Plan is adopted regular monitoring will ensure that any consistent changes in waste arising's are recognised and where appropriate reflected in any review of the Waste Plan.
Resident	Question 1	WP696	YES Medium growth of LACW	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Question 1	WP872	Caution is required when looking at housing projections within Borough and District wide Core Strategies and Local Plans. Whilst some Core Strategies and Local Plans have been adopted relatively recently, others are in need of urgent review. NESG understand that the authorities are working on a common evidence base and commissioned G L Hearn to undertake a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to identify future needs. Whilst NESG understand that an aggregated figure for Bournemouth Dorset and Poole is likely to be presented in the final report, it is noteworthy that an interim draft for Poole was published in February 2015. This suggested that a significant uplift was likely to be required. In essence, the 541 average rate of development to be built to 2031, as reported in table 6 on page 14, of the background paper on waste arising's could increase to nearer 700. If this was repeated across the Bournemouth Dorset and Poole sub-region then this would need to be encapsulated in the calculation of potential waste arising's. As such, the next iteration of the Waste Plan will need to consider the evidence set out in the SHMA. With respect to waste arising's per household, NESG believe the assumptions contained within the Medium Growth Scenario to present a sensible starting point.	Your comments are noted, the WPA agree that the projections should be updated following the publication of the SHMA.
Hampshire County Council	Question 1	WP434	Hampshire have observed an increase in LACW for the last 2 years of 2.25% and over the last 5 years an increase of only 0.14%. over the last 10 years that has been an overall drop in the amount of LACW in Hampshire by 0.85%, although over that period the definitions of LACW have changed. It is however useful to look at the last 2 Year arising and last 5 years arising alongside recent changes in the national economy.	Agree, the WPA agree it would be helpful to consider recent waste arising's and the economy prior to publication of the Waste Plan.

West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Question 1	WP516	Using the projected increase in households over the plan period as an input to the estimate of increase in waste arising would seem to be a sensible approach. Adopting the medium waste growth scenario seems to be the most appropriate however; new household projections and new estimates of Objectively Assessed Housing Need will be produced for the West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland area within 5 years.	Your support is welcomed. The level of housing growth in Dorset will be reviewed as appropriate to ensure that the Plan reflects the most housing projections.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 1	WP780	No because this scenario allows for an increased tonnage of waste arising's per household. This goes against the Waste Hierarchy Principle, which puts Prevention at the top of the Hierarchy. (Proposed Policy 1 Sustainable Waste Management.) Furthermore, paragraph 3.5 says The management of waste in line with the waste hierarchy is both a guide to sustainable waste management and a legal requirement. Your justification for this choice is that, while both Low and Medium growth scenarios take into account predicted waste arising's in the likely event of new housing going ahead, medium growth also allows for increased tonnage per household which might occur as the economy improves. Yet, Article 29 of the EU Revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/9d81EC) calls for the creation of Waste Prevention Programmes, aiming to break the link between economic growth and the environmental impacts associated with the generation of waste. Moreover, as you state in 4.21 the Government has a clear objective to decouple economic growth from waste arising's in the future. In para 3.6 you say Both prevention and Re-use involve changes in both consumer and manufacturing behaviour, which are outside the control of the local waste planning authority.	It is the role of the Waste Plan to ensure facilities are available to manage waste that is produced in the County during the plan period. Predicting how the volume of waste will change over this period is challenging but the Waste Planning Authority has worked with the waste management authorities and the waste management industry in order to plan for a realistic tonnage of waste, recyclables, food etc. Indications are that waste will grow over the plan period as the economy picks up and with population/housing growth. Monitoring will ensure that the plan remains up to date and correctly reflects waste arising's. The development of waste facilities is also likely to be market led. If higher level waste prevention initiatives result in reduced quantities of residual waste arising's then facilities simply will not be built. Where the waste planning authority is aware of local initiatives, such as the introduction of separate food waste collection, this has been built into the projections. The waste planning authority is concerned that the low growth scenario could risk under provision of waste facilities.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 1	WP780	However, in line with the legal requirement to put waste prevention at the top of the waste hierarchy, the three Local Authorities Bournemouth Borough Council, Borough of Poole and the Dorset Waste Partnership have each put in place and are carrying out their own comprehensive Waste Prevention Plans and Programmes, one aim of which is to bring about changes in consumer behaviour by for example giving advice and incentives to opt for reusable nappies, to reject over packaged goods, refuse plastic bags etc. etc.; in their plans they also encourage and give incentives for home composting and advice on how to reduced junk mailetc Dorset Waste Partnerships plan is resulting in a real enthusiasm and commitment for reduction and recycling on the part of Dorset residents. Bournemouth's plan has been developed using the National Waste Prevention Toolkit Guidance and has the potential to divert 7,910 13,365 tonnes of waste from landfill over 5 years In paragraph 4.2 you state that over the six year period from 2007/8 to 2012/13 waste arising's decreased by 10% (about 2% pa) and that this can be attributed to waste reduction and recycling initiatives as well as economic conditions slowing down. If you plan for an increase in waste arising's per household, there will be little or no incentive for Local Authorities to make progress with their waste prevention/reduction programmes. We would propose, therefore, a Low Growth Scenario forecast for LACW. This would allow for increased arising's resulting from the proposed new housing and population growth, but with decreased arising's per household as a result of a positive, pro-active waste prevention programme.	See response above
W H White LTD	Question 1	WP725	WH WHite concurs that an increase in residual waste (LACW) driven primarily by population growth and new household formations is likely. In the interest of securing a robust approach, WH White would respectfully suggest that predictions on the level of new housing take account of the SHMA, which was understand is due for publication in September. With respect to waste arising's per household, WH White believes the assumption contained within the Medium Growth Scenario to present a sensible starting point	Your support is welcomed, the WPA agree that the projections should be updated following the publication of the SHMA.
Purbeck District Council	Question 1	WP922	Purbeck District Council considers the medium scenario for local authority collected waste appears appropriate, as it is an approximate midpoint between the low and high scenarios.	Your support is welcomed
Purbeck District Council	Question 1	WP923	The low growth scenario for forecasting commercial and industrial waste appears reasonable.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	4.12	WP95	Suggest "decriminalising" disposal of so-called commercial and industrial waste from certain categories of premises, such as small hotels, restaurants, guesthouses, snack bars and the like.	Your comments have been passed to Dorset Waste Partnership.

Pimperne Parish Council	4.12	WP393	It may be dangerous to predict low growth in C&I waste by delinking it to economic growth as this could present capacity problems in future.	The Low Growth scenario still allows for growth in C&I waste arising's of 1.12% per annum. This is higher than recent research suggests growth will actually be. Additionally, the baseline amount used is likely to be an overestimate of what actually occurred and so it is considered that the Plan is still making adequate provision. The Plan will be subject to annual monitoring and if there are any indications from new published research that C&I waste arising's are growing at a quicker rate than anticipated, this can be taken into account in any review or partial review of the Waste Plan.
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP96	Low-growth scenario seems more achievable, at least short to medium term (usual lag in commercial upturns) and enforceable (more regulated "environment". Possibly, the future waste management landscape might well see more enforcement and stringent requirements placed upon everyone - not pleasant but probably necessary.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP217	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 2	WP39	Very unlikely that the medium or high growth scenarios will happen	It is agreed that the Low Growth scenario is the most realistic.
Resident	Question 2	WP9	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Devon County Council	Question 2	WP26	The updated approach to forecasting CIW and the adoption of the low growth scenario is supported. This approach is consistent to that used in the development of the Devon Waste Plan which was adopted in December 2014.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 2	WP218	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 2	WP309	The Town Council does not agree with the Government objective to decouple waste growth from economic growth. The estimate is too low for the plan period. Later on in the document under Question 16 the rate of economic growth is relied on to predict the increase in hazardous waste. It is not understood why this approach should not also be used for commercial and industrial waste as well.	The Low Growth scenario still allows for growth in C&I waste arising's of 1.12% per annum. This is higher than recent research suggests growth will actually be. Additionally, the baseline amount used is likely to be an overestimate of what actually occurred and so it is considered that the Plan is still making adequate provision. The Plan will be subject to annual monitoring and if there are any indications from new published research that C&I waste arising's are growing at a quicker rate than anticipated, this can be taken into account in any review or partial review of the Waste Plan.

Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 2	WP377	It all depends on how the Country's economy fares over the period of the Plan in the next seventeen years. See my comments on question 1.	It is agreed that economic growth will be an important factor in determining growth in arising's of C&I waste. As the Low Growth scenario still allows for growth in C&I waste arising's of 1.12% per annum, it is considered that the Plan will make adequate provision for this waste stream. The Plan will be subject to annual monitoring and if there are any indications from new published research that C&I waste arising's are growing at a quicker rate than anticipated, this can be taken into account in any review or partial review of the Waste Plan.
Resident	Question 2	WP697	Yes Low growth of C&I Waste	Your support is welcomed.
New Earth Group	Question 2	WP873	NESG is happy to defer to the Strategic Authorities judgement on the level of C&I waste arising's noting that this waste stream is notoriously difficult to predict. It is also evident that the Governments ambition of decoupling waste and economic growth has yet to be tested.	Your support is welcomed.
Hampshire County Council	Question 2	WP435	Agree since input specification of commercial waste is similar to household input for existing waste infrastructure.	Your support is welcomed.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 2	WP781	No, In your reasons for adopting this scenario (1.12% pa) you admit that this is well over national projections, which are around 0.1% pa. This builds in considerable over- capacity and so goes against the Waste Hierarchy as it discourages waste prevention. We would therefore suggest a small reduction in growth for C and I waste.	It is acknowledged that the Low Growth scenario is higher than the projection of the CIWM 2013 study. However, this study only looks at the period up to 2020, whereas the Waste Plan covers the period to 2031. It is also considered that the Waste Plan should recognise some correlation between growth in C&I waste arising's and economic growth. A small level of growth also helps to counter the fact that there are uncertainties regarding both the baseline data and the amount of economic growth that will actually occur. The Plan will be subject to annual monitoring and if there are any indications from new published research that C&I waste arising's are growing at a slower (or quicker) rate than anticipated, this can be taken into account in any review or partial review of the Waste Plan.
W H White LTD	Question 2	WP726	The Government aims to decouple waste growth from economic growth. It is our experience that local business are increasingly aware of the importance of effective waste management practices in reducing both their costs and in meeting Corporate Social Responsibility objectives. However a positive correlation still exists (as reflected at para 4.20 of the emerging Plan) and with this in mind, W H White would favour a more precautionary approach. As such W H White would recommend that the medium growth scenario be applied.	It is agreed that the Waste Plan should recognise a correlation between growth in C&I waste arising's and economic growth. However, it is considered that the Low Growth scenario is appropriate and provides sufficient flexibility because it still allows for growth in C&I waste arising's of 1.12% per annum. This is higher than recent research suggests growth will actually be. Additionally, the baseline amount used is likely to be an overestimate of what actually occurred and so it is considered that the Plan is still making adequate provision. The Plan will be subject to annual monitoring and if there are any indications from new published research that C&I waste arising's are growing at a quicker rate than anticipated, this can be taken into account in any review or partial review of the Waste Plan.

Resident	Question 3	WP40	Undoubtedly the correct choice	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 3	WP10	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 3	WP97	On the basis that these areas of waste generation are more highly regulated or may become subject to stricter regulation, plus there being some (unpredictable) scope for increased recyclability of construction-type wastes, it seems reasonable to be optimistic and elect the low or zero-growth option. Many external factors may influence future construction \(etc.) - such as energy emergencies, water and other principal resources shortages, continuing skills shortages, off/out/under-sourcing in all sectors of technology and industrial/commercial/domestic growth.	It is agreed that there are a number of factors which could restrict the level of growth in inert waste arising's so that is not in line with economic growth. However, it is considered that some growth is still likely to occur as the economy and construction sector picks up. The Medium Growth scenario is therefore considered appropriate.
Resident	Question 3	WP219	Agree	Your support is welcome.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 3	WP310	The Town Council agreed due to the number of pressures that are likely to prevent the amount increasing with the level of construction activity, notably improvements in the site management of CDE waste, the impacts of Landfill Tax and increasing transportation costs all resulting in increased re-use on site and therefore reduced 'waste' arising's.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 3	WP698	YES Medium growth of Inert Waste	Your support is welcomed
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 3	WP378	Again, critically dependent on the level of activity in the construction industry over the next seventeen years. See question 1.	Your support is welcomed. It is agreed that the projection in inert waste arising's should be linked to growth in the construction sector, as is the case with the Medium Growth scenario.
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Question 3	WP704	We believe that the plan fails to provide adequate evidence to justify the conclusion that inert waste arising's will increase at 50% the rate of growth in the construction sector and we believe that it would be more appropriate to adopt the high growth scenario. The projections are based on a low post recession starting point and they fail to fully take into account of the Governments growth agenda. The suggestion in paragraph 4.35 that there are pressures likely to prevent the amount of inert waste increasing with the level of construction activity is based on speculation not fact. It fails to take account of the planning and economic pressure on development land will result in sites being more intensively developed for example by the provision of underground parking. The Hilton Hotel redevelopment in Bournemouth alone is understood to have generated approximately 85,000m3 of excavation materials.	Whilst it is considered that some growth is likely to occur as the economy and construction sector picks up, there are a number of factors that we consider will restrict this level of growth, as set out in the Plan. In particular it should be noted that GVA is unlikely to rise as significantly as currently forecast. The Medium Growth scenario is therefore considered appropriate. The baseline year is 2013. A review of arising's for 2014 can now be undertaken to establish if a significant increase has occurred.
Hampshire County Council	Question 3	WP436	Agree since input specification of commercial waste is similar to household input for existing waste infrastructure.	Your support is welcomed
Halletec Environmental Ltd	Question 3	WP533	Agree	Your support is welcomed

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 3	WP782	No, In Para 4.35 you say that there are a number of pressures that are likely to prevent the amount of waste increasing with the level of construction activity, the main one being improvement in the management of C and D waste on site, resulting in a reduction in waste arising's. We think that Low Growth (which according to Table 5 is in fact zero growth) would be a more appropriate option.	It is agreed that there are a number of factors which could restrict the level of growth in inert waste arising's so that is not in line with economic growth. However, it is considered that some growth is still likely to occur as the economy and construction sector picks up. The Medium Growth scenario is therefore considered appropriate to build sufficient flexibility into the Plan.
W H White LTD	Question 3	WP727	It is evident that the strategic authorities have adopted a pragmatic approach to estimating inert arising's. Notwithstanding re-use on site, it is evident that a step change in housing delivery might be required over the plan period, supported by new infrastructure. Thus is is reasonable to assume that the regeneration of brownfield sites, upgrading of strategic infrastructure and, to a lesser extent, greenfield development will also lead to an increase in inert arising's. In the interest of securing a robust approach, WH White would respectively suggest that any estimate take account of the SHMA, which WH White understands is due for publication as well as the forthcoming review of the Workspace Strategy.	Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to the incorporation of the SHMA within the projections for inert waste.
Purbeck District Council	Question 3	WP924	Purbeck District Council considers the medium scenario for forecasting inert waste appears appropriate, as it is an approximate midpoint between the low and high scenarios.	Your support is welcomed
Devon County Council	5.1	WP28	Waste management targets Apart from inert waste, it is not clear from the Plan what the target recycling, recovery and disposal rates are for the main waste streams during the course of the plan period. This must have been established in order to calculate the future capacity requirements for different waste management facilities. This is an area of the Plan which the County Council believes should be strengthened. The authorities may want to consider the inclusion of targets for management types for key dates within section 4 and also within proposed policy 4, 5 and 6. This approach was endorsed by the Inspector of the Devon Waste Plan.	The WPA has discussed targets for recycling, recovery and disposal with the three waste management authorities. Unfortunately, due to the current economic climate Dorset Waste Partnership are committed to maintaining the current reduce, recycling and composting rate of 60%, but are not planning targets for increased recycling that can be built into the Waste Plan projections. Bournemouth Borough Council are considering collecting a wider range of materials at the curb side including WEEE, batteries and textiles. If implemented these measures would see increased recycling rates and reduction of residual waste. However, it is too early to quantify any increases and build this into the projections. This will be monitored and if possible reflected in the final Waste Plan. The Borough of Poole are planning for an increase in the recycling rate which will be built into the projections. Poole also plan to introduce alternate weekly collections in Autumn 2016 which should increase the recycling rate and decrease residual tonnage further. This will be monitored and if possible an allowance will be made in the final Waste Plan.
Highways England	5.1	WP336	We note the identified needs for facilities for various types of waste and as necessary the need for sites to locate facilities to deal with the waste shortfalls	Your comments are noted
Resident	5.1	WP370	5.77 Figure 5 . It is difficult to identify where the landfill and inert recycling facilities are close to Wareham from this map as the font is so small. Figure 19. Page 269 The key is a very small font too small and the Existing landfill sites for example should be named. Question 5 Vision this is over many pages and not summarised therefore not clear. Do you mean Proposed Policy boxes? Then name them so. Objectives - not summarised for clarity as items. These have to be met so should be clearly stated Spatial Strategy Local recycling facilities. I am concerned about the development in Purbeck and the Wareham depot. Swanage has now closed I believe so all of Purbeck decants to Wareham.	Figure 5 is intended to be an overview of facilities to indicate spatially the existing network of facilities. Background papers provide further detail on existing facilities. Again, the Key Diagram is meant to be an overarching illustration of the spatial strategy, rather than a detailed plan. Background papers provide further detail on existing facilities.

New Earth Group	5.1	WP874	Chapter 5: What is the need for new facilities? The waste management industry has become increasing sophisticated and often involves multiple tiers of processing in order to extract additional value, provide the economies of scale necessary to employ bespoke plant and push waste up the hierarchy. As a result, the old model of matching capacity to arising's is outdated; as this does not allow for multiple tiers of processing and can prejudice the deployment of innovative new technologies. It is acknowledged that Proposed Policy 3, to some degree, makes allowance for such circumstances; but it is considered the potential for multiple tiers should be recognised in the opening paragraphs of Chapter 5.	Your helpful comments are noted and reference will be made to multiple tiers of processing. However, the WPA maintains that comparing capacity to arising's is a good starting point to the identification of need for new waste management facilities.
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	5.1	WP756	Paragraph 5.4 of the Draft Waste Plan provides a breakdown of waste arising's. This includes wood in the category of organic waste that is biodegradable. We are of the view that wood does not sit comfortably within this category. It is submitted that seasoned wood, although it will break down, will take a long time to so. Furthermore, whilst it is an organic material, it needs to be thermally processed to recover it.	It is considered that wood waste fits appropriately within the category of organic waste. However, it is acknowledged that this type of waste needs to be managed differently to other types of organic waste. The Draft Waste Plan considers how much wood waste will need to be managed over the plan period separately to other organic wastes, and it recognises that wood waste will need to be treated separately (Identified Need 3).
W H White LTD	5.1	WP728	WH White supports the acknowledgement that commercial waste often has similar attributes/composition to municipal waste and that it is appropriate to amalgamate the totals for the purpose of indicting the need for new facilities	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Table 6	WP729	Para 5.2 and Table 6 The waste management industry has become increasingly sophisticated and often multiple tiers of processing in order to extract additional value, provide the economies of scale necessary to employ bespoke plant and push waste up the hierarchy. For instance, the MBT and MRF operations at Canford both produce an RDF for use in energy generation. Should this be sued within the consented Low Carbon Energy Facility, care must be taken to avoid double counting. WH White believes therefore, that the old model of matching capacity to arising's is outdated: as this does not allow for multiple tiers of processing and can prejudice the deployment of innovative new technologies. It is acknowledged that Proposed Policy 3, to some degree, makes allowances for such circumstances; but it is considered that potential for multiple tiers should be recognised in the opening paragraph of Chapter 5.	Your helpful comments are noted and reference will be made to multiple tiers of processing. However, the WPA maintains that comparing capacity to arising's is a good starting point to the identification of need for new waste management facilities.
	5.7	WP41	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Campaign to Protect Rural England	5.9	WP513	We hope that the export of waste material to Shotton in north Wales and elsewhere will, indeed, end very soon. It is this sort of thing which gets picked up by the newspapers and provides very bad publicity.	Your comments are noted
Halletec Environmental Ltd	5.9	WP534	The movement of recyclates to North Wales is not sustainable and should be remedied as soon as practicable.	Your comments are noted. As explained in the Plan, permission has been granted for two additional MRF's within the county. It is hoped that one of these facilities will be developed in order to increase self sufficiency.
Resident	5.15	WP43	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.17	WP45	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.17	WP221	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Resident	5.17	WP289	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Hampshire County Council	5.17	WP437	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 1	WP46	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 1	WP98	Historically, possibilities for recycling continue to increase, both in type and extent and feasibility. Let's be optimistic and hope R&D in these areas will come to our aid and be supported by central Government etc.	Your comments are noted
Resident	Identified Need 1	WP220	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Identified Need 1	WP875	Chapter 5: Paragraph 4.18 & Identified Need 1 NESG concur that there is sufficient consented capacity for dry mixed recyclates; the consented plant at Canford poses particular benefits in terms of co-location and would facilitate the uses of co-collection vehicles. Beyond this NESG consider a criteria based policy to be appropriate.	Your support is welcomed
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 1	WP783	Recyclable waste: Identified Need 1 We agree with this need. Criteria based policy: The criteria need to be spelled out at this stage. Please name the criteria, or give examples if they would be site specific, or else explain what you mean by a criteria-based policy NB Para 5.11 Clearly it is important in future not to get locked into long-term contracts which go against the guiding principles of proximity and self-sufficiency.	Proposed Policy 4 includes a series of criteria for assessing planning applications for recycling facilities.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 1	WP730	WH White notes that there is sufficient consented capacity for dry mixed recyclates: the MRF and consented extension at Canford pose particular benefits in terms of co-location and would facilitate the use of co-collection vehicles. Beyond this W H White considers a criteria based policy to be appropriate	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.2	WP47	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.2	WP194	I suppose that, with modern housing, gardens tend to be smaller than the older ones. So maybe green waste from new builds will be less.	Your comments are noted

Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	5.2	WP757	Paragraphs 5.20 to 5.23 refer to green waste and set out the potential shortfall in green waste arising's. Table 8 identifies a shortfall of 45,000 tonnes per annum. The recent planning application for Eco's site at Parley provides for the processing of up to 50,000 tonnes per annum, either through compost or the Combined AD Facility. In addition, we understand that green waste is also processed at Downend. We would therefore consider that the projections for green waste may not be sufficient, as set out in the Draft Waste Plan. Paragraph 5.25 refers to the management of green waste through a combination of composting and anaerobic digestion facilities. We support this view and would also advise that this combination of processes may be best utilised where they operate in tandem on the same site. The recent application for Eco's site at Chapel Lane combines green waste composting and anaerobic digestion, with the objective of maximising resource efficiency. We therefore submit that Paragraph 5.25 should go a step further by recognising the benefits of co-locating green waste composting and anaerobic digestion on the same sites. Paragraph 5.26 of the Draft Waste Plan states that given the current movement of waste and the location of existing facilities there is likely to be a need for green waste composting capacity in the west of Dorset. It is our contention that this capacity could be provided at Eco's existing site at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton.	The existing capacity calculated for green waste management will be revised to take into account additional capacity now permitted at the Eco Parley site. It is agreed that the text could recognise the benefits of co-locating green waste facilities with anaerobic digestion facilities. Full consideration is being given to the use of Bourne Park, Piddlehinton for green waste composting and public consultation is being undertaken during Spring 2016.
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	5.2	WP757	The presence of the existing AD Facility would be consistent with the principle of co-locating green waste composting and anaerobic digestion processes alongside each other. Having regard to Paragraph 5.27, we are concerned that the policy of small-scale, localised composting facilities will not be viable. In this regard, processing and management costs associated with the implementation of the Compost Quality Protocol (QP) on small sites (needed to prove recycling as opposed to recovery) are likely to prove prohibitive. It is therefore submitted that larger, centralised green waste composting facilities are likely to be more viable and environmentally sustainable.	Policy 4 does not specifically limit the tonnage of material to be managed through a composting facility and should be flexible enough to allow facilities to come forward where they support the delivery of the spatial strategy and their scale and design is appropriate to the proposed site.
Resident	5.21	WP49	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.23	WP50	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Table 8	WP51	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.25	WP52	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Hampshire County Council	5.25	WP438	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 2	WP53	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 2	WP222	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 2	WP290	Agree	Your support is welcomed

New Earth Group	Identified Need 2	WP876	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.27 & Identified Need 2 On the basis of the identified need for green waste composting / anaerobic digestion facilities, NESG consider a criteria based policy to be appropriate.	Your support is welcomed
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Identified Need 2	WP753	Existing Facility at Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton Eco obtained planning permission for an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility at Bourne Park Estate in June 2010 (Planning Ref: 1/D/2008/0989). The AD Facility was designed to process 25,000 tonnes per year of organic domestic and commercial waste and 12,000 tonnes of agricultural slurry arising from local pig farms. The facility would generate up to 1,000KW of power, via a CHP engine driven generator, for supply to the Local Distribution Network, whilst the final digestate would be used on farms as a soil improver or conditioner. The AD Facility commenced operation in late-2012 and is operating efficiently. We consider that the Piddlehinton site offers scope for the location of further waste management activities. The site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood and green waste transfer station. The location for such a facility is indicated in Figure 2 overleaf. It is our contention that Ecos existing site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for a small green waste composting site. We consider that the receipt of bulky waste for bulking to Parley could be undertaken in an efficient and sustainable manner at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton. The site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood transfer station alongside a green waste composting site. Paragraph 5.26 of the Draft Waste Plan states that given the current movement of waste and the location of existing facilities there is likely to be need for green waste composting capacity in the west of Dorset. It is our contention that Ecos existing site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for a green waste transfer station. The presence of the existing AD Facility would help to maximise resource efficiency at this location. Similarly, Paragraph 5.47 of the Draft Waste Plan identifies that 22,000 tonnes per annum of bulky waste currently arises from household recycling centres in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. This is projected to increase by 7,000 tonnes per annum at the end of the Plan period. We consider that the receipt of bulky waste could be undertaken in an efficient and sustainable manner at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton. Figure 2: Location of Existing Site and Potential Area of Expansion Source:	An assessment will be made of the suitability of Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton for additional uses. Further public consultation is also planned for Spring 2016.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 2	WP784	Organic/ green waste: Identified Need 2 We agree with this.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Identified Need 2	WP732	W H White considers a criteria based policy to be appropriate	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.28	WP54	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.31	WP55	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.33	WP56	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Hampshire County Council	5.33	WP439	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Table 9	WP57	Agree	Your support is welcomed

New Earth Group	Table 9	WP877	Chapter 5: Table 9 In light of the advice set out at para. 5.29 of the emerging Waste Plan on the availability of robust information on the quantum of wood waste, and our earlier comments regarding the prevalence of multiple tiers of processing, it would seem prudent to re-title row 2 Minimum Projected arising's (tpa) / Need in the table	It is agreed that this seems a sensible approach.
W H White LTD	Table 9	WP735	In light of the advice set out in para 5.29 of the emerging Waste Plan on the availability of robust information on the quantum of wood waste, and our earlier comments regarding the prevalence of multiple tiers of processing, it would seem prudent to re-title row 2 'Minimum Projected arising's (tpa) /Need in the table'	It is agreed that this seems a sensible approach.
Resident	Identified Need 3	WP58	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 3	WP223	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 3	WP291	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Identified Need 3	WP878	On the basis of the need to promote the recycling and recovery of wood waste up the waste hierarchy, NESG consider a criteria based policy to be appropriate.	Your support is welcomed
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Identified Need 3	WP754	Existing Facility at Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton Eco obtained planning permission for an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility at Bourne Park Estate in June 2010 (Planning Ref: 1/D/2008/0989). The AD Facility was designed to process 25,000 tonnes per year of organic domestic and commercial waste and 12,000 tonnes of agricultural slurry arising from local pig farms. The facility would generate up to 1,000KW of power, via a CHP engine driven generator, for supply to the Local Distribution Network, whilst the final digestate would be used on farms as a soil improver or conditioner. The AD Facility commenced operation in late-2012 and is operating efficiently. We consider that the Piddlehinton site offers scope for the location of further waste management activities. The site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood and green waste transfer station. The location for such a facility is indicated in Figure 2 overleaf. It is our contention that Eco's existing site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for a small green waste composting site. We consider that the receipt of bulky waste for bulking to Parley could be undertaken in an efficient and sustainable manner at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton.	An assessment will be made of the suitability of Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton for additional uses. Further public consultation is also planned for Spring 2016.
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Identified Need 3	WP754	The site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood transfer station alongside a green waste composting site. Paragraph 5.26 of the Draft Waste Plan states that given the current movement of waste and the location of existing facilities there is likely to be need for green waste composting capacity in the west of Dorset. It is our contention that Eco's existing site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for a green waste transfer station. The presence of the existing AD Facility would help to maximise resource efficiency at this location. Similarly, Paragraph 5.47 of the Draft Waste Plan identifies that 22,000 tonnes per annum of bulky waste currently arises from household recycling centres in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. This is projected to increase by 7,000 tonnes per annum at the end of the Plan period. We consider that the receipt of bulky waste could be undertaken in an efficient and sustainable manner at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton. Figure 2: Location of Existing Site and Potential Area of Expansion Source:	An assessment will be made of the suitability of Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton for additional uses. Further public consultation is also planned for Spring 2016.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 3	WP785	Organic/ wood waste: Identified Need 3 We agree with this, but feel more should be done to move the treatment of wood further up the hierarchy, by the provision of more opportunities and incentives for wood to be re-used before the shredding and chipping in 5.31, which should be seen as a last resort. See our comment on recycling centres.	Your comments are noted, ensuring that this type of material is collected separately, through HRC's, should help to increase re-use if the markets for this material are available.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 3	WP733	W H White considers a criteria based policy to be appropriate	Your support is welcomed

W H White LTD	Identified Need 3	WP736	On the basis of the need to promote the recycling and recovery of wood waste up the waste hierarchy W H White considers a criteria based policy to be appropriate	Your support is welcomed
Resident	5.45	WP59	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Hampshire County Council	5.45	WP440	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 4	WP60	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 4	WP99	As previously mentioned, consideration should be given to certain "special" categories of food waste generators (e.g. small hotels, food-premises, etc.) where factors such as logistics of storage, collection and costs (to the waste generator) may prove limiting or detrimental to those smaller businesses, hence adversely impacting the whole scenario as well as posing commercial risks to small business survivability and general vitality of the affected areas.	Your comments have been passed to the appropriate authority
Resident	Identified Need 4	WP224	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 4	WP292	I note that many households appear not to be separating food waste (i.e. by seeing what bins are left out). This is presumably detrimental to overall waste collection and disposal. Perhaps more attention will be needed to encouragement and even enforcement.	Your comments are noted. The WPA understands given current economic circumstances the money available for recycling and food waste collection related initiatives may be limited.
New Earth Group	Identified Need 4	WP879	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.46 & Identified Need 4 On the basis of the small identified need and the requirement to promote the recovery of food waste up the waste hierarchy, NESG consider a criteria based policy to be appropriate. In order to facilitate efficient co-collection rounds, there might be an ongoing requirement for reception and bulking points alongside residual treatment facilities. This should also be recognised and supported within the Waste Plan.	Your support is welcomed. It is also agreed that there may be a need for food waste transfer facilities and that this should be recognised.
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Identified Need 4	WP821	We would submit that any food waste shortfall can be picked up with a Phase 3 (37,000 tonnes per annum) and possible Phase 4 (50,000 tonnes per annum) at the Bourne Park site in Piddlehinton	Your comments are noted and will be considered further.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 4	WP786	Organic/ food waste: Identified Need 4 This is fine.	Your comment is noted
W H White LTD	Identified Need 4	WP734	W H White considers a criteria based policy to be appropriate	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Identified Need 4	WP825	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.46 & Identified Need 4 Agree On the basis of the small identified need and the requirement to promote the recovery of food waste up the waste hierarchy, W H White considers a criteria based policy to be appropriate.	Your support is welcomed

Resident	5.47	WP226	Important to reduce the amount of bulky waste going to landfill. Should more be done to offer 'useable' bulky waste items to the public/local organisations at the HRC level? We are such a throwaway society.	Your comments are agreed with. Proposed Policy 4 requires applications for HRC's and WMC's to make provision for a covered area for the collection of items that could be re-used where there is space to do so.
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	5.47	WP758	Paragraph 5.50 of the Draft Waste Plan refers to bulky waste and the benefits of treatment facilities to separate this waste stream into different fractions and shredded into Reuse Derived Fuel (RDF) and Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF). Further to this, Identified Need 5 states that a bulky treatment facility is required to enable Dorset to move towards the aim of net self-sufficiency, divert this material from the residual stream and manage it further up the waste hierarchy. It should be noted that the recently approved application at Eco's Parley facility includes an SRF Processing Plant. The SRF Processing Plant will receive in-coming litter and plastics, which will represent a new waste stream for the Site. In addition, the plant will process litter that is taken from the green waste composting, litter from the Road Sweeping and Gully Waste Recycling Plant and the dried plastics that are diverted from the new Drying Plant. In this regard, the SRF Processing Plant will be part of an integrated process for the various waste streams, which is intended to maximise efficiency and minimise operational impacts through the sensible location of the various plant and processes. We would respectfully submit that Eco's SRF Processing Plant should be identified in the Draft Waste Plan as helping to meet the identified need and could also be expanded to take a higher tonnage, so covering Dorset's requirements more efficiently than having a number of sites across the county.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further. Any additional permitted capacity will be built in and the shortfall revised as necessary.
Hampshire County Council	5.47	WP441	Blue Haze Landfill site hosts both landfill and transfer operational capacity. Current operators predict the site to cease accepting waste by around 2020. As noted in Background Paper 3 it is assumed that movements from Dorset to this site in Hampshire will continue to for around ten years to this site and that this has been factored into the Dorset Waste Plans projections. Approx. 26,000 tonnes of waste was exported to this site (both transfer and landfill) from Dorset in 2013.	Your comments are noted and will be updated as appropriate.
Resident	Identified Need 5	WP61	Agree	Your comments are welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 5	WP195	I know this is a simplified comment, but bulky waste items take a lot of space to transfer them around the county. I hope that satisfactory disposal methods can be used to save them taking up valuable space in landfill.	Your comments are noted and agreed with
Resident	Identified Need 5	WP225	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 5	WP293	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Identified Need 5	WP755	Existing Facility at Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton Eco obtained planning permission for an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility at Bourne Park Estate in June 2010 (Planning Ref: 1/D/2008/0989). The AD Facility was designed to process 25,000 tonnes per year of organic domestic and commercial waste and 12,000 tonnes of agricultural slurry arising from local pig farms. The facility would generate up to 1,000KW of power, via a CHP engine driven generator, for supply to the Local Distribution Network, whilst the final digestate would be used on farms as a soil improver or conditioner. The AD Facility commenced operation in late-2012 and is operating efficiently. We consider that the Piddlehinton site offers scope for the location of further waste management activities. The site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood and green waste transfer station. The location for such a facility is indicated in Figure 2 overleaf. It is our contention that Eco's existing site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for a small green waste composting site. We consider that the receipt of bulky waste for bulking to Parley could be undertaken in an efficient and sustainable manner at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton. The site is ideally placed to accommodate the installation of a bulky wood transfer station alongside a green waste composting site.	An assessment will be made of the suitability of Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton for additional uses. Further public consultation is also planned for Spring 2016.

Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Identified Need 5	WP755	Paragraph 5.26 of the Draft Waste Plan states that given the current movement of waste and the location of existing facilities there is likely to be need for green waste composting capacity in the west of Dorset. It is our contention that Eco's existing site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for a green waste transfer station. The presence of the existing AD Facility would help to maximise resource efficiency at this location. Similarly, Paragraph 5.47 of the Draft Waste Plan identifies that 22,000 tonnes per annum of bulky waste currently arises from household recycling centres in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. This is projected to increase by 7,000 tonnes per annum at the end of the Plan period. We consider that the receipt of bulky waste could be undertaken in an efficient and sustainable manner at Bourne Park in Piddlehinton. Figure 2: Location of Existing Site and Potential Area of Expansion	An assessment will be made of the suitability of Bourne Park Estate, Piddlehinton for additional uses. Further public consultation is also planned for Spring 2016.
Hampshire County Council	Identified Need 5	WP442	Agree	Your support is welcomed
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 5	WP787	Bulky waste: Identified Need 5 OK, but there should be more emphasis on moving Bulky Waste right to the top of the Hierarchy through the provision, promoting and enabling of more Reuse and Repair workshops with employment and training opportunities. Council, Charity or private.	Your comments are noted. Policy 4 of the Waste Plan includes a criterion that requires HRC's and WMC's to make provision for a covered area for the collection of items that could be re-used where there is space to do so.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 5	WP826	On the basis of the need to promote bulky waste up the waste hierarchy, W H White supports the need for a site for bulky waste treatment.	Your support is welcomed
New Forest District Council	5.54	WP212	Draft Waste Plan This states that Dorset exports a proportion of its residual waste to Dimmer landfill site in Somerset and Blue Haze landfill site in Hampshire under contracts which are due to end in 2016 (residual refers to waste that cannot be or is not separated for recycling, composting or treatment). The draft plan confirms that Dorset will continue to send a consistent, albeit small, quantity of waste to Blue Haze with the assumption that the site will close towards the end of the plan period when movements will cease. It is RECOMMENDED that Dorset County Council, Bournemouth Borough Council, and Poole Borough Council be informed that New Forest District Council: a.) Supports the assumption made with regard to the anticipated closure of the Blue Haze landfill site towards the end of the plan period;	Your support is welcomed
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	5.54	WP562	Para 5.61 We strongly support the continued use of Blue Haze HRC by local East Dorset residents. It is encouraging that the draft Plan reports that DWP/HCC discussion indicate that this will continue though disturbing that at the EDEP meeting on 25 August, MWDF officers were indicating there is some doubt and other options are being explored. It meets the principle of proximity (Policy 1) and reduces the need to develop green field land, loss of ecosystem services and cost. Recommendation: The use of Blue Haze by residents of East Dorset should continue.	Your comments are noted, however it is appropriate to consider all options early in the plan making stage
New Earth Group	5.54	WP880	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.58 NESG can confirm that is the physical and operational measures required under the Permit Variation are being progressed, releasing latent capacity within the existing MBT plant.	Your comments are noted
Hampshire County Council	5.54	WP443	5.60 HCC notes remaining void of 5 year capacity at Beacon Hill in Corfe Mullen. Approximately 23,000 tonnes of waste was exported from Hampshire to this site in 2013, 21,000 of this from Fareham BC alone.	Your comments are noted

Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Table 11	WP759	Table 11 of the Draft Waste Plan sets out the identified shortfall in capacity for residual waste during the Plan period up to 2031. The projected shortfalls are significant, rising to 212,000 tonnes per annum by 2031. However, Paragraph 5.70 states that there is sufficient capacity for residual waste until 2019 and that the shortfall does not become significant (42,000 tpa) until the end of the Plan period. This statement appears to conflict with Table 11 and we would therefore advise that it should be clarified. Aside of this issue, we also feel that the potential gasification/Pyrolysis/SRF unit at Parley could be further expanded to undertake treatment of residual waste, so assisting the county in its management of this material	The figures contained in Table 11 refer to a combined total of local authority collected waste and commercial and industrial waste. Paragraph 5.70 demonstrates the shortfall in capacity when considering only local authority collected waste.
Resident	5.66	WP196	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	5.66	WP881	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.66 - 5.71 NESG understood the Waste Plan to be technology neutral (as suggested at para. 5.68) and are surprised therefore to see reference to the provision of energy recovery facility(s), to the exclusion of other forms of recovery such as MBT and autoclaves. That said, NESG readily acknowledge that energy recovery will need to form part of a longer term solution, as a complimentary technology, but that is not to say that technologies such as MBT cannot play an enhanced role. Indeed the co-location of the Canford MBT facility and consented Advanced Thermal Conversion plant provides an ideal opportunity for intensification. The commentary in paragraph 5.70 regarding the challenge associated with delivering merchant capacity is duly acknowledged. NESG has seen other examples where this has driven up the scale and throughput of energy recovery facilities, particularly those employing mass burn technology. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the scale of any future facility is commensurate with identified needs and doesn't jeopardise waste being promoted up the waste hierarchy. The option presented in 5.71 is attractive in that it will allow time for new forms of energy recovery to mature, such as pyrolysis and gasification.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
W H White LTD	5.66	WP828	Chapter 5: Paragraphs 5.66 - 5.71 Disagree W H White understood the Waste Plan to be technology neutral (as suggested at para. 5.68) and is surprised therefore to see reference to the provision of energy recovery facility(s), to the exclusion of other forms of recovery such as MBT and MRF. That said, W H White readily acknowledges that energy recovery will need to form part of a longer term solution, as a complimentary technology, but that is not to say that technologies such as MRF cannot play an enhanced role. Indeed the co-location of the Canford MRF facility and consented Advanced Thermal Conversion plant provides an ideal opportunity for intensification. The option presented at paragraph 5.71 is attractive in that it will allow time for new forms of energy recovery to mature, such as pyrolysis and gasification.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further.
Resident	Identified Need 6	WP62		Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 6	WP100	I continue to despair of suppliers who continue to over-package al manner of items, large and small. My record example is a 1 gramme ployurethane-"rubber"-sealed glass vial of a specific chemical, packaged inside a hierarchy of boxes culminating with a 1m-cubed double-corrugated cardboard box, all layers bearing plastic film and or non-recyclable due to overprinting (toluene-based offset process) plus intermediate plastic-bubble, "mineral" packing filler, paper etc. - all intermingled in a way that made it difficult/impossible to recycle any of it! And desperately typical of nearly ALL suppliers of everything! I also liked the BandQ bubble-pack for 2 door handles that took me 30 minutes of sweaty effort with a range of tools from knives, screwdrivers, shears, pillars etc. to release and NONE of the packaging recyclable! It is time to call time on manufacturers and suppliers - rein it back on packaging, please!	Your comments have been noted, however there is very little that the Waste Plan can do to address such issues.
Resident	Identified Need 6	WP197	I agree with the previous comment, that there is far too much packaging on a lot of goods. I think suppliers should look to changing the way they package stuff and if they feel they should put several layers of packaging on their goods, they should ensure that it is recyclable as far as possible.	Your comments have been noted and are generally agreed with, however there is very little that the Waste Plan can do to address such issues.
Resident	Identified Need 6	WP227	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Identified Need 6	WP882	Chapter 5: Identified Need 6 The statement should refer to residual waste recovery, not be automatically pre-disposed to the provision of energy recovery facilities. Scale is also considered a crucial component of the need, particularly given the potential surplus capacity beyond the plan area. It is considered that commentary to this effect would be helpful.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further, however it is agreed that the Plan should remain as flexible as possible to allow for the best available technologies.

New Earth Group	Identified Need 6	WP891	Chapter 9: The need for recovery facilities: Identified Need 6 and paragraph 9.13 The emerging Plan professes to be technology neutral, but is pre-disposed to meeting the shortfall in residual capacity through the provision of energy recovery facilities, to the exclusion of other complementary technologies such as MBT. Indeed it is noted that paragraph 9.13 outlines MBT, but whilst producing an RDF such technology would not, in itself, generate heat or power.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 6	WP788	Residual waste: Identified Needs 6 and 7 As we have already asserted in our answers to questions 1, 2 and 3, we think you have over-erred on the side of caution and thus over estimated waste arising's generally. Over-provision for dealing with residual waste will have the effect of discouraging the movement of waste up the hierarchy. We believe you have not sufficiently factored in the likely effects of waste minimisation initiatives, either at a local level or by the government, which would have the effect of reducing the amount of waste produced. Any technology dealing with residual waste should be chosen on the basis that it will cause the least harm to the environment. The benefits of the recovery of through any form of thermal treatment should be weighed against any harmful effects to the environment or human health and safety including of course that of the operatives. Burning residual waste is a very poor choice and should not be used. Large and medium waste burners demand lots of waste and this undermines recycling. Small burners that are not used continuously or at a sufficiently high temperature give pollution. Pyrolysis and gasification still have question marks about safety depending on the technology. Occasionally, disposal to landfill may be the least bad option. For example, if the amount of CO 2 produced by using residual waste to produce energy is greater than the CO 2 and methane that would have been given off by the fuel it is replacing, landfill may be preferable, taking transport, etc., into consideration.	The WPA has discussed targets for recycling, recovery and disposal with the three waste management authorities. Unfortunately, due to the current economic climate Dorset Waste Partnership are committed to maintaining the current reduce, recycling and composting rate of 60%, but are not planning targets for increased recycling that can be built into the Waste Plan projections. Bournemouth Borough Council are considering collecting a wider range of materials at the curb side including WEEE, batteries and textiles. If implemented these measures would see increased recycling rates and reduction of residual waste. However, it is too early to quantify any increases and build this into the projections. This will be monitored and if possible reflected in the final Waste Plan. The Borough of Poole are planning for an increase in the recycling rate which will be built into the projections. Poole also plan to introduce alternate weekly collections in Autumn 2016 which should increase the recycling rate and decrease residual tonnage further. This will be monitored and if possible an allowance will be made in the final Waste Plan. It is difficult to quantify other waste minimisation initiatives and it is considered that the Waste Plan is correct in taking a cautious approach to ensure that we don't underprovide. The policy context should ensure that the movement of waste up the hierarchy is maximised. The Waste Plan seeks to be technology neutral to ensure that the best available technologies for specific locations can be brought forward during the Plan period.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 6	WP827	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.55 and identified Need 6 Comment It should be noted that the established MRF at the Site Control Centre, at Canford at Poole, receives residual waste, principally commercial and industrial arising's but also some municipal arising's. Notwithstanding the opportunity to separate and sort DMR, the ability to treat commercial waste is likely to be retained in some shape or form. Should the facility not be required for DMR it would offer further residual capacity. Given the locational requirements set out at paragraph 5.68 and the challenges of delivery outlined at paragraph 5.70 of the emerging Plan, the potential availability of this facility should not be overlooked.	The Draft Waste Plan considered the Site Control Centre for intensification both within the existing site and/or within the two suggested extension areas. Further consideration will be given for the allocation of the Site Control Centre for treatment of additional residual waste as an alternative to the development of a MRF.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 6	WP829	Chapter 5: Identified Need 6 Disagree The statement should refer to residual waste recovery, not be automatically pre-disposed to the provision of energy recovery facilities. Scale is also considered a crucial component of the need, particularly given the potential surplus capacity beyond the plan area. It is considered that commentary to this effect would be helpful.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further.
Resident	Identified Need 7	WP63	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 7	WP228	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Somerset County Council	Identified Need 7	WP500	We look forward to maintaining dialogue at a sub-regional level with regard to landfill capacity for non-hazardous residual waste. Given the proposed closure of the Dimmer landfill site in Somerset and expected closure of Dorset's two landfill sites, maintaining this wider dialogue will be important.	Your comments are noted and agreed with.

New Earth Group	Identified Need 7	WP883	Chapter 5: Identified Need 7 Whilst Bournemouth Dorset and Poole is undoubtedly on the path towards a zero waste economy, there will remain a small proportion of waste that cannot be re-used, recycled or recovered. It is also important to ensure that contingency is in place for unforeseen events an example being the fires at Trigon that saw the temporary closure of the site to waste deliveries.	Your comments are noted and agreed with.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 7	WP830	Chapter 5: Identified Need 7 Agree W H White concurs with the identified need.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 4	WP11	Agree	Your support is welcomed.
Resident	Question 4	WP64	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 4	WP229	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 4	WP311	As 70% has already been achieved and exceeded in many years.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 4	WP699	YES 80% should be recycled	Your support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 4	WP379	Inert waste has so many uses that it should be possible, over time, to improve on this figure. This is one area where the use of recycled inert waste rather than freshly mined aggregate might be encouraged by subsidies or some sort of tax advantage.	Your comments are noted
Somerset County Council	Question 4	WP501	We would be interested to discuss data available that helps to support the 80% recycling assumption for inert waste. To set this in context, we have found calculating the relative percentages for inert waste management is not a straight-forward task there is a good deal of uncertainty. Paragraph 4.25 notes that over half C,D&E waste was recycled nationally in 2010. Clearly the percentage of inert waste that is recycled will be different (and likely higher); but if the proportion that is re-used on-site is discounted from the calculation, what do the available data indicate?	It is agreed that ascertaining the proportion of inert waste that is recycled is not straightforward. The baseline figure used is the amount that was managed at facilities in Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole (excluding transfer facilities). Whilst this is not a perfect way of establishing arising's, it means that any inert waste reused/recycled on site, and therefore not entering the waste stream, is not included.
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Question 4	WP705	We believe the figure of 80% inert waste recycling is over optimistic. As stated above much of the growth in the amount of inert materials is likely to be in the form of excavation spoils some of which will unsuitable for recycling. We believe a 70% figure is more realistic.	Your comments will be considered further when preparing the final Waste Plan.
Hampshire County Council	Question 4	WP484	Agree, based on current rate of recycled inert waste and in accordance with requirement of revised WFD.	Your support is welcomed

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 4	WP789	Question 4: Inert waste Do you agree with the assumption that 80% of inert waste will be recycled over the Plan period? No. Go for 90%	Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to a higher recycling rate.
Purbeck District Council	Question 4	WP925	As it is not a fixed percentage and there is a degree of flexibility, an 80% inert waste recycling rate seems reasonable.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	5.76	WP831	Chapter 5: Paragraph 5.79 Comment Please note that the aggregates recycling facility at Whites Pit benefits from temporary consent only. As per our responses to the Minerals Sites Plan, W H White would respectfully request that the facility be allocated in order to meet the longer term need for inert recycling capacity. Whilst a related satellite site (specifically the washing plant) has been retained within the site control centre, this will shortly be moved to the Whites Pit facility.	This will be amended in our capacity calculations. The allocation of the site will be considered through the Mineral Sites Plan.
Resident	5.84	WP198	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Albion Stone PLC	5.84	WP318	I am unable to find the section in the Mineral Plan that sets out the quarry sites that would utilise inert waste as part of the restoration.	The emerging Mineral Sites Plan will allocate specific sites for mineral extraction. Where it is proposed that restoration of a specific site will use inert waste, it is expected that this will be set out in the site information/development criteria.
Hampshire County Council	5.84	WP485	5.85 Agree	Your support is welcomed
Halletec Environmental Ltd	5.84	WP535	5.85 - The Waste Plan identifies a need for inert recycling facilities in the west and north of the county. A number of sites within the current Draft Mineral Sites will be able to service these areas. See also comments under 5.86 below. 5.86 - Identified Need 8 stipulates there will likely be a requirement for additional suitable sites due to a shortfall in inert landfill capacity. Since the introduction of the European Waste Directive the volumes of active waste has fallen significantly as more waste is recycled and / or converted to other uses. The volumes of inert construction and demolition wastes have not fallen to the same extent. The primary source of inert waste is construction activity which is linked directly to the health of the local economy. The UK is one of the best performing European States in terms of recycling inert waste and currently generates in the region of 30% recyclate for re-use in construction. Sand and gravel extraction and inert waste disposal and recycling are very similar in scope and nature and can usually function alongside each other on the same site sharing the same infrastructure. Accordingly where possible it makes practical and environmental sense for both activities to be located along side each other. The use of inert fill materials in the restoration of quarries is well recognised and can add significantly to the sustainable development of land for mineral extraction where, in appropriate circumstances, inert fill is utilised for reinstatement and restoration. The combination of shallow deposits and relatively high water table in a number of Dorset sand and gravel deposits renders some sites particularly suitable for restoration with inert waste materials. Where appropriate restoration using imported inert fill materials should be encouraged. Through the use of imported inert fill for restoration enhancement the overall sustainability of mineral and waste activities can be enhanced by the following: I) increase opportunities for restoration enhancement, ii) reduce the amount of inert waste going to landfill, iii) increase opportunities to recycle, iv) reduce traffic volumes by encouraging back loading, v) increase the scope for conversion and recovery of waste.	Your comments are noted and it is agreed that co-location of inert waste facilities with quarries can be beneficial. It is particularly beneficial if non-recyclable inert waste can be used to facilitate the restoration of mineral workings, potentially enabling the 'recovery' of this waste rather than 'disposal'. The emerging Mineral Sites Plan will allocate specific sites for mineral extraction. Where it is proposed that restoration of a specific site will use inert waste, it is expected that this will be set out in the site information/development criteria. This will be taken into account in the final version of the Waste Plan.
Resident	Identified Need 8	WP66	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Identified Need 8	WP230	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Resident	Identified Need 8	WP297	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Albion Stone PLC	Identified Need 8	WP317	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Identified Need 8	WP706	A criteria - based policy for the identification of inert waste facilities is strongly supported because the nature and scale of inert waste operations would make it impossible to identify and allocate all the sites which may be required to meet future needs throughout the Plan period. However, as stated above, we do not accept the surplus/shortfall projections set out in Table 12 because we believe these should be based on the high growth scenario. The actual usable the permitted void (Existing Capacity) set out in paragraph 5.76 and Table 12 is also uncertain. It is essential therefore that the plan should contain sufficient flexibility to enable future needs to be met based on the actual requirement over the plan period. The plan should therefore include a contingency to cover these uncertainties. The Plan should also include the criteria based policy referred to in Need 8. It is not certain if the policies set out in Chapter 12 are intended to be these criteria, however, we believe the plan should contain a specific policy setting out the locational criteria for inert waste landfill/land recovery facilities based on the locational criteria as set out in Appendix A in the National Planning Policy for Waste.	Your support is welcomed. It is agreed that a criteria based policy will enable the flexibility to deliver sufficient facilities.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Identified Need 8	WP790	Identified Need 8 This is fine but please name the criteria, or give examples if they would be site specific, or else explain what you mean by a criteria-based policy.	A draft criteria based policy is included in Chapter 10 of the Draft Waste Plan - Proposed Policy 7.
W H White LTD	Identified Need 8	WP832	Chapter 5: Question 4 and Identified Need 8 Comment This is considered a pragmatic starting point, albeit W H White would suggest that flexibility needs to be built into the Plan to reflect the fact that C,D&E waste will fluctuate over time and that restoration projects might well provide buffer capacity during peak periods. W H White would also suggest that flexibility be given to take account of the wider economic, environmental and amenity benefits accruing from restoration / engineering works and the end use. Clearly this would need to be assessed on a case by case basis and this lends itself to a criteria based approach.	It is considered that the proposed criteria based policy (see Proposed Policy 7, Chapter 10) provides for flexibility.
Highways England	6.1	WP337	Highways England supports the requirement for appropriate waste management facilities to support economic development and the needs of society whilst minimising the impact. We are content with the spatial strategy for expansion as set out, based on evidence of the levels of waste likely to be produced going forward compared with the facilities in place.	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	6.1	WP884	Chapter 6: A Vision The sentiment expressed in the Vision is supported. NESG is pleased to see emphasis placed upon partnership working, recognising the crucial role of delivery partners in operating existing infrastructure and investing in new plant and facilities. NESG is also pleased to see reference the innovative and effective network of waste management facilities and the need for flexibility moving forward. However, the first sentence of the second paragraph would benefit from re-ordering to reflect the waste hierarchy; so start with the optimisation of waste prevention as source reinforced through education initiatives and collection regimes. Thereafter the focus should be on reuse, recycling and recovery and the operation of existing waste management infrastructure and delivery of infrastructure that enhances the network.	Your comments are helpful and the vision will be amended to better reflect the waste hierarchy.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	6.1	WP791	Our suggestion is zero waste, where nothing goes into incinerators nor into landfill (bar inert waste). What you say is admirable but we would ask you to go farther. Also, if by planned growth you mean population and housing growth, then the Vision is fine. If, however, you mean economic growth then this should be decoupled from waste generation, as required by the government. You need to make this clear. This vision is why there should be no contracts that depend on the Councils supplying fixed quantities of waste to operators.	Your comments are noted. However, the Waste Plan must use the best available evidence to project waste arising's throughout the Plan period and seek to allocate to appropriate sites for the management of that waste. Although zero waste is an overarching government ambition it is unlikely to be achieved in Dorset during the plan period.
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP67	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	6.2	WP199	Let's hope this can all be achieved.	Your comments are noted

Resident	6.2	WP298	As a set of objectives, no problem - it's how this is achieved that counts	Your comments are noted
New Earth Group	6.2	WP885	Chapter 6: Objective 1 Agree NESG welcome and share the view that waste should be seen as a resource. Chapter 6: Objective 2 Agree NESG support the intent and wording of the Objective, which is clearly consistent with National Policy, Practice Guidance and Guidance on the interpretation of the rWfD. Chapter 6: Objective 3 Agree Flexibility is an essential agreement, particularly over the life of a 15 year Plan, and the explicit reference to enabling emerging technologies. Chapter 6: Objective 4 Disagree NESG concur with the intent of the objective albeit recommend that safeguard replace protect, in the interest of clarity. Chapter 6: Objective 5 Agree NESG welcome and share the view that efficient and effective waste management plays a vital role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and building resilience to climate change. Chapter 6: Objective 6 Agree As the operator of an established waste management facility in Poole, NESG support this objective.	Objective 4 - the Waste Planning Authority is happy to amend the objective as suggested if it would provide clarity
Hampshire County Council	6.2	WP486	6.2 Objective 6 incompatible?	This is an overarching objective; incompatible development is further explained in Chapter 13.
Hampshire County Council	6.2	WP487	6.2 Objective 2 self sufficiency over half of users visiting Somerley HWRC in Hampshire in 2014 were surveyed to be from East Dorset DC residents according to user survey commissioned by HCC.	Your comments are noted, Objective 2 also addresses the proximity principle which would apply to residents of East Dorset utilising the Somerly household recycling facility.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	6.2	WP792	Objective 1. We agree with all of this except that we would add to the last sentence, unless the only possible alternatives to landfill are more harmful. Objective 2 We agree with this, but caution against creating a toxic ring around the conurbation. Objective 3 Yes, but emerging technologies needs qualifying - emerging technologies, providing they move waste up the hierarchy or they are environmentally beneficial. Objective 4 Yes but please add tourism and the safety , health and wellbeing of the local people and of the operators . Objective 5 and Objective 6 Agreed.	Objective 1 is consistent with the waste hierarchy with disposal to landfill as a last resort Objective 2 - your comments are noted Objective 3 - the Waste Plan is seeking to be technology neutral to allow for the best available technologies to be brought forward when needed during the Plan period. Objective 4 - It is considered that 'safety' is included within health. 'local people' will be broadened in scope by the omission of 'local'
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP68		Your support is welcomed
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP564	Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy We do not support the approach to the acknowledged conflict (tensions) between sustainability and economic benefits. Recommendation: The Plan should not take this short term approach: it is unacceptable in the context of climate change and management of non-renewable resources. The final sentence of the Sustainability Appraisal Summary of the Objectives refers to mitigation to acceptable levels. This is imprecise Recommendation: Criteria should be established to determine what is acceptable. Economic benefits would be a great bonus if achieved but first and foremost we must have a sustainable programme for disposing of waste in all its forms without further adverse impact on climate, the local environment and the needs of an increasing local population. By 2027 East Dorset is likely to see an increase in population of about 15,000 to 20,000 with much of that centred round existing settlements. It is understood that Bournemouth and Poole together could see a similar increase. From 1955 to 2015 (a sixty year period) the population of Bournemouth has quadrupled. In that time, Verwoods population has increased by a factor of 8. Increases in population in this part of the country are driven not just by need but also by incoming population because of the appeal of the area. Para 4.3 highlights this problem but omits any reference to tourism. In planning for waste, we should also be looking at what happens beyond the Plan Period. Although commercial waste is discussed throughout the report, there is little if any acknowledgement of the increases that are likely on new/extended employment sites. Within the Christchurch & East Dorset Plan area there are major planned extensions to the Airport Business Park which we understand will be taken up primarily by aerospace industry and generate a significant increase in commercial waste; Uddens/Ferndown Industrial Estate; and Woolsbridge Employment site. Given the rate at which Hi-Tech Industry is developing in the UK, and the LPAs vision of a being a growth area for knowledge based industry, areas like Bournemouth, Poole, Christchurch and East Dorset will increasingly be seen as attractive areas for commercial exploitation. The final waste plan must identify and, as far as it is able, quantify and factor in the needs of this further development, if necessary safeguarding land based on the proximity principle so that appropriate waste facilities do not extend further and further into sensitive urban fringe and rural sites. Recommendation: Growth in population, tourism and commercial waste during and beyond the plan period should be taken into consideration. While economic benefits should be achieved where possible, sustainability is crucial.	Your comments are noted, however it is maintained that there is an inevitable tension between objectives that will lead to the provision of new waste facilities and those that aim to protect the environment. This is a summary of the SA and the WPA would suggest that the whole SA is read to fully understand the complex range of issues. The final Waste Plan will include a detailed range of policies containing specific criteria that ensure that impacts are mitigated to acceptable levels balancing the need for waste facilities with environmental issues. Growth in waste arising from the commercial sector has been built into the projections, waste arising's will be monitored and any significant increases (or decreased) beyond planned levels will be identified which could, if necessary, result in a need to review the Waste Plan (or part of it).

New Earth Group	6.3	WP886	Chapter 6: Spatial Strategy The spatial strategy is noted. It is considered that it provides a clear, concise expression of the need for new facilities.	Your support is welcomed
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	6.3	WP793	Spatial strategy 1 Strategic recycling facilities: Why just one large MRF in south East Dorset? Wouldn't smaller MRFs throughout Dorset follow the proximity principle better? 2 Local recycling : Wimborne, see under site options. Other areas are outside our remit 3 Green Waste Composting : Good, but some of the green waste could be moved up the hierarchy by facilitating home and community composting 4. Food Waste Treatment : Good, but only after a comprehensive food waste reduction effort. Perhaps this could be linked to Bournemouth's sustainable food city existing initiative. No burning, please, just anaerobic digestion. Separate food and kitchen waste collection needs encouraging. 5. Bulky Waste: Yes, but first every effort should be made to move Bulky waste up the Hierarchy (as identified in Need 5) and, for example, through the auspices of the excellent on-line Dorset Waste Directory 6. Residual Waste : If Dorset is successful in pushing waste up the hierarchy and aim for zero waste, then hopefully the shortfall will be much less. A flexible approach to technology is good. We also need a flexible approach to quantity of waste arising, dealt with by more than one facility to satisfy the proximity principle. 7. Landfill disposal : Much of Trigon is wet heath or should be restored to this and so it is probably unsuitable for residual waste. Please name the criteria, or give examples if they would be site specific, or else explain what you mean by a criteria-based policy. A zero waste policy, or moving waste up the hierarchy, would considerably reduce the need for landfill. 8. Hazardous Waste Management : Please explain brought forward. Teaching establishments also need to be more careful with hazardous waste. 9. Inert Waste management : OK, but need to look more to using inert waste as raw material building or other uses.	1. There are already a number of small MRF's in Dorset. However, with the co-mingled collection that has been rolled out throughout the county these smaller facilities do not have the sophisticated machinery required to adequately sort the material. As explained in the Waste Plan, funding has been secured for a MRF and planning permission has already been granted on a number of sites. An appropriate network of local transfer facilities will be essential to reduce the movement of waste around the county. 2. Noted. 3. It is agreed that home and community composting should be encouraged as it will reduce the movement of waste. 4. Your comments are noted and are not discouraged by the Waste Plan. During the Plan period it is likely that all homes in the Plan area will have a separate food waste collection. 5. Policy 4 should see any new/improved HRC's making provision for a re-use area which should assist in moving bulky waste up the waste hierarchy. 6. Your comments are noted, quantities of waste arising will be monitored to ensure the Waste Plan policy remain up to date. 7. Policy 6 provides a series of appropriate criteria for assessing applications for non-hazardous waste disposal. 8.'Brought forward' refers to a planning application being brought forward for a facility for managing hazardous waste, should the need arise. 9. Agree
Devon County Council	Question 5	WP27	The updated wording to Objective one is supported.	Your comment is noted
Resident	Question 5	WP70	This is logical and comprehensive. It may not be popular but it is necessary	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 5	WP101	The overall policy seems generally reactive (we are where we are, I suppose) but I can't help wishing for elements of "education" on waste, for manufacturers, packagers, operatives ad the public at large. Major problems are looming and we are going to end up in the same boat. In 40/50 years time, there may be no money, energy, materials, water, other resources - to tackle anything. What we start now is an answer for decades to come. Let us at least get everyone on board.	Your comments are noted, however the Waste Plan is not able to actively promote education, this is the role of the Waste Management Authorities. Unfortunately the current economic climate is likely to result in less waste related initiatives than in the past.
Resident	Question 5	WP200	I agree with all this and also the comment that we need to educate people, manufacturers etc. on the need to reduce waste or at least, to be able to recycle packaging.	Your comments are noted, unfortunately it is beyond the scope of the Waste Plan to encourage manufacturers to reduce waste, and this is best dealt with at a national level.
Resident	Question 5	WP231	The Spatial Strategy would seem to cover everything, but more must be done to commit manufacturers to produce packaging which is as near 100% recyclable as possible.	Your comments are noted

Trigon Estate	Question 5	WP283	The 6 objectives as set out in Chapter 6 are sensible and lead to the proposed Spatial Strategy. I agree with the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy and therefore give a positive answer to question 5. If, at any time in the future there is a proposal to change the safeguarding of the Trigon Landfill capacity I would ask to be consulted.	Your support is welcomed
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 5	WP312	The vision is agreed with and all objectives except Objective 6, seeks to safeguard existing waste management facilities from incompatible non-waste development. It is unclear how this will be achieved with industrial sites being able to convert to dwellings without planning permission. The Spatial Strategy is agreed with, however the Plan does not seek to introduce renewable energy options such as anaerobic digestion within Dorset.	Your support is welcomed.
Resident	Question 5	WP328	There has been no criteria given why the Strategic Materials Recovery facility should be situated in SE Dorset. This appears to be normal DCC policy to dump all unwanted items in East Dorset so as not to offend the gentry in Dorchester, Bournemouth and Poole. There is already over-concentration of waste facilities in East Dorset.	There is an identified need for a Strategic MRF in the SE Dorset area as this is where the greatest quantities of recyclables are generated. A number of planning permissions have already been granted within Poole.
Resident	Question 5	WP700	YES to Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy. However in the consideration of non recyclable waste recovery the report gives very scant information for non experts on the issues of pollution, leakage, and emissions. For example there is NO specific mention of a 35 - 40 metre chimney requirement in these sections. This is a very important element to consider.	Agree, the Waste Planning Authority has undertaken further work to ensure that the emerging preferred options for managing residual waste are appropriate. This work will be published on our website once complete.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 5	WP380	We need proper advance planning for landfill sites with good spatial relationship to the major sources of waste materials and also, of course, to the waste management centres. Ideally the waste management centres might be adjacent or very close to the landfill sites.	Your comments are noted and agreed with, however there is less flexibility for the location of landfill sites than other forms of waste facility. In accordance with the waste hierarchy non-hazardous landfill will only be supported as a last resort.
Environment Agency	Question 5	WP618	Objective 4 notes enhance the natural environment, but Vision and Strategy only mention mitigation. We would strongly support that enhancement be included and designed in to all proposals, and as such, perhaps should be more strongly supported in the Vision and Strategy. We would also like to see the principle of working with, and not designing against, natural processes and function. This is relevant not just for the aquatic environment and water resources/flood risk, but to include habitat succession and where possible, provide ecosystem services for e.g.. recreation / SUDs etc. Therefore to include the above, we would like to see the Sustainability Appraisal summaries more strongly worded to give more influence to positive environmental outcomes.	Your comments are noted and a number of amendments have been made to the vision.
Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural	Question 5	WP684	The Vision and Objectives, set out in part 6 are laudable but objective 4 should include landscapes (as well as the biodiversity topics) so that there is no misunderstanding that Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with the focus on conserving and enhancing natural beauty, are included. It would also be helpful to note that the protect, conserve and enhance policies are for the benefit of the landscape and countryside for its own sake and not just for the wellbeing of local people.	Your comments are noted and specific reference to landscape has been made within Objective 4
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Question 5	WP707	No, Vision 9 fails to take account of the proposed criteria based approach favoured for the identification of suitable sites as stated in Need 8. As stated elsewhere, we would also question the reliability of estimated shortfall in capacity.	The spatial strategy is intended to summarise the spatial aspects of the Waste Plan. The detail, justification and criteria based polices are provided in the chapters that follow.
New Earth Group	Question 5	WP887	Chapter 6: Question 5 Subject to the detailed comments on wording set out above, NESG support the intent of the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy.	Your support is welcomed
Intelligent Land	Question 5	WP554	There is no infrastructure implementation plan for the specific site proposals and most particularly those reliant on the public sector. For example, there is little point in setting out the need to replace the recycling centres at Wimborne and Shaftsbury without a clear parallel business plan for implementation. The analysis of the split in function between the public and private sector is also blurred in this context. The answer to Question 5, therefore, is that this critical implementation dimension of the plan is missing	Implementation and monitoring will be addressed in greater detail in the final Waste Plan. The Waste Plan is a long term planning strategy and will ensure that sites are safeguarding to address the needs that have been identified within the Plan period. Monitoring of the Waste Plan will ensure that allocated waste sites are not unnecessarily safeguarded.

Hampshire County Council	Question 5	WP488	6.6 (Q5) Blue Haze Landfill has void capacity available until 2020.	It is our understanding that although the current contract ends 2016, Blue Haze is likely to be available for 10 years + for limited volumes. This will be clarified and our capacity assumptions updated.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Question 5	WP517	The Vision within the Plan states that: Waste management facilities will be flexible, appropriately sized, located, designed and operated to minimise impacts on climate change, local amenity, the local road network and the natural and built environment whilst meeting the needs of communities and businesses. The facilities should be located, designed and operated to minimise the adverse impacts on as there is the potential through careful location, design and operation to bring about benefits. In addition, the importance of local amenity as highlighted in the vision is not carried forward into the objectives. The most appropriate location for mention of local amenity in the vision would be in Objective 4.	It is agreed that the vision would be clearer with the addition of the word 'adverse' as suggested. The importance of 'local amenity' will also be reflected in Objective 4.
Halletec Environmental Ltd	Question 5	WP536	With regard to Spatial Strategy 9, Policy SG-3 of the Minerals Strategy (2014) suggests that aggregate recycling facilities will be safeguarded unless an alternative new site or facility within an acceptable distance can be provided. Accordingly, alternative sites should be sought for the inert waste activities currently undertaken at the Warmwell and Redbridge Road site in Crossways which are due to cease operations well within the period of the Waste Plan. The proposed sites for allocation in the current Mineral Sites Plan in the vicinity would allow a continuation of such activity in the local area.	Your comments are noted. If possible the next iteration of the Waste Plan will cross refer to the Mineral Sites document and the proposed allocated sites that will use inert material to aid restoration.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 5	WP579	Dorset Wildlife Trust is supportive of the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy in the Draft Waste Plan, particularly the objective to move waste up the Waste Hierarchy. Provision of better and more appropriately sited recycling and waste management facilities is therefore essential. It is also important that as much information as possible is provided to householders on ways to reduce waste and to reuse materials wherever possible, such as signposting local facilities and initiatives for the re-use of household items. Commercial and Industrial Waste should also be subject to a recycling target.	Your support is welcomed. There is very little that the Waste Plan can do in terms of education. Policy 4 does require proposals for HRC's to make provision for a re-use area which should assist in moving waste up the waste hierarchy.
W H White LTD	Question 5	WP833	Chapter 6: Question 5 Comment W H White supports the intent of the Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy.	Your support is welcomed
Purbeck District Council	Question 5	WP926	Purbeck District Council has no comments on the vision, objections and spatial strategy.	Noted
Resident	6.7	WP201	New sites might be a problem for people living in those areas. But we need to do something as soon as possible. Or we will be over-run with rubbish.	Your support for the allocation of new sites is welcomed.
Trigon Estate	7.1	WP284	Under Chapter 7 Identified Need 2 relating to localised Green Waste is interesting.	Your comment is noted
Campaign to Protect Rural England	7.1	WP514	We deplore the removal of recycling bins in towns and public spaces. Few people take their rubbish home with them but just throw it down where ever they are. Why cannot Dorset provide the double-sided bins like those in Poole, black on one side for landfill waste and blue on the other side for recyclables and both sides clearly labelled?	Your comments have been passed to the appropriate authority
Resident	7.4	WP71	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	7.4	WP202	Our local waste site in Christchurch is always busy; sometimes it is chaotic. If more housing is built in the area, I can see the need for a larger site.	Your comments are noted, consideration has been given to all Dorset's existing household recycling centres. Christchurch HRC has been identified as adequate but would benefit from being brought up to modern standards. It is considered that this could be achieved within the existing site.

Resident	7.4	WP232	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	7.4	WP888	Chapter 7: Paragraph 7.5 Transfer facilities are an integral part of modern day waste management, supporting effective and efficient collection regimes. The potential for transfer activities as part of, or alongside, established waste management facilities should also be recognised, particularly where this would support effective and efficient co-collection rounds (i.e. whereby residual and / or food and/or recyclates are picked up by a single compartmentalised refuse collection vehicle).	Agree, this will be reflected in the text
Resident	7.16	WP108	Green waste seems (to the layman at least) to be a "soft" target - relatively easy to upscale and take more benefit (e.g. sales of suitably processed and packed composted materials) - so perhaps a shame not to add further facilities out West, perhaps. Maybe there is scope for a certain amount of "customer pre-processing" ?	Your comments are noted. The Waste Plan acknowledges the need for facilities for managing green waste in the west of Dorset to improve the spatial distribution of facilities
Resident	7.16	WP203	I agree with previous comment on this.	Noted
Resident	7.22	WP110	I thought there existed some methods for recycling wood chip/dust etc. into useable articles (perhaps pallets, insulation slabs, etc., in addition to the normal fibreboard routes, etc.) Maybe I read about polymer-infiltrated wood fines being used to make quite strong and resilient structural components, also. Potential for relatively high-value-adding there.	Your comment is noted, any application for recycling wood for further reprocessing elsewhere would be considered against Policy 4.
Hampshire County Council	7.22	WP489	7.22 Approx. 5,000 tonnes of wood waste arrived at Wallington from Dorset in 2013.	Your comment is helpful, cross boundary movements are inevitable for this waste stream.
Hampshire County Council	7.24	WP490	7.24 metal recycling 1,700 tonnes of metal waste sent to Hampshire in 2013, 30% of this arrived at site at Hurstbourne Station, which is currently subject to a planning application for redevelopment which would lose capacity at the site. The application ref for the proposal is 14/02489/OUT and the respective LPA is Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.	Your comment is helpful, cross boundary movements are inevitable for this waste stream and its management tends to be market led. The loss of this facility is interesting however the WPA is confident that there will be an alternative facility within an appropriate proximity.
Resident	Policy 4 - Facilities to enable the recycling	WP234	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Policy 4 - Facilities to enable the recycling	WP450	North Dorset District Council supports Proposed Policy 4	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 4 - Facilities to enable the recycling of	WP889	Chapter 7: Policy 4 NESG support the intent of the emerging Policy in so far as it goes. However, NESG believe that the Policy should explicitly support transfer activities within or alongside established waste management facilities where this would support effective and efficient co-collection rounds (i.e. whereby residual and / or food and/or recyclates are picked up by a single compartmentalised refuse collection vehicle).	It is considered that Policy 2 would support transfer facilities alongside other waste management facilities. However this will be strengthened in the text accompanying Policy 2.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Proposed Policy 4 - Facilities to enable the recycling of	WP794	As stated, we are asking for re-use centres where recycling is an afterthought, not recycling centres where re-use is an afterthought. Household recycling facilities f) covered area : chosen sites should have space for a covered area and facilities in this covered area for display of items for sale and exchange. The design of the covered area should make for a pleasant customer experience.	Your comments are noted

W H White LTD	Policy 4 - Facilities to enable the recycling	WP834	Chapter 7: Policy 4 W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP233	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	8.1	WP111	Oh dear! Money!!! Cannot realistically achieve much, or anything like enough, without very substantial Government backing and acceptance that the whole country faces something of a precipice - Act now! Pay now! Or face increasingly dire consequences.	Your comments are noted and will be passed to the relevant authority.
Resident	8.1	WP204	Yes, we need to do it now. Or our grandchildren will face a dire future.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	8.1	WP299	It rather seems that all the fine and rather long-winded words of the previous sections are blown out of the water if there isn't any money to actually do all that is predicted to be needed. I'm not clear how the statement that almost all HRCs need some sort of improvement actually fits with the statements below suggesting that quite a few are 'adequate'? I would have liked to see a clearer view of priorities, otherwise it's hardly a long term plan (accepting that things do change). When it comes down to it, siting is the key issue for most people.	The Waste Plan is a long term planning strategy and will ensure that sites are safeguarding to address the needs that have been identified within the Plan period. Priorities for the improvement/relocation of recycling facilities are clearly set out within Chapter 8 of the Draft Waste Plan.
Wessex Water	8.1	WP602	Co-location of waste assets with facilities at Dorchester Wimborne Kinson is being considered and we will be seeking further discussion to ensure that appropriate arrangements can be agreed with waste processing at these sites.	Your comments are noted, it will be necessary to discuss these sites further in developing preferred options for the allocation of waste facilities in the Waste Plan.
New Earth Group	8.1	WP890	NESG support the principle of developing new transfer stations to serve the Dorchester, West Dorset area and Wareham, Purbeck area respectively.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	8.7	WP73	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 6	WP12	ND03 seems the best choice as close to major roads and easy access	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 6	WP37	Nd01 would be my preferred site	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 6	WP102	ND02 would seem to be a logical site. ND05 is unworkable due to AONB status, highways issues accessing the site from the A354 plus the proximity to a narrow part of the road crossing the Pimperne stream. The site is also partly flood plain.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Question 6	WP154	My view on the proposed sites is: ND01: Clearly the best site for HRC and transfer because: the site is already used for this purpose; the surrounding land is industrial; by keeping the site within the bypass, additional traffic is not added to the bypass and roundabouts; there are no water courses to cause concern from a contamination standpoint. ND02: This site would be second choice for HRC and transfer because: by keeping the site within the bypass, additional traffic is not added to the bypass and roundabouts; there are no water courses to cause concern from a contamination standpoint. ND03: I don't believe this site should be used for HRC and transfer because: it would cause additional traffic to the bypass and roundabouts; access would be difficult and it is possible at peak time that traffic would queue onto the bypass; it is a greenfield site; it is within an AONB. ND04: If the vehicle depot is to be separate from the HRC and transfer facility then this is clearly a good choice given existing use and facilities. ND05: This is probably the worst choice for HRC and transfer because: it is within an AONB; during the period of Great Dorset Steam Fair traffic queues from Tarrant Hinton to the bypass, making the site practically inaccessible from Blandford which is probably the largest user base; it is greenfield; the cost of appropriate screening and layout would be high; its furthest from the principal user base in Blandford; it would add traffic to the bypass and roundabouts; it would add to light pollution outside of Blandford; there is an immediately adjacent water course which is a concern from a contamination standpoint; Pimperne Brook flooded in 2014 in that area making the road impassable for some traffic; holiday traffic often queues on the A354 towards the bypass this would exacerbate the situation and add to the time take to make a round trip to the site from Blandford.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Clean Up Blandford Town Campaign Team	Question 6	WP174	Order of preference with reasons: 1. ND03 - easy access and a large area, will be built on in time, anyway. 2. ND02 - easy access, but in industry/retail development area, and better to allow people to walk to work, etc. 3. ND03 - built up site, but lots of rubbish which goes onto residential areas and streets. Sell for industry development. 4. ND05 - problems with Steam Fair period. Close to houses. 5. ND04 - too close to Town Centre - better use of land.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 6	WP181	Option ND01 is best for a Waste Management Centre. It will make use of existing derelict land and is the most convenient for the majority of users The greenfield sites outside the Blandford By-pass (options ND03 and ND05) should not be used any waste facility.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 6	WP235	ND01 Holland Way, Blandford This site is a greenfield site, adjoining Sunrise Business Park lying outside the existing settlement boundary. The site is being considered for a Waste Management Centre. ND03 Land south of Sunrise Business Park Two areas of land are being considered on allocated employment land within Holland Way Industrial Estate in order to improve the existing Waste Management Centre. Alternatively, the site could be developed as a transfer facility with the HRC element relocated to another location. ND01 - NOT IDEAL - CONSTRAINTS WITH REGARD TO ACCESS AND SIZE, AND WOULD REACH CAPACITY ND03 PREFERRABLE FOR A WMC AND TRANSFER STATION- GOOD ACCESS, GOOD SIZED SITE AND AWAY FROM RESIDENTIAL (AT THE MOMENT)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 6	WP313	ND01 - The site is not considered to be suitable to be expanded on. Although the staff at the existing site are extremely helpful the site already struggles to be user friendly, particularly in terms of highways issues. ND02 - It was noted that Asda is no longer coming to Blandford Forum, however that the Town Council is in discussion with other supermarkets. Blandford hopes to allocate this land for a supermarket within its Neighbourhood Plan and would not be appropriate for a waste management centre. ND03 - This site was considered most suitable as it is well located, with adverse impact to the AONB easily mitigated. Blandford are seeking to allocate this land as an extension to Sunrise Business Park with provision of a Waste Management Centre. ND04 - Providing the bypass is used for access it is not considered inappropriate for this site to serve as a vehicle depot. ND05 - This site is not considered suitable. It is in a poor location in terms of accessibility and the negative impact on the AONB could not be as easily mitigated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Question 6	WP451	ND01 Holland Way . This site scores highly in the Sustainability Appraisal. Option ND01 is not contrary to planning policy and could accommodate the facilities to meet the identified needs in the short term. Options ND02 and ND04 are also not contrary to policy, however both site have restricted capacity and would not be able to accommodate the full WMC required. Options ND03 and ND05 are both outside of settlement boundaries and within the AONB and are both contrary to national and local planning policy.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 6	WP381	ND01 This allocated employment land at the Holland Way Industrial site is the preferred option and should be used for these facilities rather than any of the other Greenfield sites.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 6	WP619	We do not have a preferred option for locating the Blandford Waste Management Centre, but we would point out that ND05 Land south of Pimperne is located in a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, which may mean it is not suitable for the proposed development. The preferred site(s) should be chosen based on the assessment of any environmental issues, and the one(s) with least potential environmental impact picked. We also wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Our previous comments for these sites should also be taken into account. Flood Risk Part of ND04 and ND05 sites encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at these two locations should one [or both] of them be deemed most suitable as the Blandford Waste Management Centre. Biodiversity: We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, we would have concerns over ND05 land south of Pimperne, due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications to an already heavily modified winterbourne stream, and if that were the preferred option, would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural	Question 6	WP686	In section 8 three of the potential sites are within this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although from a simplistic point of view the sites are relatively close to the boundary, nevertheless this AONB would see the location of waste treatment, disposal, or transfer station facilities, other than of a village / community scale, as entirely inappropriate within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Pimperne Parish Council	Question 6	WP391	The preferred option should be ND02 or ND03. Although there are merits in the former following ASDA's decision against taking up the space, it is believed that a retailing solution in the area is preferred. ND03 is the "wrong side" of the bypass but is already bordered by industrial units and access should be easily obtained via the Sunrise roundabout. ND05 is the least suitable option from perspectives of traffic management and the nature of the site itself. It will result in considerable extra traffic on the A354 and will necessitate costly road improvements. Moreover the proposed site is in a greenfield area within the AONB with important hedgerows and there could have an adverse impact on the landscape and environment. The site could be prone to flooding and possibly result in discharges of contaminants into the Pimperne stream and the River Stour.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Figure 7	WP74	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Highways England	Figure 7	WP338	Replacement of Blandford WMC and waste vehicle depot, North Dorset from the sites listed, HE has no preference. All the sites are located in the Blandford area and are therefore likely to have a similar impact on the SRN. We will however take an interest in this moving forward in order to ensure that the trips and trip distribution not have a severe impact in line with the NPPF.	Your comments are noted
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP236	Obviously, using greenfield site is not ideal, but must not take a short term view, bearing in mind the need/capacity identified up to 2031.	Your comment is noted
Resident	Question 7	WP38	Wd02 is my preferred option	Noted
Resident	Question 7	WP13	WD01 seems the best site	Noted
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 7	WP416	WD02 the old radio station is clearly the best option here for a transfer station and vehicle depot. The other sites may be too remote for an HRC but WD03 land south of stadium roundabout is the least unsuitable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 7	WP620	We do not have a preferred option for locating the Waste Transfer Station, but we would point out that WP WD04 Charminster Depot and WP WD05 Land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester are located in a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, which may mean they are not suitable for the proposed development. The preferred site(s) should be chosen based on the assessment of any environmental issues, and the one(s) with least potential environmental impact picked. We also wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Our previous comments for these sites should also be taken into account. Flood Risk : A significant proportion of WD05 site encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at this location should it be deemed most suitable as a Waste Transfer Station. Biodiversity: We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, we would have concerns over WD04 Stinsford due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications, and if that were the preferred option, would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality. Groundwater and contaminated land: Of all the sites in the draft plan, WD05 Land at Stinsford Hill is our least preferred site. This is due to it being immediately up-gradient of the Eagle Lodge PWS boreholes.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

	Question 7	WP368	Transfer Station WD02 Old Radio Station is identified in the draft plan as the most favourable site having been previously developed and having the least traffic impact. Whilst it has the space to include an HRC other factors, primarily traffic volume and access, mitigate against this use. Taking into account the various difficulties with the majority of the proposed sites and in particular Highways concerns (or objections) to siting outside the town boundary or where access via the SRN would be prevalent or essential, WD05 would seem to be the most pragmatic option despite its own limitations. As recited above, WD05 is large enough to include a combination of facilities and limits much of the potential general environmental impact that would occur beyond the site itself. Whilst there are other environmental and access problems to overcome, these are generic to all of the options in various ways and the best site will be the site which carries the least long term impact and offers the greater probability of long term availability.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council	Question 7	WP422	Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council strongly objects to the use of site WD03 for any waste management purposes. The location in question is adjacent to a busy junction between two major roads which already suffer from congestion at peak times. It is hard to see how any access could be created to this site which would not significantly further impact the traffic flow on the A354, causing a re-emergence of rat-running along side roads that has up until now been largely discouraged by the improved access to Weymouth along the A354. The land itself is known to flood. No consideration either seems to have been given to the residents of the Maiden Castle Farm cottages who could find that a waste management facility becomes a noisy next door neighbour. Again, earlier consultation with the AONB Partnership has highlighted a further concern that the site's impact when viewed from Maiden Castle seems to have been forgotten about - this is a hugely important monument, one of the largest hill forts in Western Europe and it is surely incongruous for such a site to have a development such as this within its sightlines. It should be noted by the County Council that following the recent Planning Inspectorate examination of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland local plan the inspector has removed the Trunk Road Service Area (TRSA) from the local plan for exactly this reason, stating "I do not find the case for a TRSA to be so compelling so as to outweigh the substantial harm that siting the scheme adjacent to the Stadium Roundabout would have on the landscape and historic features of national importance." We additionally object to the outward expansion of Dorchester towards the small farming village of Winterborne Monkton - it should not become a suburb of Dorchester by way of piecemeal development. We refer you to the Inspector's report into the precursor of the Adopted Local Plan which stated "I agree with the objector that development of this site would create a most undesirable precedent ignoring established policies to confine Dorchester to land within the bypass ... I agree that a park and ride site especially if coupled with a primary route service station would create unwanted noise, pollution, visual intrusion and light pollution in a countryside location...". She continues "I consider that the harm to the countryside and landscape from development of this site would outweigh the benefits to the transport system and town centre...". (Policy EA24, page 293m, paras 13.27.5 and 13.27.6)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 7	WP496	I have lived in Poundbury for 3 years in the new development of houses between the Bridport Road and Middle Farm Way leading up to the Monkeys Jump Roundabout. The opportunity for comments on your draft Waste Plan could not have come at a more opportune time in respect of the traffic flow in our area. Last Friday(during the afternoon) my wife and I were walking towards the Monkeys Jump roundabout and noticed that the traffic was gridlocked with tailbacks of vehicles on the A35(both in East and west directions), the A37 and Middle Farm Way. These tailbacks are not unusual and I just worry that the increase in traffic in this area will just get worse and worse if the construction of a Household Recycling Centre (for Parkway Farm WD08) or Waste Management Centre/HRC (for NW Monkeys Jump WD01) goes ahead. In the past, I have lived near to and used both the Charlton Lane Transfer Station at Shepperton in Surrey and St Erth in West Cornwall. It would appear to me that a combined HRC/WMC has many advantages -- such as the joint sharing of staff, offices and equipment(JCBs etc.). Yesterday I used the Loudsmill WD07 site. With improved access and updated facilities, I would have thought this could continue as an ideal position. I hope my comments will be found useful.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Dorchester Civic Society	Question 7	WP743	General Comments The provision of a transfer station in the next five years is seen as a strategic priority (para 8.4). The Society's observations therefore concentrate on this issue. It would seem logical that as the Household Recycling Centre is a longer term requirement any site chosen as a waste transfer station should be capable of expansion to also accommodate a replacement Household Recycling Centre for Dorchester. Given the location and setting of the town of Dorchester there is no obvious area which would lend itself to accommodating such a facility with little or no impact on the landscape. These comments are therefore made on the basis of which of the sites is the least worst in terms of landscape environment and traffic. The order is set out in terms of the least worst first (WD02) and the worst last (WD05). It would appear that sites WD01, WD02, WD03 and WD06 would require improvements to the A35 Dorchester by-pass to a greater or lesser degree. Given there are many other drivers of the need to improve the A35 (e.g. see Transforming Dorset Strategic Economic Plan p149) it is to be hoped that all such improvements could be co-ordinated and therefore the individual access arrangements of these have not be addressed in these observations The Sites WD02 - Old Radio Station (the least worst option) Although an isolated site in the AONB it has the advantage of there already being a relatively large collection of buildings which are a settled part of the landscape. It is not clear whether there would be additional buildings, re-use of existing buildings or replacement buildings. Either way a sensitive design along with landscaping which the site currently lacks need not have any greater impact on the landscape and sensitive landscaping could reduce the current impact of the site. The existing development generates a certain amount of heavy goods vehicles and coaches already. It has a direct access onto the A35 subject to any improvements that might be required. (see para1.3 above). WD06 - Rainbarrow Farm As with WD02 although relatively isolated there is already development on this site of a relatively large scale. By using the topography of the site and careful siting of buildings the visual impact would be mitigated. There is good road access onto the A35 subject to any improvements that might be required. (see para1.3 above). WD01 - Monkeys Jump This would be an entirely new greenfield site within the AONB. Nevertheless the scale, elevation and proximity of the commercial buildings constructed on the nearby Poundbury estate would provide a backdrop to any new buildings on this site. Careful siting of buildings and use of levels would further mitigate any visual impact and potentially the site would only be visible when approaching from the north towards the Monkeys Jump roundabout. Access to the site would have to depend on changes to the Monkeys Jump roundabout which are referred to in Transforming Dorset Strategic Economic Plan (see para 1.3 above) WD04 - Charminster Depot Whilst this is an existing Council depot site it has two main draw backs - road access is very poor and use as a vehicle depot would increase traffic through Charminster. There is also a recent outline planning permission for residential development adjoining this site (WD/D/14/002784). WD03 - South of Stadium Roundabout This site has recently been considered for Park and Ride for Dorchester and a Trunk Road Service Area within the context of the draft local plan. These matters were the subject of examination into the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Joint local Plan. The inspectors report has recently been published (14 August 2015). He concluded that there was a case for a park and ride but there was no case for a Trunk Road Service Area. He found that substantial harm would be caused to the landscape and historic features of national importance (Maiden Castle) and that there were other sites that would have less impact (paras140 -152 of the Inspectors report deal with this issue) Given the conclusions of the Inspector it would be inconceivable to now promote a waste transfer station on this site which may have an even greater impact on the setting of Maiden Castle than a Trunk Road Service Area WD05 - Stinsford Hill (the worst option) This is a greenfield site on an essentially open approach to Dorchester. The views towards Dorchester across the Frome flood plain are across the open countryside. Any building on this site would be obtrusive and significantly damage this important gateway approach to Dorchester. It is acknowledged that the landowner wishes to promote development of this site. Indeed this site and adjoining land was promoted for development by objectors to the joint local plan in Autumn 2014. The inspector who has recently reported on the draft local plan did not see fit to recommend inclusion of any of this land for development in the plan period 2015-31. The inspector has recommended a review of housing land supply with a request that this should be done by 2021 and allocate further land for housing in Dorchester for the end of the plan period and through to 2036. He emphasises that this should be done with the full involvement of local residents. It would be inconceivable for a public body, Dorset County Council, to prejudice such a review by seeking to construct in the shorter term a Waste Transfer station that would prejudice an objective assessment of the various options for the further expansion of Dorchester.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Figure 8	WP112	Tricky. WD04 seems least worst option.	Noted
Resident	Figure 8	WP237	WD02 would seem best	Noted
Highways England	Figure 8	WP339	The development of a transfer station for the Dorchester area, West Dorset due to the location of Dorchester on the A35, the location of proposals for a transfer station are of concern to HE. We note the location of the site options put forward, and although we have no preference at this stage some are right on the SRN. In justifying sites for transfer stations we would expect waste plan authorities to demonstrate the trip generation based= on existing and future traffic movements, and to quantify the net impact at specific junctions on the SRN as necessary.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council	Figure 8	WP423	Winterborne Farringdon Parish Council strongly objects to the use of site WD03 for any waste management purposes. The location in question is adjacent to a busy junction between two major roads which already suffer from congestion at peak times. It is hard to see how any access could be created to this site which would not significantly further impact the traffic flow on the A354, causing a re-emergence of rat-running along side roads that has up until now been largely discouraged by the improved access to Weymouth along the A354. The land itself is known to flood. No consideration either seems to have been given to the residents of the Maiden Castle Farm cottages who could find that a waste management facility becomes a noisy next door neighbour. Again, earlier consultation with the AONB Partnership has highlighted a further concern that the site's impact when viewed from Maiden Castle seems to have been forgotten about - this is a hugely important monument, one of the largest hill forts in Western Europe and it is surely incongruous for such a site to have a development such as this within its sightlines. It should be noted by the County Council that following the recent Planning Inspectorate examination of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland local plan the inspector has removed the Trunk Road Service Area (TRSA) from the local plan for exactly this reason, stating "I do not find the case for a TRSA to be so compelling so as to outweigh the substantial harm that siting the scheme adjacent to the Stadium Roundabout would have on the landscape and historic features of national importance." We additionally object to the outward expansion of Dorchester towards the small farming village of Winterborne Monkton - it should not become a suburb of Dorchester by way of piecemeal development. We refer you to the Inspector's report into the precursor of the Adopted Local Plan which stated "I agree with the objector that development of this site would create a most undesirable precedent ignoring established policies to confine Dorchester to land within the bypass ... I agree that a park and ride site especially if coupled with a primary route service station would create unwanted noise, pollution, visual intrusion and light pollution in a countryside location...". She continues "I consider that the harm to the countryside and landscape from development of this site would outweigh the benefits to the transport system and town centre...". (Policy EA24, page 293m, paras 13.27.5 and 13.27.6)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Figure 8	WP918	That Council supports the views of the Planning and Environment Committee and that Dorset County Council is advised that: I) Dorchester Town Council supports development of a Household Recycling Centre outside of the town; ii) Dorchester Town Council considers that site WD05 Stinsford Hill is their first option for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility with suitable mitigation to protect impact on the landscape environment. Second option would be WD02 Old Radio Station and third option would be WD01 Monkeys Jump with mitigation measures to protect the AONB; iii) Dorchester Town Council supports WD04 Charminster Depot as the Vehicle Depot; iv) Dorchester Town Council does not support the use of WD07 Loudsmill for any use as a future waste site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP382	WD02 The Old Radio Station is clearly the best option for a transfer station and waste vehicle depot. The other sites seem too remote for an HRC but WD03 land south of the Stadium roundabout would be a possibility.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 8	WP14	PK02	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Question 8	WP208	PK01 would be a good site as there is room to expand and being on an industrial estate, there are no residential areas that would be affected. However, there would need to be a planning condition that the Sandford Road (A351) would NOT be used but traffic to use A35 and approach from the Bakers Arms on the Wareham Road (A351). The vehicles are too large to go through Sandford, which is already congested. The alternative would be PK03 which is being developed but like PK02, there are only rural roads with residential properties lining the roads and the impact would affect the quality of life and damage the road structure.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 8	WP512	PK01 Blackhill Road This is the obvious choice for a Waste Vehicle Depot and Waste Transfer Station in the Wareham area. It is situated on allocated employment land at the large Holton Heath Industrial Estate with room for possible expansion at some time in the future. There are no residential properties nearby. The A351 Road provides adequate access unlike some waste and mineral facilities located down narrow and twisting roads in this part of Dorset. PK02 Dorset Green This could accommodate these facilities but is much too far to the west. PK03 Binnegar This site is in a rural location and unsuitable for these facilities. It is also rather too far to the west.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 8	WP621	We do not have a preferred option for locating a Depot and/ or Waste Transfer Station, provided environmental issues for each of the sites are considered. However, we do wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Flood Risk: Part of PK02 site encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at this location should it be deemed most suitable as a Depot and/or Waste Transfer Station. Biodiversity: We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, we would have concerns over PK02 and PK03 due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications, and if that were the preferred option, would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 8	WP373	I think it is essential the vehicle journeys should be counted with the minerals plan and not in isolation. Both PK02 and PK03 would affect local residents with the use of the A352 and Puddletown Road and these are already heavily used by minerals transport. It is not joined up and you are misleading the residents by not doing this. Both these roads serve the visitor population, cyclists as well as residents without industrial movements.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Purbeck District Council	Question 8	WP927	The Council acknowledges that DCC did approve an energy from waste plant at Dorset Green in 2010 (planning ref 6/2010/0172), indicating the potential suitability of the site for this facility, though this permission has since lapsed. The Council has concerns, however, that Dorset Green and Holton Heath are Purbecks prime employment areas. Using space on these sites for a waste transfer facility could very well affect future potential users. The same applies to a potential waste recycling plant. At the moment, the Council would rank the choice of sites given in the following order: Binnegar Environmental Park Dorset Green Holton Heath It is not clear in the consultation material why the site at Binnegar could not be a vehicle depot as well. The Council would like further information as to why it cannot be considered for both.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	Figure 9	WP340	Relocation of the existing Wareham waste vehicle depot and development of a new transfer station, Purbeck. Frome the sites listed, HE has no preference. All the sites are located around Wareham and are therefore likely to have a similar impact on the SRN. We will however take an interest on this moving forward in order to ensure that the trips and trip distribution do not have a severe impact in line with the NPPF.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP239		Noted
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP383	PK01 Blackhill Road on this large industrial site is clearly the best option for vehicle depot and transfer station. It is nearer Poole and Bournemouth where most of the waste arises and there are no residential houses nearby. PK02 Dorset Green is much too far to the west. PK03 Binnegar is in an unsuitable rural setting and also rather too far west.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 9	WP277	Should be sited near to bypass - either Monkeys Jump, Poundbury or Bridport Road not down unsuitable road to Louds Mill	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 9	WP384	WD07 Loudsmill may be the best choice here. It is always easier and more acceptable to develop or extend an existing site rather than setting up a new one. Most of the other sites are Greenfield and rather too far out of town to be useful.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 9	WP622	We do not have a preferred option for locating a Household Recycling Centre, provided environmental issues for each of the sites are considered. However, we do wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Flood Risk: As per Q7, a significant proportion of WD05 site encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at this location should it be deemed most suitable as a Household Recycling Centre. Part of WD07 site encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at this location should it be deemed most suitable as a Household Recycling Centre. Biodiversity : We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, would have concerns over WD05 (Stinsford) and WD07 (Louds Mill) due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications, and if that were the preferred option, would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality. Groundwater and contaminated land: Of all the sites in the draft plan, WD05 Land at Stinsford Hill is our least preferred site. This is due to it being immediately up-gradient of the Eagle Lodge PWS boreholes.	Noted

Resident	Question 9	WP367	HRC objections to siting of WD08 and comments focused on WD08 and WD07 The draft plan identifies eight potential sites and concludes that WD07 Loudsmill and WD08 Parkway Farm appear to be the most favourable, a conclusion that seems to be based more on them having fewer factors set out against them than their actual suitability. Two key factors mitigating against the majority of the sites are traffic impact on the Strategic Road Network (principally the Dorchester by-pass) and the situation of most within the Dorset AONB. The latter also applies to WD08. The location of WD08 places it directly up wind of the prevailing south westerlies of Sunny Days Nursery, approximately 160m to the north east, and place some 40% of Dorchester down-wind and thus susceptible to dust, blown rubbish and smells. There is also an allotment area between the nursery and the proposed site which will in effect be first in line for any blown pollution with potential consequential impact. For Sunny Days Nursery there could be significant impact on their ability to have children outdoors as part of their programmes - their outdoor area is on the side facing the site. WD08 and WD03 are similarly positioned as a source of airborne pollution over significant (residential) areas of Dorchester whereas the other sites are not; this makes their siting unsuitable from this aspect. This location as a potential HRC would seem to be particularly inappropriate given its proximity to the nursery. Access to WD08 will be via Middle Farm Way feeding onto the Parkway Farm site cul de sac. Middle Farm way is intended to be the primary feeder road to Dorchester from and to the West and as such is heavily used particularly during commuter periods. Access on and off the site will be disruptive to the traffic flow and the additional usage is likely to result in new and extended delays on the road which may have the counter-productive impact of encouraging current users of the Middle Farm Way routing back on to the by-pass with the consequent impact to flow there. WD08 is the smallest of the proposed sites and thus possibly offers the least long term capacity sustainability. The access limitations also restrict its long term sustainability there is well documented history of consistent underestimation of demand and usage of such public amenities and it is likely that traffic flows, both using the HRC and normal regular use, will continue to rise. Future difficulties in getting to or from the site are likely to encourage an increase in fly tipping. WD07 suffers from existing access difficulties which are expected to be mitigated by the alternative routing via Lubbecke Way. Due to its location on the eastern edge of Dorchester, there is and would be significantly less impact on residential properties due to airborne pollution; notwithstanding that any impact should be minimised. Of the two sites WD07 offers least impact on the general Dorchester population although its access needs significant improvement - any site situated or accessed from within the Dorchester boundary is going to exacerbate the existing traffic flows through the town centre or generate local rat runs. Whether situated on the East or West side of the town, users from outlying areas will need to travel through or around the town to gain access despite Highways objections to the alternative sites outside the town boundary, surely the longer term welfare of the towns residents should require improved access (or the consequences of access) to one or more of the alternative sites. WD05 would appear to offer a suitable compromise in that it provides improved access over WD07 although it will give rise to similar potential traffic disruption as WD08 due to it lying on a commuter access route. It would be unlikely to draw additional traffic through the town and could possibly reduce it through use of the SRN from the North and West. It appears to share most of the environmental and Water Resource problems listed against WD08 (and others) but offers a less disruptive access route and significantly reduced potential impact from airborne pollution. The site is also suggested to be large enough to include a Transfer Station and a Waste Management Centre siting a combination of facilities in one place is part of meeting the objective of minimising unnecessary traffic movements and is beyond the spatial capacity of WD08.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 9	WP388	We have recently moved to Dorset from Surrey and although the current arrangement at Loud Mills is not great, we feel with slight adjustments it could be fully functional. The dump in Kingston on Thames was off a busy road but there seldom a problem apart from Saturdays when queues would build up. Our second preferred location would be at Stinsford as there would be little inconvenience to local housing. We have noticed that the worst part of the A35 for being blocked is the roundabouts at Monkey Jump, Dorchester Football and Kingston Maurward. We feel therefore that the proposed site at Stinsford would impact the least on the Dorchester area. The proposed site in Poundbury appears very unsuitable as Middle Farm Way is already congested with traffic avoiding the A35 into Dorchester. The busy Happy Days nursery where parents drive from places as far away as Exeter, Bournemouth and Basingstoke is right beside the proposed site and this seems to be a potential safety problem. The site with the Red Cross and Weymouth College is currently busy and there is new business structures being built at the moment which will also create extra traffic flow. The increase in traffic over the next 15 years with the doubling of houses in Poundbury will do nothing to lessen the traffic flow. We feel it would be dangerous to have a large increase of traffic accessing and exiting onto Middle Farm Way. The lorries from the Chocolate Factory have not yet started to exit onto Middle Farm Way via Ladock Green but when they do this will increase the traffic noise and density. We were given to believe that Poundbury is supposed to be a "village" and that the lack of road signs etc. leads to a relaxed pace of life without too much traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 9	WP392	From the point of view of easy access from main roads to the site, three of the proposed sites seem appropriate: WD01 (NW of Monkey's Jump), WD02 (Old Radio Station) and WD03 (south of stadium roundabout). Of those, WD02, the old radio station site, also has the advantage of having fewer homes in close proximity to it and looks like a good option.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 9	WP389	Having studied all the options for the proposed new waste sites in the Dorchester Area, I wish to make the following observations: No new HRC, WTF, or WMC should be sited within 250 metres of any existing housing larger than 20 dwellings. Most A roads in Dorchester area can, and do become congested, especially at peak times during the day and in holidays, therefore road widening schemes would have to take place. Any site chosen would need to have extensive tree planting to screen it from view Sites at serious risk from flooding must not be developed In my opinion options WD02, and WD03 are the most suitable for development for waste management. The existing vehicle depot in Charminster should continue to be used to house and service vehicles.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Question 9	WP495	I have lived in Poundbury for 3 years in the new development of houses between the Bridport Road and Middle Farm Way leading up to the Monkeys Jump Roundabout. The opportunity for comments on your draft Waste Plan could not have come at a more opportune time in respect of the traffic flow in our area. Last Friday(during the afternoon) my wife and I were walking towards the Monkeys Jump roundabout and noticed that the traffic was gridlocked with tailbacks of vehicles on the A35(both in East and west directions), the A37 and Middle Farm Way. These tailbacks are not unusual and I just worry that the increase in traffic in this area will just get worse and worse if the construction of a Household Recycling Centre (for Parkway Farm WD08) or Waste Management Centre/HRC (for NW Monkeys Jump WD01) goes ahead. In the past, I have lived near to and used both the Charlton Lane Transfer Station at Shepperton in Surrey and St Erth in West Cornwall. It would appear to me that a combined HRC/WMC has many advantages -- such as the joint sharing of staff, offices and equipment(JCBs etc.). Yesterday I used the Loudsmill WD07 site. With improved access and updated facilities, I would have thought this could continue as an ideal position. I hope my comments will be found useful.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Winterborne St Martin Parish Council	Question 9	WP844	The Parish Council consider that of the sites being promoted for Household Recycling in the area the one at Poundbury is the least inconvenient. This has reasonable access to the site and could easily be managed as a Household Recycling Centre. The present site at St Georges Road, Dorchester if enlarged with improved access to the site from Kings Road would be a sensible location for a Recycling Centre and a Waste Transfer site. The other sites proposed would cause serious access problems and should not be considered.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Figure 10	WP324	The whole assessment criteria and conclusions are hypocritical as the new Waste Management Site for Bridport is in open countryside, within the AONB, visible in views of Bridport from surrounding hills and is directly on the A35 !!! It would be interesting to see the assessments for the alternative sites around Bridport which lead to that site being chosen and to compare these with the current draft plan. Some of the comments about landscape etc. are biased - for instance the Stinsford Hill site WD05 is not visible in long views and cannot be seen except from the road to the Piddle valley and the minor road along the ridge. The comments regarding the view of Dorchester across open countryside can only be from the minor road along the ridge as the site is not visible in the view towards Dorchester from any other point. It is not visible from the A35 nor from the B3150 the approach road from London, as it is completely screened by large dense hedges. One wonders if the officer concerned actually visited this site or was it a 'desk' exercise from the map of the area?! The comments for the Weymouth road site WD03 ignore the impact of the proposed Park and Ride and Service Area within the same site. The comments from Highways England are somewhat biased. Firstly with regard to site WD03 they do not take account of the need for an access on the Weymouth road for the Park and Ride - a joint access could be provided for this and the HRC. Secondly the comments regarding the Stinsford Hill site apply equally to the Parkway Farm site in terms of distance to the A35 junction and site WD05 would be accessed off a side road causing no access problems. The Stinsford Hill site WD05 lies within one large open field. The site assessed appears to have been deliberately outlined on that part which lies within the flood area when it could have been outlined on another part of the field was this to give it another reason to be rejected ? The paragraphs above (SA summary), taken from the draft plan, do not make reference to site WD05 - why is this, is it because the site has no real highway problems? The Parkway Farm site a) Firstly it is not 0.94 hectares of usable site area as it irregular in shape and the area includes land which should be used for extending the noise bund. If one cuts out this lower corner, the site is substantially less than the 1 hectare required and is still an irregular shape - not totally useful in laying out the site. b) Secondly the levels dictate that the yard for the manoeuvring of skips must be at the lower level at the bottom of the site and the skips at the higher level nearer the access road, to give the public easy tipping above them. This would appear to indicate that there will be virtually no queuing distance within the site at busy times. This would result in queuing up the access road, blocking access to the new commercial units either side and making access for the skip lorries very difficult. Without at least a sketch layout, to scale, it is impossible to judge whether the site is of adequate size to prevent these problems. This is needed at this stage to decide whether the site is a sensible choice rather than one of the others. Or has a plan been prepared which was not exhibited and if so what does it show ??	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	Figure 10	WP341	Replacement/improvement of Dorchester HRC, West Dorset our comments relating to the sites in Dorchester and Wimborne as both locations are adjacent to the SRN so we will be taking a close interest in proposals coming forward. The waste planning authority will need to provide specific trip generation and distribution data in order for us to be able to comment further so as to understand the catchment area ands routes better, in order to understand the potential impacts on the SRN.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Figure 10	WP919	That Council supports the views of the Planning and Environment Committee and that Dorset County Council is advised that: I) Dorchester Town Council supports development of a Household Recycling Centre outside of the town; ii) Dorchester Town Council considers that site WD05 Stinsford Hill is their first option for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility with suitable mitigation to protect impact on the landscape environment. Second option would be WD02 Old Radio Station and third option would be WD01 Monkeys Jump with mitigation measures to protect the AONB; iii) Dorchester Town Council supports WD04 Charminster Depot as the Vehicle Depot; iv) Dorchester Town Council does not support the use of WD07 Loudsmill for any use as a future waste site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP238		Noted

Resident	Question 10	WP15	ED02	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 10	WP116	This isn't really an agree or disagree question so I'm posing a comment only. We all want easy access to drop our rubbish off but we don't want to do it on our own doorsteps. Wherever a new site goes, it will have an adverse effect on anybody who lives near it. It will also have an adverse effect on the local environment and wildlife. That being said, the only logical place to locate one would be in an area that will affect the least number of people in a bad way and still be useful to the most number of people. Cost also has to be taken into consideration it will surely be cheaper to build on an existing industrial site. ED01 OK as a short term solution but doesn't really address the problem. ED02 Definitely not here. To build anything near the Canford Bottom roundabout is sheer lunacy. Anybody who lives near it knows how bad it can be when busy. This site will also have a very bad effect on the local wildlife and environment. Right now, it is green fields and farm land precious little of these around. ED03 Not a bad choice this one, especially the southern area. Increasing the size of an existing industrial site is a sensible choice. I cant see it affecting many people in a bad way. Good catchment area also. ED04 Not the best choice but better than many. ED05 The best choice by far. Already an industrialised area, serves the area well and not that many people will be adversely affected. ED06 Not a good idea really. In a flood zone and if built here the A31 traffic would be terrible. ED07 Looks OK as it is already industrial. However probably too close to existing households. ED08 Cant see any problems of this being a vehicle depot as it is already a scrap yard.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 10	WP325	Retention/small expansion of ED01, despite limitations, avoids traffic from Wimborne and surrounding areas having to cross/use the awful Canford Bottom roundabout and add to burden on A31. Clearly means that a further facility would be needed. ED02 & ED06 are 'central' and close to the main road but suffer from similar problem on traffic as ED05, but not acknowledged here; i.e. journey from Wimborne involves using the roundabout and return involves crossing A31 (more distant sites to north are actually similar). Access to ED06 probably better (it is unclear how ED02 would be accessed) and this could be among best of a bad set of options if a single facility is really the only way forward. ED03 & ED04 are rather far from main centres of population and have their own traffic issues; ED04 would not be too bad if an HRC at ED01 can be retained. Despite the problems with traffic, though not actually much worse than other options, ED05 looks the best single site. ED08 & especially ED07 seem rather far for vehicle depots, whilst ED08 suffers from a difficult right turn onto the A31 towards Wimborne, etc. POO3 would be a helpful addition if ED01 were to close, but hardly a preferred option.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 10	WP701	For Household Recycling I think ED05 Little Canford is the most suitable as it is more central to the main population areas and therefore to the main area of household waste.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 10	WP613	ED01 Brook Road This is an ideal location for an HRC but the extension must be large enough to eliminate the traffic jams in Brook Road when the skips are changed. ED02 Blunts Farm The present HRC is very popular but this area is already under pressure from overcrowded roads. ED03 Woolsbridge Another very good location for an HRC on this extensive site. ED04 West Moors Petroleum Depot Plenty of room for an HRC on this Brownfield site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 10	WP623	We do not have a preferred option for locating the Household Recycling Centre, but we would point out that WP ED08 Land at Candy's Lane, Corfe Mullen is located in a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, which may mean it is not suitable for the proposed development. The preferred site(s) should be chosen based on the assessment of any environmental issues, and the one(s) with least potential environmental impact picked. We also wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Our previous comments for these sites should also be taken into account. Flood Risk: Part of ED03, ED05, and a significant proportion of ED06 site encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at these locations should one [or more] of them be deemed most suitable as a Household Recycling Centre. Biodiversity : We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, all sites have some concern due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications, and therefore would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Christchurch & East Dorset Councils	Question 10	WP360	East Dorset District Council supports the principle of this proposal, but has the following comments to make on the site options put forward in the Draft Plan: The Council favours retaining the facility in its existing location if at all possible as it represents a convenient, central and sustainable location for household recycling. The Council therefore favours the option (ED01) of expanding and reconfiguring the existing site. Should a totally new facility be required, the Council supports the sites at West Moors Petroleum Depot (ED04), Little Canford Depot (ED05) or the Police Headquarters site at Ferndown (ED06) subject to the proposal being acceptable in terms of its impact on the Green Belt. East Dorset District Council considers that the sites at Blunts Farm (ED02) and Woolsbridge (ED03) represent important strategic employment sites required to serve the future growth of the local economy and key business sectors, and that waste uses are not appropriate on these sites. The Sites at Candy's Lane (ED08) and Bailie Gate (ED07) are considered to be poorly located to serve as recycling centres. The Council does not consider that relocating the household recycling centre to Poole is a sustainable option as it will increase traffic to and from the site from all parts of East Dorset.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 10	WP409	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District object to the inclusion of Blunts Farm in the list of possible locations for the Replacement/Improvement of Wimborne Household Recycling Centre, East Dorset. Either the existing facility should be improved or one of the other sites identified by East Dorset District Council in their comments should be identified. Blunts Farm was taken out of the Green Belt as an exceptional measure to provide much needed employment land to support the local economy. This site located in the A31 corridor is a preferred location for local business to grow not for any and all waste facilities.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 10	WP795	DISAGREE We don't agree that there should be an y such centres. Now that were in the 21 st century, can we have sites that move us towards zero waste, please? How about renovation centres, renovate, repair and exchange centres, or some catchy version of this? If we could go forward with this in our county it would give an example of good practice for others to follow. Local industry, commerce and the public would be very much in favour of it. If we must have household recycling centres, how about 2 sites, one North and one South of the A31? For the Southern site, ED 05, Little Canford Bottom, in the reduced form we ask for to enhance the SNCI, may be OK if the work is done. The same applies to ED 02, Blunts Farm, because although its in the green belt it does seem to be a well placed. However, the nature conservation and sensitive areas to the East and West of this site must be taken out first , with a green and biodiversity buffer of at least 20 metres as well, otherwise we will vigorously oppose this choice. For the Northern site, ED 03, the Northwestern part, at Woolsbridge looks OK but this must be the site to the North East and not the South West site, which is inappropriate, due to its proximity to an SAC and an SNCI. The ED 06 site, East Dorset Police HQ, is accessible both North and South; we have no problem with this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Figure 11	WP113	This isn't really an agree or disagree question so I'm posing a comment only. We all want easy access to drop our rubbish off but we don't want to do it on our own doorsteps. Wherever a new site goes, it will have an adverse effect on anybody who lives near it. It will also have an adverse effect on the local environment and wildlife. That being said, the only logical place to locate one would be in an area that will affect the least number of people in a bad way and still be useful to the most number of people. Cost also has to be taken into consideration it will surely be cheaper to build on an existing industrial site. ED01 OK as a short term solution but doesn't really address the problem. ED02 Definitely not here. To build anything near the Canford Bottom roundabout is sheer lunacy. Anybody who lives near it knows how bad it can be when busy. This site will also have a very bad effect on the local wildlife and environment. Right now, it is green fields and farm land precious little of these around. ED03 Not a bad choice this one, especially the southern area. Increasing the size of an existing industrial site is a sensible choice. I cant see it affecting many people in a bad way. Good catchment area also. ED04 Not the best choice but better than many. ED05 The best choice by far. Already an industrialised area, serves the area well and not that many people will be adversely affected. ED06 Not a good idea really. In a flood zone and if built here the A31 traffic would be terrible. ED07 Looks OK as it is already industrial. However probably too close to existing households. ED08 Cant see any problems of this being a vehicle depot as it is already a scrap yard.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	Figure 11	WP342	Our comments relating to the sites in Dorchester and Wimborne as both locations are adjacent to the SRN so we will be taking a close interest in proposals coming forward. The waste planning authority will need to provide specific trip generation and distribution data in order for us to be able to comment further so as to understand the catchment area ands routes better, in order to understand the potential impacts on the SRN.	Further discussions will be necessary in order to develop the preferred site
Wimborne Minster Town Council	Figure 11	WP411	As you know from our meeting a year ago the biggest issue for the Town Council is the potential closure of the Brook Road HRC and with that in mind passed the following resolution: RESOLVED: a) that the Dorset Waste Partnership be advised that the Town Council wishes to see the important facility at Brook Road being retained for the longest possible time to serve Wimborne and surrounding areas; b) that in the event of the future necessary closure of Brook Road, the site at Candy's Lane, Corfe Mullen is overwhelmingly preferred and that steps should be taken now to plan the necessary highway improvements and infrastructure including collaboration with Highways England for a traffic roundabout on the A31 at its junction with Candy's Lane, which would aid the traffic collision problem on this section of that road generally.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP5	I favour ED02 Blunts Farm as the most suitable site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP75		Noted
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP115	This isn't really an agree or disagree question so I'm posing a comment only. We all want easy access to drop our rubbish off but we don't want to do it on our own doorsteps. Wherever a new site goes, it will have an adverse effect on anybody who lives near it. It will also have an adverse effect on the local environment and wildlife. That being said, the only logical place to locate one would be in an area that will affect the least number of people in a bad way and still be useful to the most number of people. Cost also has to be taken into consideration it will surely be cheaper to build on an existing industrial site. ED01 OK as a short term solution but doesn't really address the problem. ED02 Definitely not here. To build anything near the Canford Bottom roundabout is sheer lunacy. Anybody who lives near it knows how bad it can be when busy. This site will also have a very bad effect on the local wildlife and environment. Right now, it is green fields and farm land precious little of these around. ED03 Not a bad choice this one, especially the southern area. Increasing the size of an existing industrial site is a sensible choice. I cant see it affecting many people in a bad way. Good catchment area also. ED04 Not the best choice but better than many. ED05 The best choice by far. Already an industrialised area, serves the area well and not that many people will be adversely affected. ED06 Not a good idea really. In a flood zone and if built here the A31 traffic would be terrible. ED07 Looks OK as it is already industrial. However probably too close to existing households. ED08 Cant see any problems of this being a vehicle depot as it is already a scrap yard.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP118	This isn't really an agree or disagree question so I'm posing a comment only. We all want easy access to drop our rubbish off but we don't want to do it on our own doorsteps. Wherever a new site goes, it will have an adverse effect on anybody who lives near it. It will also have an adverse effect on the local environment and wildlife. That being said, the only logical place to locate one would be in an area that will affect the least number of people in a bad way and still be useful to the most number of people. Cost also has to be taken into consideration it will surely be cheaper to build on an existing industrial site. ED01 OK as a short term solution but doesn't really address the problem. ED02 Definitely not here. To build anything near the Canford Bottom roundabout is sheer lunacy. Anybody who lives near it knows how bad it can be when busy. This site will also have a very bad effect on the local wildlife and environment. Right now, it is green fields and farm land precious little of these around. ED03 Not a bad choice this one, especially the southern area. Increasing the size of an existing industrial site is a sensible choice. I cant see it affecting many people in a bad way. Good catchment area also. ED04 Not the best choice but better than many. ED05 The best choice by far. Already an industrialised area, serves the area well and not that many people will be adversely affected. ED06 Not a good idea really. In a flood zone and if built here the A31 traffic would be terrible. ED07 Looks OK as it is already industrial. However probably too close to existing households. ED08 Cant see any problems of this being a vehicle depot as it is already a scrap yard.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP329	Mr Wilding's comments are broadly as mine. Distance to travel is clearly important as is access and congestion.ED01 Brook Road suffers by vehicles parked on the access road but is most convenient for most of the conurbation and even better if skips were at ground level rather than requiring waste to be elevated to gain access. Why have you not included the Bournemouth site at Longham, which has superior access and disposal facilities? Traffic congestion is bad but it must be more convenient for Ferndown and Parley folk. ED02 has been considered and rejected in the past. It has all the usual objections with added impact on recreation areas.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP507	ED01 Brook Road This is an ideal location for an HRC but the extension must be large enough to eliminate the traffic jams in Brook Road when the skips are changed. ED02 Blunts Farm The present HRC is very popular but this area is already under pressure from overcrowded roads. ED03 Wooolsbridge Another very good location for an HRC on this extensive site. ED04 West Moors Petroleum Depot Plenty of room for an HRC on this Brownfield site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 11	WP42	ND07 is my preferred option	Noted
Resident	Question 11	WP107	Shaftesbury and Gillingham need recycling sites - population is expanding. Recycling is vital perhaps more funding is needed. The easiest it is to recycle the more people will use it. Kerbside recycling is excellent makes life easy and saves fuel taking things to the recycling centre.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 11	WP240	WPND06 Wincombe would be the most suitable site: its is well known, good access, extending an existing facility. Although greenfield and sensitive location, visible from the Cranborne Chase and West Wilts AONB, this could be mitigated by appropriate landscaping. WPND07 Brickfields site - would seem an appropriate site due to it being employment land but access to the site would be via the B3092 which is not ideal, even with the proposed the link road from B3092/B3081 (part of Gillingham southern extension) .Gillingham has severe traffic congestion at times, especially to the south of the town, Shaftesbury Road and New Road, with pinch point at the Railway Bridge and such a depot would only add to this if located on the Brickfields site. WDN08 - Enmore Green site - Not ideal - greenfield and out of town settlement boundary. Steepness of the site might make it more visible from around the area and it depends upon the Enmore link road being in place.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Question 11	WP452	ND07 Brickfields Business Park . This site scores highly in the Sustainability Appraisal. ND07 is not contrary to planning policy and is generally well located to serve both towns, but with Gillingham set to grow substantially to approximately twice the population size of Shaftesbury, would be appropriately located in the largest town. Options ND06 and ND08 are both outside of settlement boundaries and contrary to planning policy, whilst ND06 is also outside of North Dorset District and Dorset County and therefore cannot be allocated by the Draft Waste Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 11	WP624	We do not have a preferred option for locating a Household Recycling Centre, provided environmental issues for each of the sites are considered. However, we do wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Flood Risk: Part of ND07 site encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at this location should it be deemed most suitable as a Household Recycling Centre. Biodiversity : We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, would have concerns over ND07 due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications, and if that were the preferred option, would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Shaftesbury Town Council	Question 11	WP817	The Town Councils Planning and Highways Committee met on 1st September 2015 to consider its response to the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals and Waste Planning Consultations. I am instructed to write to you providing you with the Committees minuted response; Officer report 0915PH07 was received. The Committee resolved to respond to the waste consultation that its preferred site option was WPND08 Enmore Green, second preferred was WPND06, for both of these options the Enmore Green link road should be built first. The Committee objected to WPND07.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Figure 12	WP48	WP ND06 is by far the best option, being already established. WP ND07 will make the disastrous traffic situation in Gillingham worse WP ND08 has particularly poor access and the strrp site will make conversion difficult the slope and side of Shaftesbury is likely to make wind picking up loose waste an issue.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Figure 12	WP103	Enmore Green would be a shame: outside the development boundary and a new road required. Wincombe is fine but keeping the facility within Dorset seems sensible. Gillingham seems a good option, although the New Road /Newbury access seems restricted.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	Figure 12	WP343	Replacement/improvement of Shaftesbury HRC from the sites listed, HE has no preference. All the sites are located around Shaftesbury and are therefore likely to have a similar impact on the SRN. We will however take an interest on this moving forward in order to ensure that the trips and trip distribution do not have a severe impact in line with the NPPF.	Noted
Resident	Question 12	WP16	ND07 is the best site	ND07 is not being considered for the management of bulky waste as it is outside the area of sea
Resident	Question 12	WP330	ED02 is entirely unsuitable for bulky waste management with severe issues regarding access, traffic congestion, impact on environment and households. The movement of waste across Dorset etc. will make road congestion worse and create longer holdups at an area which contributes to our economic wealth.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 12	WP702	An industrial site is clearly more appropriate for this type of waste management and the following East Dorset sites would be the most suitable: ED02 Blunts Farm ED03 Woolsbridge Ind Estate ED04 West Moors Petroleum Depot ED05 East Dorset Police HQ Of these ED03, Ed04 and ED05 would have the most suitable links to the main road network provided that ED02 was accessed via the Ferndown Industrial Estate roads which are used to volume traffic . Of the urban site the following would seem most suitable: PO01 Manning's Heath PO03 Nuffield Ind Estate CB01 Hurn Of these PO01 and PO03 are closest to industrial areas. However CB01 I think would be a more suitable site where better links to the main road network could be developed along with expansion of the site itself.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 12	WP508	ED02 Blunts Farm This is an important employment which is unsuitable for a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility. There are many residential properties, schools and businesses nearby this proposed site. Uddens and Cannon Hill Plantation provide a vital area for recreation. The access via Uddens Drive is very poor. The whole area is already under pressure from overcrowded roads and this would be exacerbated by the large numbers of HGVs associated with a bulk waste transfer and/or treatment facility. ED03 Woolsbridge This spacious site seems to be suitable for the bulky waste transfer/treatment facility. ED04 West Moors Petroleum Depot This brownfield site would also be suitable for a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 12	WP625	We do not have a preferred option for locating a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility, provided environmental issues for each of the sites are considered. However, we do wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Flood Risk: Part of ED03, CB01, and a significant proportion of ED06, sites encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at these locations should one [or more] of them be deemed most suitable as a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility. Biodiversity: We note the points included in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, all sites have some concern due to wetland landscape/river corridor implications, and therefore would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and improve remaining habitat quality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Christchurch & East Dorset Councils	Question 12	WP361	It is noted that the search for a bulky waste management facility is being undertaken for the whole conurbation. Both Councils consider that the most sustainable location for such a facility will be within the main urban area as this will reflect where the majority of bulky waste will arise and where traffic to and from the site will be generated. East Dorset District Council considers that the sites at Blunts Farm (ED02) and Woolsbridge (ED03) represent important strategic employment sites required to serve the future growth of the local economy and key business sectors, and that waste uses are not appropriate on these sites. Similar comments apply from Christchurch Borough Council to the re-use of the MRF site at Hurn for this facility. Of the remaining site options in East Dorset, East Dorset District Council considers the site close to the A31 at Ferndown (Police Headquarters) represents the most accessible and sustainable location for such a facility.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

	Question 12	WP410	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District object to the inclusion of Blunts Farm in the list of sites for the Management of Bulky Waste. It agrees with the local District Council's assessment of the preferred location in the search for such a facility. Blunts Farm was taken out of the Green Belt as an exceptional measure to provide much needed employment land to support the local economy. This site located in the A31 corridor is a preferred location for local business to grow not for any and all waste facilities. The combined allocation options for this site amounts to around 5.5 hectares which amounts to around a quarter to a third of the developable area of this strategically important site for employment purposes. Such a land take is excessive and damaging to the proposed principle use of the site. The recognition of congestion on the A31 in this area is welcome. The economic impact of the effect of this congestion and should be included in the appraisal of this site especially and no acceptable means of accessing the site has been identified. Uddens Drive is clearly not a viable or sensible option.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 12	WP796	As with question 10, we prefer renovation centres. We strongly oppose ED 04, West Moors, and the South West part of the Woolsbridge site, ED 03, as they are too close to environmentally sensitive areas. We mentioned that ED 02, Blunts Farm, must not include the nature conservation and sensitive areas to the East and West of this site and must have a green and biodiversity buffer of at least 20 metres as well, otherwise we will vigorously oppose this choice. We have no problem with ED 06, the East Dorset Police HQ, nor any of the other sites, for this purpose.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Table 16	WP209	Manning's Heath would be a good choice given it is an industrial estate and already being used currently for waste facilities.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Table 16	WP331	P004 looks suitable but I don't know the site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Figure 13	WP114	ED06 may allow a deal to be cut, possibly with a little Government greasing of the wheels PO02 scheduled for expansion seems possibly more appropriate than PO03 where release of some space may actually NOT happen (depending).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP76		Your support is welcomed
Resident	9.1	WP117	AD is the way to go (soil-enhancing residues, biogas, contribution to increasingly difficult energy landscape, Govt and EU pressures)	Your support is welcomed
Resident	9.1	WP182	Whilst pleased to see that Energy Recovery is recognised as a solution for the projected non-hazardous residual waste treatment shortfall of 210,000 tpa at the end of the Plan (certainly underestimated and anyway doesn't include C & I waste) the Plan actually lacks vision in this area. Cornwall, Devon and Hampshire have already bitten this bullet and I would like to see in the next version of the Plan, far less prevarication. Getting an Energy from Waste Plant planned and built will take more than 10 years so pussy footing around at this stage isn't sustainable or indeed good for the environment.	Chapter 5 explains that the facilities needed to manage LACW and C&I waste are similar and it is appropriate to total the projected arising's of these waste streams in order to consider the need for new facilities. Therefore the shortfall of 210,000 tpa includes C&I projections. The best way that the Waste Planning Authority can encourage the development of an energy from waste facility is to find a deliverable site and allocate it in the Waste Plan.

Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	9.1	WP559	Considerable concern has been expressed by members that although the Waste Plan may well cover the essentials from a Strategic Planning standpoint, it is not reaching out to residents to ensure that they fully understand what is needed; why it is needed; and what the implications are for people in the area. While we recognise that the Plan is intended to be technology neutral, if this Plan is to be adopted as having been through a proper consultation process it is essential that all Dorset residents and businesses understand the realities of the impact of sites and types of facility. We all want the services and the advantages that they bring but may be wary or even frightened of the impact they may have in our own area because most of us don't understand what we are being asked to sign up to. This has a bearing on the validity of the Statement of Community Involvement which will be required for EiP. EDEP (and its predecessor ETAG) has always strongly supported proposals to reduce landfill but any form of incineration must ensure emissions and residues present no hazards to people or the natural environment; energy produced is fed into the National Grid; the production of any by-products is economically viable . The word incinerator is avoided assiduously in reports and plans because of peoples perception of what it is. A better explanation and dialogue could make this much more acceptable on a suitable site with examples of the type of technology that is being used successfully elsewhere and the way in which it is anticipated that technology is likely to develop within the plan period. The environmental pros and cons including impact on residential and environmentally sensitive areas, emissions from traffic and incineration need to be explained more fully so that people can make informed judgements on what would be acceptable or unacceptable to them. Recommendation: The Pre-submission Draft should ensure that the implications of the Waste Plan are clear and concise.	Your comments are noted, further work will be undertaken to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural	9.1	WP685	In response to your comments in connection with anaerobic digesters the experience of this AONB is that these tend to be constructed far too large and, therefore, they have to import feed stock from a large area. That means, in the overall assessment of things, that they are not sustainable and far too much time and energy goes in transporting materials to feed these oversized treatment units.	Your comments are noted
Somerset County Council	9.1	WP502	Paragraph 9.2 Suggest add without energy recovery after Recovery does not include mass burn incineration	Agree, the text will be amended as suggested
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	9.1	WP708	It is noted that this chapter does not address the recovery of inert waste, though we think this should be made clearer for the lay reader. Chapter 10 should also make it clear that it covers inert waste landfill and recovery. It should be entitled disposal and inert waste recovery.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
New Earth Group	9.1	WP892	Chapter 9: Paragraph 9.1 NESG welcome the distinction drawn between recovery and disposal; albeit NESG would respectfully suggest that the footnote also make reference to the R1 efficiency quotient when looking at mass burn technology.	It is agreed that reference should be made to R1 efficiency within this section.
New Earth Group	9.1	WP893	Chapter 9: Paragraphs 9.6-9.11 NESG is pleased to see the stable of Energy from Waste technologies outlined in a clear and concise manner.	Your support is welcomed
Intelligent Land	9.1	WP556	There is relevant material background information missing from the plan. The most important public concern will surround sites for potential strategic waste recovery and whether this means incineration. It is disingenuous to have no reference anywhere to the Blunts Farm appeal of 2005 and how that needs to be differentiated in any proposals now coming forward. This also affects all the other sites for major facilities, including ED03 in so far as the public needs to have proper transparency in the plan proposals or the onus will shift unfairly on to the landowners. In relation to the public consultation process, because the plan lacks transparency in this respect it is difficult to understand and therefore will inevitably skew the public response.	Your comments are noted, further work will be undertaken to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
Intelligent Land	9.1	WP551	There is a lack of clarity about the relationship between proposals motivated by the use of facilities to generate power and heat compared with the primary motive of waste disposal/recycling. In the Core Strategy documents for the relevant Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) there are policies consistent with maximising the potential for green energy from renewable sources. There are examples already in existence of farm waste being used to generate power (see paragraphs 11.43 to 11.49 of the Draft waste Plan), and there are potential small scale waste to energy plants that may well be beneficially incorporated into housing or mixed use schemes.	The primary purpose of the Waste Plan is to establish a strategy for the management of waste arising's. The Waste Plan is guided by the waste hierarchy, which ranks waste management options according to what is best for the environment. Therefore where waste cannot be reused or recycled the waste plan is seeking to recover energy from waste.

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	9.1	WP797	9.3 to 9.17: this section is a fair summary of waste to energy but please note: 1) large plant can gobble up waste and prevent waste from moving up the hierarchy. 2) Burning residual waste is a very poor choice and should not be used. Large and medium waste burners demand lots of waste and this undermines recycling. Almost all small burners give serious pollution because they are not used continuously or do not burn at a sufficiently high temperature. The inefficient nature of burning contributes to climate change even when its done properly. Also, there is no truly safe method of preventing dangerous particulates leaving the chimney. Gasification can be problematic and we would need to be sure any pyrolysis plant was genuinely effective and environmentally sustainable. The residue from a good version of such a plant is carbon similar to charcoal; it can be added to soil and is therefore a good carbon sink. Pyrolysis and gasification still have question marks about safety depending on the technology. Anaerobic digestion, still classed as a form of composting, is the preferred preliminary stage; the residue is a form of compost. Occasionally, disposal to landfill may be the least bad option. For example, if the amount of CO 2 produced by using residual waste to produce energy is greater than the CO 2 and methane that would have been given off by the fuel it is replacing, landfill may be preferable, taking transport, etc., into consideration.	Policy 5 specifically requires proposals not to displace the management of waste which is already managed or likely to be managed by a process further up the waste hierarchy unless there are environmental benefits. Further work will be undertaken which will include a review of existing and emerging waste treatment technologies to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
W H White LTD	9.1	WP835	Chapter 9: The need for recovery facilities: Identified Need 6 and paragraph 9.13 Disagree The emerging Plan professes to be technology neutral, but is pre-disposed to meeting the shortfall in residual capacity through the provision of energy recovery facilities, to the exclusion of other complementary technologies such as Materials Recovery (MRF). It is respectfully suggested that reference be made to the potential of MRF paragraph 9.13.	Consideration will be given to how the plan can be as flexible as possible to allow for the most appropriate technologies to manage residual waste.
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP22	Incinerator Bottom Ash - A need is identified in the Draft Plan for an Energy Recovery Facility, and a number of potential sites are identified. The technology is not specified, but if a conventional ERF plant there will an opportunity to recycle the Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) to produce Incinerator Bottom Ash Aggregate (IBAA). RBMR has considerable experience in this field and consider that this issue should be addressed in the Waste Plan. IBA recycling can be provided at the ERF plant, but this is not always possible due to the extent of the stockpiling areas required. In these circumstances a separate IBAA site is required.	The residue from the treatment process known as incineration bottom ash is acknowledged within Chapter 10.
Resident	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP77	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP210	It should be required that technology must be capable of obtaining an Environmental Permit for consideration and that this permit must be achieved before operation begins.	The environmental permitting process is a separate process and it is not necessary to refer to that within the policy. Further work will be undertaken which will include a review of existing and emerging waste treatment technologies to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP183	The policy should include words to the effect that only technology capable of obtaining an Environmental Permit can be considered	The environmental permitting process is a separate process and it is not necessary to refer to that within the policy. Further work will be undertaken which will include a review of existing and emerging waste treatment technologies to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
Resident	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP241	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP453	North Dorset District Council Support Proposed Policy 5	Your support is welcomed

New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP894	Chapter 9: Proposed Policy 5 It is difficult to see how this proposal might be applied to technologies such as MBT, or indeed whether it is the intention to do so. This needs to be clarified. Notwithstanding the above, NESG note that when considering technologies under the umbrella of energy from waste, proposals should meet all of the criteria. It is evident that some might not. For instance, criteria (c) requires combined heat and power in the first instance, but criteria (d) relates to technologies producing a gas for injection to the grid or a transport fuel. Thus criteria (c) and (d) ought to be and/or. Criteria (d) does not allow for the extraction / production / refinement of gas for industrial application. Nor does it allow for the manufacture of oils. NESG understand that both are technically feasibility	Further consideration will be given to ensure the Waste Plan remains flexible to ensure the best available technology is developed for the management of residual waste.
Resident	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP445	Energy Recovery Facilities Following the grant of Planning Application No. 8/14/0515 for Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd, Chapel Lane, BH23 6BG, by Dorset County Council on 30th July 2015, this site now has consent. Therefore there should be no necessity to progress mention of this	Agree, the plan will be updated
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP798	Please, no burning of residual waste.	Further work will be undertaken which will include a review of existing and emerging waste treatment technologies to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 5 - Energy recovery	WP836	Chapter 9: Proposed Policy 5 Disagree It is difficult to see how this proposal might be applied to technologies such as Materials Recovery (MRF), or indeed whether it is the intention to do so. This needs to be clarified. Notwithstanding the above, W H White notes that when considering technologies under the umbrella of energy from waste, proposals should meet all of the criteria. It is evident that some might not. For instance, criteria (c) requires combined heat and power in the first instance, but criteria (d) relates to technologies producing a gas for injection to the grid or a transport fuel. Thus criteria (c) and (d) ought to be and/or. Criteria (d) does not allow for the extraction / production / refinement of gas for industrial application. Nor does it allow for the manufacture of oils. W H White understands that both are technically feasibility.	It is the intention that Policy 4 deals with materials recycling facilities
Resident	Question 13	WP17	Agree	Your support for ED02 is noted
Resident	Question 13	WP332	ED02 is unsuitable due to close proximity to schools, businesses and residential properties. Visual intrusion and effect on landscape, environmental pollution, noise, emissions, smell etc. make this unsuitable.	Your concerns relating to ED02 are noted
Christchurch & East Dorset Councils	Question 13	WP362	It is noted that the search for an energy recovery facility is being undertaken for the whole conurbation. Both Councils consider that the most sustainable location for such a facility will be within the main urban area as this will reflect where the majority of bulky waste will arise and where traffic to and from the site will be generated. East Dorset District Council considers that the sites at Blunts Farm (ED02) and Woolsbridge (ED03) represent important strategic employment sites required to serve the future growth of the local economy and key business sectors, and that waste uses are not appropriate on these sites. Of the remaining site options in Christchurch and East Dorset, the site close to the A31 at Ferndown (Police Headquarters) represents a sustainable location for such a facility. The existing Eco Composting site at Hurn already has consent for expansion and should therefore be deleted from these proposed sites.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Question 13	WP703	Growth in Hazardous Waste is a highly contentious issue and one which in my opinion is likely to become more so due to developments in technology producing more toxic types of waste, for example plastics and other synthetic materials. Buildings and processing plant will have an adverse impact on the area in which it is sited and as such by default will breach most of the considerations in Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and Quality of Life. Whilst mitigations can be put in place for some of the adverse impacts, some such as air pollution, natural leakage and water drainage are much more unpredictable and uncontrollable. Of the main concerns hazardous waste is probably the main worry but continuous noise and traffic pollution can also make life in the vicinity of such a site unbearable. For these reasons in my view such a treatment facility should be sited as far as possible from populated or recreational areas where people obviously live and gather. I want to object to the following two sites: ED02 Blunts Farm ED05 East Dorset Police HQ Both these sites are virtually central to the main population areas of Ferndown, Wimborne, and Colehill, along with others further afield. Both are adjacent to the woodland amenity areas of Cannon Hill and Uddens, and Whitesheet. These areas are widely and continuously used for recreation in many forms. ED05 also has a golf club and a hockey club used by young people. Whilst the general prevailing wind is from the south west no-one can guarantee the flow of emissions or the absolute level of pollutants generated from a high chimney and any landfall of pollutants close by would seriously affect both the residential and amenity areas. A chimney of the proportions suggested would be a blight on the are for miles around and could not be screened by landscaping or other screening techniques. There are also an increasing number of aircraft using a flight path over Ferndown and Colehill. A tall chimney would I should think present a hazard to aircraft. Similarly land drainage is complex in this area and with ED02 right adjacent the woodlands seepage of pollutants into this area is a major concern. Stapehill is also notorious for flooding, another major hazard if waste recovery operations were to take place here. A great deal of work has been undertaken in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and many more people are using this area for recreation. As a result of this work a number of species of mammals and birds have been discovered - who can tell how many more undiscovered creatures there may be - the adjacent area of Whitesheet is a designated as a SSSI site. Ferndown Industrial Estate in which the Blunts Farm site will fall is designated an area of light industrial use in the Core Strategy. Many people work here in small industrial units; I think waste recovery could not be considered as light industrial use. ED03 Woolsbridge Ind Estate is better suited than either ED02 or ED05 but in my view ED04 West Moors Petroleum Depot would be the best place to site a waste recovery plant . The MOD Fuel Depot has already been used to store hazardous materials and in the main the site is away from the populated area of West Moors. Any emissions from the chimney would likely be blown to open areas to the east and north east in a SW wind, to the south east in a NW wind, and to the north west in a SE wind. Only in the more rare event of a NE wind would the main population areas be affected. This site also has a good link with the main A31 trunk road. In Conclusion I can see some merit in using ED02 Blunts Farm or ED05 east Dorset Police HQ for household recycling and as a vehicle depot. However I wish to object to the sites being used for bulky waste and recovery purposed as both these would produce unacceptable adverse impacts on the people and land use of the area.	Your comments are noted, however it should be noted that this section deals with residual waste facilities for managing non-hazardous waste. Due to its nature hazardous waste needs to be dealt with separately is specialist facilities. In determining the preferred sites for a residual waste treatment plant it will be necessary to consider further many of the issues you have raised, inc emissions, landscape, impact on recreational areas and ecology.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 13	WP510	ED02 Blunts Farm This site would be quite unsuitable for an energy recovery facility for the same reasons that we presented in qestion12. ED03 Woolsbridge This would be an excellent location for the energy recovery facility. ED04 West Moors Petroleum Depot This, also would be a good location for the energy recovery facility. P002 Canford Magna This is also a good location for the energy recovery facility especially as there seems to be room to expand the site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 13	WP626	We do not have a preferred option for locating a bulky waste transfer/treatment facility, provided environmental issues for each of the sites are considered. However, we do wish to outline below some environmental constraints that relate to some of the sites. Flood Risk: Part of ED03, CB02, and a significant proportion of ED06, sites encroaches within the Flood Zones, hence the Local Planning Authority should consider the sequential approach within the site at these locations should one [or more] of them be deemed most suitable as an energy recovery facility to manage our residual waste.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Question 13	WP412	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District object to the inclusion of Blunts Farm in the list of sites for an Energy Recovery Facility. It agrees with the local District Council's assessment of the preferred location in the search for such a facility. Blunts Farm was taken out of the Green Belt as an exceptional measure to provide much needed employment land to support the local economy. This site located in the A31 corridor is a preferred location for local business to grow not for any and all waste facilities. The combined allocation options for this site amounts to around 5.5 hectares which amounts to around a quarter to a third of the developable area of this strategically important site for employment purposes. Such a land take is excessive and damaging to the proposed principle use of the site. There is a relevant history in the consideration of a previously proposed "incinerator" type facility at Blunts Farm which was refused at appeal in 2005. This history is a material consideration that should be referred to. The adverse impact on existing food and drink businesses on the existing adjacent estates including the perception by clients of possible contamination from such a facility is a particular consideration why such a facility should not be allocation on this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 13	WP799	East Dorset FoE opposes the burning of residual waste. No new waste burning facility should be built. We are comfortable that the operators of CB 02, Eco Composting, Parley, are responsible operators. We strongly oppose ED 04, West Moors, and the South West part of the Woolsbridge site, ED 03, as they are too close to environmentally sensitive areas. We mentioned above that ED 02, Blunts Farm, must not include the nature conservation and sensitive areas to the East and West of this site and must have a green and biodiversity buffer of at least 20 metres as well, otherwise we will vigorously oppose this choice. However, we do not think a high chimney in any of the sites will be a problem except for aircraft. East Dorset FoE does not oppose any of the other sites for sustainable uses. BO 01, the Kinson sewage works, is not mentioned but a slightly enlarged site taking in a small part of Vernons Coppice could house an anaerobic digester taking in sewage and residual waste. For this purpose, the loss of a small section of green belt is permissible	Your comments are noted, however the waste arising's projections undertaken by the Waste Planning Authority point strongly to the need for a waste treatment facility within the Plan period. Your specific comments on site options will be considered further when developing the preferred site

Highways England	Figure 14	WP344	We have concerns about a number of the suggested sites are their location in relation to the SRN. Before we can comment further on these specific sites, as previously iterated we will need the waste plan authority to provide evidence of trip rates and distribution.	Your comments are noted, further discussions with Highways England will be necessary in developing the preferred site.
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP78	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Trigon Estate	10.1	WP285	Under Chapter 10 we support the principle of self sufficiency and note the suggested need for capacity to take approx. 80,000 t a year of non-hazardous residual waste.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	10.7	WP119	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	10.7	WP242		Noted
New Earth Group	10.7	WP896	Chapter 10: Paragraph 10.7 The efficiency of energy recovery is paramount to determining whether mass burn facilities are classified as a disposal or recovery operation. In the interest of clarity, it is recommended efficient be inserted before energy recovery in the first sentence and that a foot note be added to explain the R1 efficiency quotient.	Agree the plan will be amended as suggested
Resident	10.8	WP121	Didn't fly ash used to be used in aerated concrete block construction materials? (Celcon, Thermalite, etc., or was that PFA and somewhat different in properties?)	Noted
Hampshire County Council	10.8	WP491	10.8 Dorset waste to Hampshire Landfills are as follows o 14,300 tonnes (72%) to Blue Haze 4.85 years of void space remaining based on permitted void capacity/2013 waste received. o 4,500 tonnes (23%) to Pound Bottom which has approximately 3 years of permitted void capacity remaining based on 2013 waste received. o 550 tonnes (2.7%) to Squabb Wood which has approximately 1 years of permitted void capacity remaining based on 2013 waste received. However, within Policy 32 of the adopted HMWP (2013) Squabb Wood Landfill is allocated within Appendix A Site allocations of the plan for additional void capacity of up to 400,000 tonnes (approx. 5 years) although still requires a planning application for surcharging to take place. Squabb Wood has recently been subjected to a permitted planning application to extend land fill operations until 2018 (further five years) to make up for the short term dormancy of the site around 10 years ago. o 400 tonnes of inert waste (2%) to Bleak Hill	Your helpful comments are noted
Resident	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP120	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Northamptonshire County Council	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP159	Policy 6 criterion a: "extensive treatment the Plan would benefit from defining what extensive treatment should normally entail.	It is agreed that a definition of extensive treatment would be helpful.

Resident	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP243	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Viridor	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP280	Para:10.7 support the plan's clear intentions here and under Objective 6-page 61 in recognising the strategic importance of non-hazardous landfill waste disposal; and, in particular, the safeguarding of Trigon Landfill site from non-mineral development or generally from incompatible non-waste development.	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP454	North Dorset District Council Support Proposed Policy 6	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP897	Chapter 10: Proposed Policy 6 The intent and wording of the emerging Policy is pragmatic.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 6 - Final disposal of non-hazardous waste	WP838	Chapter 10: Proposed Policy 6 Agree The intent and wording of the emerging Policy is pragmatic.	Your support is welcomed
Halletec Environmental Ltd	10.22	WP537	While it is understood some inert fill is needed in landfill/disposal sites, the identified shortfall of inert material (Quarry Products Association 2006) suggests inert waste should be prioritised for the restoration of quarries.	The importance of restoration of quarries with inert fill is recognised in the Draft Waste Plan.
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP21	RBMR feel that a more positive approach should be taken to using inert waste to restore mineral workings. Such use is supported in Para 10.23, but under Policy 7 the there is a permissive approach to all forms of disposal presumably including golf courses etc.- with a general requirement that these other proposals will not prejudice minerals restoration. We would ask that Policy 7 be amended to give a clear priority to quarry restoration.	Your comments are noted. The policy already contains a criteria to ensure that inert waste disposal does not prejudice the restoration of mineral sites, this is considered appropriate as it would be difficult to enforce a priority for quarry restoration. Consideration will be given to re-ordering the policy.
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP455	North Dorset District Council Support Proposed Policy 7	Your support is welcomed

Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP629	We recommend that this policy should refer to waste hierarchy.	Policy 1 covers the overarching Plan principals including the waste hierarchy and should apply equally to all relevant applications. It is not considered necessary to repeat reference to the hierarchy in this policy.
Somerset County Council	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP503	We support this policy. From initial review it looks as though it will provide a helpful framework to support beneficial use in its different guises. We note that Dorset County Council plan to allocate two inert landfills, both of which facilitate restoration of the quarry and both of which are supported by a waste transfer station.	Your support is welcomed
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP709	The plan does not clearly distinguish between inert landfill and inert land recovery. They are distinct operations. For example, the first sentence of Paragraph 10.22 should make this clear by stating ..will need to be managed through inert landfill or recovery operations. Inert materials may also be required for the engineering and restoration of non-hazardous landfill operations such as for lining and intermediate cover purposes. It is noted that Policy 7 and some of the supporting text refers to inert waste filling This term should either be defined in the glossary to include both landfill and land recovery, or preferably not used at all, to avoid confusion.	Your comments are noted and agreed with. Amendments will be made to the text and Policy as appropriate.
Halletec Environmental Ltd	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP538	Agree	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 7 - Inert waste recovery and disposal	WP839	Chapter 10: Proposed Policy 7 Disagree W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy in so far as it goes. However W H White is concerned that the plan is silent on the need to retain established inert recycling facilities that benefit from temporary consent, such as the facility at Whites Pit, where these have not given rise to environmental or amenity concerns. Representations have been submitted to the Minerals Sites Plan to this effect and W H White respectfully requests that a reciprocal policy be included in the Waste Plan.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further. However once adopted, the Mineral Sites Plan and the Waste Plan will both form the policy context for minerals and waste development within the Plan area. It is not likely to be necessary to repeat policies in both plans. Cross references within the text may be appropriate.
Resident	Question 14	WP79	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 14	WP385	WD11 Coombefield has few SSSI and other designations in the immediate area and would be a better choice for inert landfill than WD10 Broadcroft.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Question 14	WP627	We have no preferred option for use as inert landfill. The option should be chosen based on assessment of any environmental issues.	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 14	WP800	There are no proposed inert landfill sites in our area.	Noted

Resident	Question 15	WP80	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 15	WP122	Slight preference for WD11. Hope it will not interfere with Jurassica project?	Noted
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Question 15	WP710	The specific details relating to sites WD10 and WD11 are not know to the author of this submission, however, it is noted that they are both to be restored to limestone grassland. It is believed that much of the excavation spoils that may be available arriving from development projects in the Bournemouth/Poole conurbation are likely to be acidic in nature (which gives rise to the Dorset Heathlands) and thus may be unsuitable for this purpose. This illustrates the need for a criteria based approach where site specific issues can be assessed in detail at the time of a planning application.	Your comments are noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 15	WP801	Are there any other sites that you think should be considered for inert waste filling? Several of the aggregate and other sites in the draft Mineral Sites Plan will probably require inert fill as remediation is carried out. As we are asking that remediation is carried out during g quarrying operation and is underway y before any extension is granted, this inert fill may be needed quite soon, if the Local Authorities accept our suggestion on this point. For East Dorset Friends of the Earths response to the draft Mineral Sites Plan, please see our comments on the interactive website; some comments will be added later.	Your comments are noted. The Waste Plan acknowledges that both existing and potential new mineral sites will require inert fill for restoration.
Highways England	Figure 15	WP345	We have no preference for either site. Both are located close by, some distance from the SRN so are likely top have similar levels of impact on the SRN.	Noted
Resident	Question 16	WP123	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 16	WP244	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 16	WP314	There has been fluctuation in past years and it is considered prudent to plan for increase rather than no increase.	Your support is welcomed

Resident	Question 16	WP742	Growth in Hazardous Waste is a highly contentious issue and one which in my opinion is likely to become more so due to developments in technology producing more toxic types of waste, for example plastics and other synthetic materials. Buildings and processing plant will have an adverse impact on the area in which it is sited and as such by default will breach most of the considerations in Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and Quality of Life. Whilst mitigations can be put in place for some of the adverse impacts, some such as air pollution, natural leakage and water drainage are much more unpredictable and uncontrollable. Of the main concerns hazardous waste is probably the main worry but continuous noise and traffic pollution can also make life in the vicinity of such a site unbearable. For these reasons in my view such a treatment facility should be sited as far as possible from populated or recreational areas where people obviously live and gather. I want to object to the following two sites: ED02 Blunts Farm ED05 East Dorset Police HQ Both these sites are virtually central to the main population areas of Ferndown, Wimborne, and Colehill, along with others further afield. Both are adjacent to the woodland amenity areas of Cannon Hill and Uddens, and Whitesheet. These areas are widely and continuously used for recreation in many forms. ED05 also has a golf club and a hockey club used by young people. Whilst the general prevailing wind is from the south west no-one can guarantee the flow of emissions or the absolute level of pollutants generated from a high chimney and any landfall of pollutants close by would seriously affect both the residential and amenity areas. A chimney of the proportions suggested would be a blight on the are for miles around and could not be screened by landscaping or other screening techniques. There are also an increasing number of aircraft using a flight path over Ferndown and Colehill. A tall chimney would I should think present a hazard to aircraft. Similarly land drainage is complex in this area and with ED02 right adjacent the woodlands seepage of pollutants into this area is a major concern. Stapehill is also notorious for flooding, another major hazard if waste recovery operations were to take place here. A great deal of work has been undertaken in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and many more people are using this area for recreation. As a result of this work a number of species of mammals and birds have been discovered - who can tell how many more undiscovered creatures there may be - the adjacent area of Whitesheet is a designated as a SSSI site. Ferndown Industrial Estate in which the Blunts Farm site will fall is designated an area of light industrial use in the Core Strategy. Many people work here in small industrial units; I think waste recovery could not be considered as light industrial use.	It should be clarified that ED02 Blunts Farm and ED05 East Dorset Police Headquarters are being considered for a range of waste management facilities. Neither however are being considered currently for the management of hazardous waste. Further work will be undertaken which will include a review of existing and emerging waste treatment technologies to determine the suitability of the site options for a range of treatment technologies prior to reaching a decision on a preferred site.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 16	WP386	It is likely that the various hazardous wastes listed in section 11.2 will increase over the period of the Plan. It is also likely that more types of hazardous wastes will be invented and manufactured. The forecast of an overall growth rate of 0.5 % per annum or 0.5 X 17 = 8.5 % until 2032 may possibly turn out to be rather on the low side.	Your comments are noted, annual monitoring of hazardous waste arising's will highlight if the projections made in the Waste Plan remain appropriate.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 16	WP802	Question 16) Do you agree with the level of growth forecast for hazardous waste? Yes. There should be tighter constraints on teaching establishments, some of which still regularly flush very toxic waste, believing that small quantities don't matter.	Your support for the level of growth is welcomed
Purbeck District Council	Question 16	WP928	An average figure seems reasonable.	Your support is welcomed
Hampshire County Council	11.9	WP492	11.9 2013 HWDI shows approximately 2,350 tonnes of healthcare waste sent to Bournemouth UA for HTI without recovery. Dorset send approximately 700 tonnes of oils for recovery in Hampshire and approx. 700 tonnes of contaminated soils for rec	Your comments are helpful
Resident	11.15	WP124	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Bilfinger GVA (on behalf of Magnox Ltd)	11.19	WP678	Bilfinger GVA is the appointed property advisers for Magnox Limited, who operate and manage the Winfrith Nuclear Licensed site. We are pleased to submit written representations, on behalf of Magnox Limited, to the current public consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste Plan. Background The site is located west of the village of Wool in Dorset and neighbours the Dorset Green Technology Park. The wider site extends to approximately 99 hectares and was used as an atomic energy establishment between 1958 and 1996. The decommissioning process at Winfrith began under the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority and since 2005 has been under the control of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). The site is currently working towards an Interim End State, a long process expected to run until 2021, before establishment of a final End State at a point in the future. The site is licensed to Magnox Limited who manages and operates the site under contract to the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). Written Representations General Comments The draft plan recognises the work undertaken so far at Winfrith in getting the site to its Interim End State and that Magnox will continue to engage with the county and district councils on restoration options. Overall, Magnox is supportive of the steps that have been taken since the Waste Plan Issues Paper was consulted on between December 2013 and February 2014. We have a few minor comments; each of these is discussed below. The chapter number and paragraph, policy number, or site name/reference is included with each specific comment in line with the Response Form. Chapter 11, Paragraph 11.24 Waste planning authorities (WPAs) are required to have regard to Article 16 of EU Waste Framework Directive 2008/98/EC, which requires Member States to take account of the principles of self-sufficiency and proximity. Paragraph 11.24 of the Draft Plan states that the WPA will have regard to the proximity principle in considering proposals for radioactive waste management. Whilst Directive 2008/98/EC specifically excludes radioactive waste from its scope in Article 2, from a radioactive waste management perspective, disposals of waste are subject to the requirement of Best Available Techniques (BAT) for which the proximity principle is a factor the EA would expect to be considered. Later in the paragraph, national strategies for radioactive waste management are referred to, including those produced by the Nuclear Development Agency. It is considered that this is an error that should in fact say the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). The following wording is suggested as a replacement for paragraph 11.24 to acknowledge and clarify the statutory position with regard to the proximity principle and the management of radioactive waste Although national planning practice guidance (through related EU legislation (32)) specifically precludes radioactive waste from adherence to the proximity principle, proposals for radioactive waste management which have regard to the proximity principle will be viewed favourably by the Waste Planning Authority, but it is acknowledged that this is not a statutory requirement. Notwithstanding this, facilities for the treatment of waste emanating from beyond the Plan area should demonstrate that they will meet a need that is not adequately provided for elsewhere. They should also comply with national strategies for radioactive waste management, including those produced by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority with respect to the treatment, storage and disposal of radioactive waste. Proposed Policy 8 It is noted that the pre-text to Proposed Policy 9, at paragraphs 11.27 and 11.31, acknowledges that certain LLW and below ground structures may be disposed of by being left in-situ. Due to the nature of some of the remaining structures associated with the Winfrith site, the ability to dispose of residual sub-surface contamination by leaving it in-situ is important to the decommissioning strategy.. However, as Proposed Policy 9 only specifically relates to the Winfrith site, it is therefore considered that an amendment to Policy 8 is required, as this policy relates to special types of waste in general terms. As such, an amendment to Policy 8 is considered necessary to align with the needs of Magnox Limited. It is therefore considered that the following text should be inserted at the end of Proposed Policy 8: Disposal of residual below-ground radioactive contamination may be considered appropriate where it would be practically beneficial to do so, taking account of economic and environmental considerations. Conclusions In conclusion, Magnox Limited commends the Draft Waste Plan and will continue to liaise with Dorset County Council, Purbeck District Council and other regulatory bodies over the decommissioning of Winfrith. As outlined above, Magnox consider amendments should be made to Paragraph 11.24 and Proposed Policy 8.	Your support is welcomed and the detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	11.19	WP737	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Waste Plan. We welcome the support in principle of the NDA's Strategy as it relates to the Winfrith site. We broadly agree with the statements, policies and summaries presented in Section 11 with regard to radioactive waste. We have a few minor comments:- Paragraph 11.20 (and subsequently): Higher Activity Low Level Waste and Lower Activity Low Level Waste are not terms which have a legal definition. There is High Level Waste, Intermediate Level Waste, Low Level Waste and Very Low Level Waste. Higher Activity Waste is a term used to encompass High Level Waste, Intermediate Level Waste and those Low Level Wastes for which a disposal route is not yet identified. In paragraph 11.22 it may be appropriate to refer to Low Level Waste instead of Lower Activity Low Level Waste. Paragraph 11.23: The first sentence may need a bit of clarification as to what is meant. As we understand it, disposal of Very Low Level Waste with non-radioactive waste to landfill may not require planning permission but the use of a landfill for disposal of Low Level Waste is likely to require it. We understand that with regard to planning permission, any proposals for in-situ disposal of waste on the Winfrith Site would be considered on a case-by case basis. Paragraph 11.24: We note a small typo: we are the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and not the Nuclear Development Authority.	Your support is welcomed and the detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Resident	Proposed Policy 8 - Special types of waste	WP125	Agree	Your support is welcomed

North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 8 - Special types of waste	WP456	North Dorset District Council Support Proposed Policy 8	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 8 - Special types of waste	WP630	Paragraph 11.20. It is suggested here that the category of waste dictates how waste should be managed. This is not quite accurate. The Environment Agency permits the management and disposal of radioactive waste in England. We require Operators to manage their wastes in ways that ensure proper protection of people and the environment through the application of Best Available Techniques, irrespective of the category of the waste. For example, the final disposal of solid radioactive waste at any site is dependent upon the Environmental Safety Case that is demonstrated for that particular site, taking account of the relevant site-specific conditions that exist. Paragraph 11.24 we note reference is made to the Nuclear Development Agency this should refer more accurately to the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (who has responsibility for implementation of the national nuclear LLW Strategy). We suggest reference should also be made to the national NORM waste strategy produced by UK government (including Devolved Administrations) as this is also relevant to the waste streams that may require treatment / disposal within the Waste Plan area. The relevant reference is: Strategy for the management of Naturally Occurring Radioactive Material (NORM) waste in the United Kingdom, UK Government, July 2014. (Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2014/07/5552). We welcome the recognition within this paragraph of the importance of the national strategies that relate to radioactive wastes. Safe and sustainable management and disposal of radioactive wastes depends on the continued availability to the nuclear and non-nuclear industries of specialised capabilities and services which available only in limited supply across the UK. The emphasis of the national strategies is on enabling the development of the supply chain to provide solutions for radioactive waste management and in removing policy barriers to the development of waste treatment and disposal facilities (e.g. page 8 UK NORM waste strategy). Similarly, in our regulation of the waste producers we want to ensure that industry optimises its management of radioactive wastes appropriately through having access to the full range of capabilities and services that exist within the UK. With that in mind we are concerned that, as written, proposed Planning Policy 8 might inadvertently constrain Operators from being able to make use of key facilities and services that exist within the Waste Plan area. Also that it may stifle the willingness of the supply chain to invest further in the development and delivery of such services, either disrupting existing nationally-important waste treatment routes or suppressing future growth opportunities. Current text: Proposals for the management of hazardous waste, clinical waste and/or radioactive waste will be permitted where they are designed to meet a requirement for the management of a waste stream produced from within the Plan area and will not result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity or the environment. Facilities that provide capacity for such waste from a wider area should demonstrate that they will meet a need for waste management that is not adequately provided for elsewhere. Proposals for radioactive waste management facilities will also be expected to demonstrate that they are consistent with the national strategy for radioactive waste management. We suggest the policy might be re-written as: Proposals for the management of hazardous waste, clinical waste and/or radioactive waste will be permitted where they are designed to meet a requirement for the management of a waste stream produced from within the Plan area and will not result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity or the environment. Facilities that provide capacity for such waste from a wider area should demonstrate that they will meet a need for waste management that is not adequately provided for elsewhere, or that, in the case of radioactive waste management facilities, any such proposal supports the delivery of relevant national strategies.	Your detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Somerset County Council	Proposed Policy 8 - Special types of waste	WP504	Policies 8 and 9 Somerset County Council looks forward to further dialogue with Dorset County Council on radioactive waste, seeking to ensure for example there is a clear understanding of the scope and any constraints (including time limits) of existing radioactive waste management facilities at Winfrith, which we believe are operated by Tradebe.	Your comments are noted and agreed with
Tradebe Inutec	Proposed Policy 8 - Special types of waste	WP920	Following our discussions on the draft Waste Plan (July 2015), as part of the consultation process we would like to propose that consideration is given to some minor additional text to Proposed Policy 8 Special types of waste on page 135. The proposed additional text is in [italics]: Proposed Policy 8 Special types of waste Proposals for the management of hazardous waste, clinical waste and/or radioactive waste will be permitted where they are designed to meet a requirement for the management of a waste stream produced from within the Plan area or are an extension of facilities already established within the Plan area and will not result in an unacceptable impact on local amenity or the environment. Facilities that provide capacity for such waste from a wider area should demonstrate that they will meet a need for waste management that is not adequately provided for elsewhere taking account of national capabilities. Proposals for radioactive waste management facilities will also be expected to demonstrate that they are consistent with the national strategy for radioactive waste management. .. If you would like to discuss further, please do not hesitate to contact me.	Your detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Proposed Policy 8 - Special types of waste	WP738	We support this policy statement but where waste is received from outside the area, the proximity principle is also a key factor. This appears to be noted in Paragraph 11.24 but it would be helpful to re-iterate in the policy statement.	Your support is welcomed and the detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP739	It may be helpful to note after the second sentence that appropriate stakeholder engagement will occur to manage the concerns of local residents.	Noted

Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	11.25	WP740	Paragraph 11.25 (and subsequently): Rather than use the term 'restoration', which implies return to a greenfield site, we use the term 'remediation', which means return to a suitable state for an agreed next use. Paragraph 11.26: It may be helpful to note that through the application of the Waste Hierarchy, suitable material will be reused or recycled e.g. demolition material used for filling basement voids. Therefore, not all waste will require disposal. Paragraph 11.27: It is unclear what is meant by in-situ disposal here. If this refers to disposal on the Winfrith Site such disposal would not be under the management of the LLWR framework but would be for Magnox to justify on a case-by-case basis. Paragraph 11.30: We presume this refers to the 'NDA Strategy' of which waste is part. We do not have a 'NDA Waste Management Strategy' document as such. Paragraph 11.31: Does this refer to the 'NDA Strategy' or the 'UK Strategy for the Management of Low Level Waste from the Nuclear Industry'?	Your detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Resident	Proposed Policy 9 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith	WP126		Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 9 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith	WP245	Agree	Your support is welcomed
NuLeAF	Proposed Policy 9 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith	WP300	NuLeAF (the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum) is a Special Interest Group of the Local Government Association (LGA). NuLeAF is supported by 108 local authorities and 3 national park authorities across England and Wales. Our remit encompasses all aspects of the management of the UKs nuclear waste legacy, including spent nuclear fuel and waste management from prospective new nuclear generating capacity. Our primary objectives are: to provide a mechanism to identify, where possible, a common, local government viewpoint on nuclear legacy management issues; to represent that viewpoint, or the range of views of its member authorities, in discussion with national bodies, including Government, the NDA and the regulators; to seek to influence policy and strategy for nuclear legacy management in the interests of affected communities; and to develop the capacity of its member authorities to engage with nuclear legacy management at a local level. Our membership includes Dorset County Council and Purbeck District Council. Through our Radioactive Waste Planning Group (RWPG) we provide a forum for discussion of the challenges facing local authorities around the management and disposal of radioactive waste. NuLeAF welcomes the inclusion of Policies 8 on Special Types of Waste and Policy 9 on Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith. We believe all waste planning authorities, and in particular those with significant local facilities such as Winfrith, should include policies on radioactive waste. This is particularly important given the presumption for development within the new National Planning Policy Framework, as an absence of policy may leave a local area more open to developments that it does not support. The optimum management solution for different types of radioactive waste may vary depending on type and local characteristics. What is important is that the solution chosen should lead to the best result for the environment and communities both in Dorset and more widely. In assessing the best option for management of different waste streams, nuclear sites and other facilities that create radioactive waste should take full account of the Duty to Co-operate, the proximity principle and the waste hierarchy, while also accepting that in certain circumstances the best option may involve storage and disposal of waste outside the area. We are pleased to see that Dorset has addressed these issues. It is also welcome that the plan notes that while there may be scope for the retention of certain structures in-situ, this should not be at the expense of the desired site end state. We also support the objectives within Policy 9 that are designed to ameliorate the impact on communities and the environment of any decommissioning work. Given this, we agree with the policy as it stands.	Your comments and support are welcomed
Nuclear Decommissioning Authority	Proposed Policy 9 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith	WP741	a) In the first sentence, we hope NDA will also be one of the organisations the Waste Planning Authority will work with on the decommissioning and remediation of the Winfrith Site; b) We note item (c) makes reference to use of the rail freight link. Is this also covered in the Local Plan?	Your detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.

Purbeck District Council	Proposed Policy 9 - Decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith	WP933	Policy 9 (decommissioning and restoration of Winfrith): the Council is committed to working with Dorset County Council to facilitate the smooth decommissioning of the Winfrith site. Officers have previously sent comments to the waste team on this part of the plan, most of which appear to have been incorporated into the current draft. However, Dorset Green Technology Park is a major employment site and Purbeck District Council believes that and employment land should be added after public access in the opening sentence of the policy. Indeed, the northern part of the site is included in an application for enterprise zone status, so it is important that the waste plan recognises the important role Dorset Green play for employment	Your comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Resident	Proposed Policy 10 - Sewage treatment works	WP127	Imagine the full spectrum of methodologies has been evaluated long ago (e.g. reverse osmosis, ozonolysis, etc., etc., etc.)	Your comments are noted
Resident	Proposed Policy 10 - Sewage treatment works	WP246	I am agreeing with particular reference to Gillingham with very significant growth imminent with the southern extension it is extremely important that expansion to this service is made within the early part of the Plan period.	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 10 - Sewage treatment works	WP457	North Dorset District Council Support Proposed Policy 10	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 10 - Sewage treatment works	WP631	New Environmental Permits or variations to existing permits may be required for any new or extended sewage treatment works. Early discussions should be held with the Environment Agency regarding any proposals. We recommend that Environmental Permitting requirements and discussions with the Environment Agency should be mentioned in the Waste Plan.	Agree the plan will be amended to include reference to environmental permitting
Wessex Water	Proposed Policy 10 - Sewage treatment works	WP603	Where there is a need for new pipelines we are seeking policy support from Dorset CC to service sustainable development. Wessex Water is working with the local authorities in this region to introduce a holistic catchment approach/partnership to achieve nutrient reduction and planning targets.	Your comments are noted
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 10 - Sewage treatment works	WP840	Chapter 10: Proposed Policy 10 Agree W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Table 18	WP128	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Table 18	WP247	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	12.1	WP129	Noted	Noted

New Forest National Park Authority	12.1	WP717	Following on from above, in light of the statutory protection afforded to National Parks, the Authority is of the opinion that an assessment of the impacts on the National Park should be an essential requirement for any assessment of waste development proposals and this should be reflected in the Plan as follows.	Comments on individual sections of this chapter have been addressed.
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	12.1	WP711	This chapter should make reference to, and demonstrate that, the policies comply with the locational criteria set out in Appendix A of the National Planning Policy for Waste.	Agree, this will be clarified
	12.1	WP371	In pages 145 to 163 you mention the need to review; Traffic the Dorset road networks as any proposed development would generate significant new traffic (12.15) Suitability of the network, road links (12.18) safety, environmental effects and impacts on amenity (12.15) 12.17 Rail transportation is mention and this need to be joined up with the minerals plan. Dorset County Council is in the position to do this and should do so. 12.19 A Transport assessment is mentioned as being required for all developments. 12.21 A travel plan is mentioned as being required with significant amounts of movements of goods and people. 12.22 Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is mentioned if the road network is not adequate. It is at capacity now and I doubt that DCC know how much HGV travel movements take place in East Stoke on the A352 and Puddletown Road now as a baseline from the planning they have already agreed to. 12.23 I disagree that new waste facilities will be on existing area and that direct impacts might be unlikely regarding transport and recreational routes. I do not think DCC have any idea of the movements on the Puddletown Road and A352 in East Stoke at the moment. Appraisal Policy . Impacts on traffic are documented (page 147) 12.24 to 12.29 Quality of life for residents is documented here and key for any industrial developments. We were here first! Proposed Policy 12 welcomed 12.30 Landscape and design quality . This item is missing in the minerals plan. The Puddletown area is lacking restoration and is simply an eye sore. DCC seem to turn a blind eye to the effects of this landscape on other aspects of the area such a tourism, recreation, Heritage sites etc. What does the Dorset Landscape Character assessment cover? We will need to be familiar with this if plans go ahead. Proposed Policy 13 Landscape and Design Quality Proposed Policy 17 Biodiversity and geological interest Proposed Policy 18 Historic Environment and built heritage These are all welcomed. They are key to an AONB, tourism and residential harmony and quality of life. Proposed Policy 22 restoration, aftercare and after use This is lacking with the current Minerals extraction but it is essential. I am surprised that DCC is so lax in following this up with the commercial sector as they should be preserving the county for the future.	Your detailed comments are noted. Traffic - further discussions and where appropriate additional work will be undertaken on traffic impacts and access arrangements in developing preferred sites for waste facilities. Your support of Policy 12 is welcomed Landscape and design quality - a Puddletown road policy is being developed in the Mineral Sites Plan to guide further development and restoration. Your support of Policies 13, 17 and 18 is welcomed.
Resident	12.5	WP81		Noted.
New Forest National Park Authority	12.5	WP718	Traffic and Access para 12.9 As stated previously, reducing the impacts of traffic associated with waste management facilities on roads through areas bordering the waste plan area, including the New Forest National Park should be a key assessment for any development proposal likely to have an impact on the road network of the National Park. As pointed out previously, Lyndhurst has been identified as an Air Quality Management Area and additional traffic impacts associated with waste development proposals with potential impacts on Lyndhurst should be properly assessed. The Authority therefore considers it essential that any Transport Assessment should properly assess the impact of traffic on the National Parks road network and reference should be made to this requirement in the Plan.	It is agreed that any TA should assess impact outside of Dorset when appropriate.
North Dorset District Council	Figure 18	WP458	Figure 18 is labelled as the Dorset Strategic Road Network and Primary Route Network, which is a matter of road classification. However, the text describes issues of vehicle movements, which is illustrated in Figure 18, and this is reflected in the Dorset Freight Map. There is a distinction between I) voluntary encouragement of the use of the road, and ii) the road classification. This could be remedied by either altering the title of the map e.g. Dorset Freight Map Illustrative Likely Patterns of HGV Waste Movements, or leaving the title as it is and changing Figure 18 to show the mapped Dorset Strategic Road Network and Primary Route Network. The current issue is illustrated in the inconsistency between Fig 18 on page 145 and the Key Diagram pull out map. Fig 18 shows the northern part of the A350 between Blandford and Shaftesbury as an Other Route whereas the Key Diagram identifies this stretch of road as a Primary Route.	Your comments are noted and will be amended as appropriate
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Figure 18	WP683	You indicate through the draft document that transportation is an issue. This AONB is specifically recognised for its tranquillity and HGVs can have a significant adverse impact on tranquillity. There seem to be two issues in connection with this. Firstly vehicles accessing sites for waste treatment and disposal should be restricted to A class roads and, when a site is not sited on such a road, vehicles should be directed by the least damaging (probably the shortest) route to an A class road. The second matter is the long distance transfer of materials for treatment. The AONB is particularly concerned that satellite navigation systems used by drivers can indicate routes that are not on A class roads and this can have an extremely negative impact on not just the physical character of the AONB but the aesthetic tranquillity aspects. Transfer vehicles should, this AONB strongly recommends, be restricted to principal and A class routes. I note that your figure 18 indicates the principle routes of the County and the implication is that controls would be in place to ensure that HGVs use those routes. I note that restrictions have been put on lower class routes and this AONB would be extremely interested to discuss restrictions on roads within this AONB to protect and conserve the character of this nationally important area.	Your comments are noted

Resident	Proposed Policy 11 - Transport and access	WP130		Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 11 - Transport and access	WP248		Noted
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 11 - Transport and access	WP459	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Highways England	Proposed Policy 11 - Transport and access	WP346	We support the transport related development management policies and are pleased with the inclusion of For any proposed development that would generate significant new traffic, or substantially alter existing traffic flows, there is a need to ensure that the additional traffic can be accommodated satisfactorily We are generally content with the general thrust of Proposed Policy 11. We are pleased to note that a number of our comments from the previous consultation have now been included in the wording.	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 11 - Transport and access	WP898	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 11 The emerging Policy presents clear and concise criteria for determining a planning application.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 11 - Transport and access	WP841	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 11 Comment The emerging Policy presents clear and concise criteria for determining a planning application.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP249	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Devon County Council	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP29	Proposed Policy 12 could be enhanced through the inclusion of loss of privacy as a criterion. Part f could be expanded to ensure consideration of loss of natural light in addition to light pollution.	Consideration will be given to your suggestions and the Policy amended as appropriate.
Resident	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP82	Agree	Your support is welcomed.
Resident	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP131	Locally, issues of odour, windblown litter and pests (crows, wasps, etc.) are significant (Preston Road, Weymouth) - not sure how privacy may be affected (unless access to personal information via discarded paperwork etc., is an issue? Have lived elsewhere in UK where leachate and leachate gas were significant hazards. Also, yet another area where land stability was so bad, I witnessed a forklift truck vanish 200 feet into a hidden void. Also a still further area where odour reached a mile or more, causing even nearby Motorway travellers some "displeasure" (Basically everything on the list!)	The policy ensures that proposals for waste management facilities avoid these issues or mitigate them to an acceptable level.

Resident	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP250	Agree	Your support is welcomed.
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP460		Noted
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP632	Environmental Impact Assessment should run alongside any other required assessments, to assess impacts on wider ecosystem services provided by the environment and therefore identify what other mitigation/ enhancement should be included. Ecosystem services consider other supporting/ regulating/ cultural/ provisioning roles that the current environment plays, which are sometimes more difficult to quantify, but there are increasing examples. We can provide further guidance on this, if required.	Environmental Impact Assessment will be required for relevant applications, in line with the regulations.
Wessex Water	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP604	We do have concerns that encroachment of new development on land close to existing facilities is increasing. We are concerned that this does present greater risks for future enforcement action from new residents. Therefore we request that where possible policies are proactive in protecting residents amenity with robust safeguarding arrangements.	Proposed Policy 12 should ensure that proposals for new waste facilities do not have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity. The Draft Waste Plan also includes a proposed policy on safeguarding (Proposed Policy 23), which is to ensure that new residential developments do not encroach inappropriately on existing waste management facilities.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP899	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 12 The emerging Policy presents clear and concise criteria for determining a planning application and is consistent with the locational criteria listed in annex B to the National Waste Planning Policy for Waste, published October 2014.	Your support is welcomed.
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and quality of life	WP842	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 12 Comment The emerging Policy presents clear and concise criteria for determining a planning application and is consistent with the locational criteria listed in annex B to the National Waste Planning Policy for Waste, published October 2014.	Your support is welcomed.
Resident	12.3	WP251	Agree	Your support is welcomed.
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	12.3	WP687	The AONB welcomes the supporting statements and discussions within section 12 about landscapes, biodiversity, and heritage assets. Nevertheless, on behalf of the Partnership, I feel some attention to detail in the wording would benefit the policy plan in the long term. For example, in paragraph 12.31 reference should be made to the national importance and the national designation of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty so that the status of an AONB is immediately obvious to any reader. Similarly paragraph 12.35 is welcomed but I would suggest that the final sentence should be changed to Waste development proposals will need to demonstrate how they take account of AONB Management Plan objectives and policies. We have found in recent years that if that precise wording is not included developers assert, with no supporting evidence, that they have considered the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. That unsatisfactory situation means that a considerable amount of time and effort has to be put in on behalf of the AONB Partnership to demonstrate that such assertions are unsupported. Paragraph 12.39 is similarly welcomed but, again, to avoid a misunderstanding I strongly recommend that you refer to landscape and visual impact assessment.	Your comments are noted and your suggestions will be incorporated.

Resident	Proposed Policy 13 - Landscape & design quality	WP132	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 13 - Landscape & design quality	WP461	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Forest National Park Authority	Proposed Policy 13 - Landscape & design quality	WP719	The Authority fully supports and welcomes the wording in this policy which states; Great weight will be given to conserving the scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Beauty, National Parks and the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site, and their settings. Permission will only be granted for waste developments that do not result in unacceptable adverse impacts upon the special qualities that underpin the relevant organisation.	Your support is welcomed
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Proposed Policy 13 - Landscape & design quality	WP690	This AONB recognises that within a large rural area with a relatively small population, there will be occasions where on-farm treatment of waste materials will be proposed. There are materials generated within farmsteads that are recycled on the fields as fertiliser. The AONB is consulted by the Environment Agency when this involves the spreading of significant quantities of slurry or similar liquids. There can also be arguments made in support of on-farm composting. The view taken by this AONB is that for such proposals to be both sustainable and acceptable they should meet the aims of from the farm, for the farm, on the farm. That seems to the AONB Partnership to be clearer than the reference to local need in your current version of policy 13. I have recently seen a development proposal that refers to local need that would involve the transportation and importation of significant quantities of waste from a wide area. The interpretation of what is local seems rather too open when dealing with rural areas.	Given the extent of AONB coverage in the county, it is considered that there are occasions when a small-scale waste management facility needs to be sited in the AONB to offer the most sustainable solution to meeting a waste management need. For example, an anaerobic digestion facility or composting facility may be able to appropriately sited within the AONB without adversely affecting the special qualities of the designation whilst providing capacity for the management of waste in the vicinity of where the waste is arising, in line with the proximity principle.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 13 - Landscape & design quality	WP900	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 13 NESG support the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 13 - Landscape & design quality	WP845	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 13 Comment W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP253	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	12.4	WP252	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 14 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	WP133	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Resident	Proposed Policy 14 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	WP254	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 14 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	WP462	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 14 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	WP633	We support this policy.	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 14 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	WP901	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 14 NESG support the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 14 - Sustainable construction and operation of facilities	WP846	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 14 Comment W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP255	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	12.46	WP256	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Resident	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP83	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP134	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP257	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP463	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP634	We support this policy, but wish to make the following comments. Paragraph 12.50 - we agree there should be no net loss of open watercourse or wetland areas, but this should also include no net loss of their corridor and buffer. We also agree with ... it is expected that impacts will be mitigated to an acceptable level but enhancement should also be included as a requirement. Water Framework Directive outcomes should be considered and promoted. These comments could equally apply in Policy 13 Landscape and design quality. Within the Proposed Policy 15 wording, there appears to be a word missing at the end of bullet a. We believe the missing word is mitigated.	Your helpful comments are noted and amendments will be made to the text and policy.
Wessex Water	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP605	Reference to quality of ground/surface water do we need to set out locations/areas of SPZ/DRWPA/SGZ under the Water Framework Directive on maps for these policy areas. 12.48 12.50 We note the role of catchment partnerships to support nutrient reductions. The role and requirements of these arrangements can be acknowledged. Error on Policy 15 adequately ???.. protected	Your comments are noted
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP902	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 15 NESG support the intent and wording of the emerging Policy	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP847	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 15 Comment W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Purbeck District Council	Proposed Policy 15 - Natural resources	WP934	Policy 15(a) (natural resources): clause a of this policy contains an incomplete sentence.	Noted, this Policy will be amended
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP84	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP258	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	12.54	WP85	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Resident	12.54	WP135	No telling what you might get if leachate becomes tailings.	Noted
Resident	12.54	WP259	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 16 - Flood risk	WP260	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 16 - Flood risk	WP464	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 16 - Flood risk	WP635	We support this policy, but wish to comment that where a risk of flooding needs to be mitigated, natural flood risk management schemes should be promoted, for example upstream storage.	Your helpful comments are welcomed and the Plan will be amended as appropriate.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 16 - Flood risk	WP903	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 16 NESG support the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 16 - Flood risk	WP848	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 16 Comment W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP136		Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP261	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Forest National Park Authority	12.63	WP720	The Authority is disappointed to note that our previous comments made have not been taken on board. Again, whilst mention is made here of the need to protect Dorset's important habitats there is no mention of the requirement to assess the potential impacts that a development proposal may have on the National Parks network of Nature 2000 sites and the Authority again requests that the Plan should be amended accordingly.	Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to amending the text to refer to adjoining authorities.
Resident	Proposed Policy 17 - Biodiversity and geological interest	WP262		Your support is welcomed

North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 17 - Biodiversity and geological interest	WP465	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Proposed Policy 17 - Biodiversity and geological interest	WP563	Policy 17 Biological and geological interest We are concerned that the policy as worded has not accorded the same level of protection to SNCIs, LNRS, priority habitats and species or SANGs as in Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Policy ME1. Further there is no mention of the need for buffer zones. Recommendations : 1. Protection of nature conservation interest should be given far higher priority in policy. Weakening of policy that already has Secretary of State approval is unacceptable 2. The final sentence should be amended to read .. and consistent with sustainable development. 3. To comply with the Review of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive 2014, policy should also include reference to the need for monitoring of habitats and species for a suitable period of time after completion of the development to indicate any changes in habitat quality or species numbers, and put in place corrective measures to halt or reverse any decline . http://ec.europa.eu/environment/eia/review.htm .	Your detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 17 - Biodiversity and geological interest	WP636	We support this policy, but we wish to make the following comments. We agree with the end of paragraph 12.65 .. together with any area/habitat that could be considered to be essential.... Paragraph 12.72 - we would recommend this paragraph is amended to say designed-in and committed to , rather than just explored , in terms of opportunities for biodiversity gains. We would question whether Bio2020 aims be included as well as Dorset Biodiversity Strategy. Invasive non-native species and biosecurity could be mentioned in this section.	Your detailed comments will be considered further in preparing the final plan.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 17 - Biodiversity and geological interest	WP904	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 17 NESG support the intent of the emerging Policy, but would respectfully suggest that the requirement for objective assessment should be proportionate to the proposed development. As it stands, the Policy would appear to require any and every application for a waste related development to be accompanied by an objective assessment; even if were to be for a minor development within the curtilage of an established facility.	Noted, consideration will be given to amending the Policy
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 17 - Biodiversity and geological interest	WP849	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 17 Comment W H White notes the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Noted
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP137	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP263	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 18 - Historic environment	WP264	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 18 - Historic environment	WP466	Agree	Your support is welcomed

New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 18 - Historic environment	WP905	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 18 NESG note the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Noted
Dorset Gardens Trust	Proposed Policy 18 - Historic environment	WP539	This policy is acceptable as far as it goes, but the HER is not the only source for heritage assets. The Dorset Gardens Trust holds a Local List of parks and gardens that are not (yet) within the HER, and other organisations no doubt are in the same position. Local List sites are accorded protection within the NPPF. Developers need to ensure that they have established local list sites within the 'heritage asset' umbrella from l.p.a.s and where possible other heritage bodies.	There are indeed other useful sources of historic environment information as well as the Dorset Historic Environment Record (DHER). However, I understand that entries in the Dorset Gardens Trust's gazetteer have not been incorporated within the DHER because the information is not yet in an appropriate form. It would seem better for that information to be provided to the DHER in a way that enables it to be added to the Record, rather than referring developers to it separately.
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 18 - Historic environment	WP850	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 18 Comment W H White notes the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Noted
Purbeck District Council	Proposed Policy 18 - Historic environment	WP935	Policy 18 (historic environment): it is impossible to conserve and enhance. This should probably say or.	The policy is trying to say that 'conservation' and 'enhancement' are mutually exclusive. However, I would say that you could both conserve and enhance a heritage asset, e.g. by undertaking repairs and improving public access. For clarify the policy will be amended to use 'and/or'.
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP138	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP265	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	12.8	WP139	As well as gulls, Weymouth is especially "blessed" with an abundance of crows. Luckily few flight paths, except for "search and rescue" and nearby flights from Yeovil manufacturer (Westland).	noted
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 19 - Airfield Safeguarding Areas	WP467	Agree	Your support is welcomed
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 19 - Airfield Safeguarding Areas	WP906	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 19 NESG note the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Noted

Bournemouth Airport	Proposed Policy 19 - Airfield Safeguarding Areas	WP824	In respect of other allocated sites within a 13 mile radius of the airport a general policy statement is requested about assessing whether or not the proposal has any impact on aerodrome safeguarding, especially in respect of the likelihood of the site becoming an attractant to birds, in line with the requirements of DfT Circular 1/2003 advice to Local Planning Authorities on safeguarding aerodromes and military explosive storage areas. This should apply to other sites not allocated that come forward in the Plan period.	Your comments are noted, once adopted and when considering planning applications for allocated or non-allocated sites, the Waste Plan should be read as a whole and applications will need to comply with Policy 19. This requires developments within an Airfield Safeguarding Area to demonstrate that the proposed development will not give rise to new or increased aviation hazards. It is proposed to have development criteria alongside all allocated sites, this should highlight when developments lie within Airfield Safeguarding Areas.
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 19 - Airfield Safeguarding Areas	WP851	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 19 Comment W H White notes the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Noted
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP266	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 20 - South East Dorset Green Belt	WP86	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 20 - South East Dorset Green Belt	WP140	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Proposed Policy 20 - South East Dorset Green Belt	WP267	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Wessex Water	Proposed Policy 20 - South East Dorset Green Belt	WP606	This policy may introduce adverse conditions when considering critical capacity for sewerage sites to service new development. The circumstances and requirements of these sites are unique and careful consideration may be needed for some allowance of these sites and future expansion.	It is agreed that there may be the need for the expansion of sewage treatment sites within the Green Belt. The policy allows for development where there is a need that cannot be met by alternative suitable non-Green Belt sites. The text will be amended to refer to any exiting sewage treatment sites that are located within the Green Belt.
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 20 - South East Dorset Green Belt	WP907	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 20 As you will be aware, NESGs established MBT facility is located within the South East Dorset Green Belt. As recognised elsewhere in the Plan, the established facility forms a critical part of the sub-regions waste management infra-structure. Whilst the intent of the Policy is duly acknowledged and is broadly consistent with the NPPF, an air of pragmatism will be required when determining applications for minor development within the curtilage of the established facility, particularly where such development would facilitate operational or amenity improvements. Flexibility is currently afforded through the Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt Policy in Borough of Poole's DM&SSA DPD, but would be more appropriately enshrined within emerging Policy 20. NESG would therefore recommend that an additional criteria be added after (a) to read where it would serve to support an established facility and deliver operational and / or amenity improvements; or .	The importance of the Site Control Centre in managing waste arising's is acknowledged elsewhere in the Plan but it is agreed that the Green Belt policy and text could be strengthened to allow flexibility for improvements at existing waste management facilities situated in the Green Belt.

W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 20 - South East Dorset Green Belt	WP852	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 20 Disagree As you will be aware, the Site Control Centre is located within the South East Dorset Green Belt. As recognised elsewhere in the Plan, the established facility forms a critical part of the sub-regions waste management infra-structure. Whilst the intent of the Policy is duly acknowledged and is broadly consistent with the NPPF, an air of pragmatism will be required when: Considering the Site Options, recognising the particular locational requirements of waste management facilities (as retained in the National Planning Policy for Waste); and · Determining applications for minor development within the curtilage of the established facility With respect to the former, this is certainly the case when waste management facilities are to be co-located and integrated with established permanent waste management facilities in the Green Belt. W H White would respectfully suggest that an additional criteria be added after (a) to read where sites are allocated for such purposes within this Plan. With respect to the latter, this is particularly important where such development would facilitate operational or amenity improvements. Flexibility is currently afforded through the Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt Policy in Borough of Poole's DM&SSA DPD, but would be more appropriately enshrined within emerging Policy 20. W H White would therefore recommend that an additional criteria be added after (a) to read where it would serve to support an established facility and deliver operational and / or amenity improvements; or .	The importance of the Site Control Centre in managing waste arising's is acknowledged elsewhere in the Plan but it is agreed that the Green Belt policy and text could be strengthened to allow flexibility for improvements at existing waste management facilities.
Resident	12.9	WP141	I guess the west/north/Weymouth tri-council will have charging authority?	Noted
	Proposed Policy 21 - Waste from new developments	WP268	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 21 - Waste from new developments	WP468	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 21 - Waste from new developments	WP637	We support this policy, but wish to comment that there is no mention of the need for remediation to reduce amount of waste exported to landfill offsite.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Wessex Water	Proposed Policy 21 - Waste from new developments	WP607	We welcome the support for requiring adequate capacity at treatment works to service new development.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 21 - Waste from new developments	WP853	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 21 Agree W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP142	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP269	Agree	Your support is welcomed

Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural	12.109	WP688	Landscape Management Guidelines are mentioned in paragraph 12.114. The reference is incomplete so it would be helpful to indicate where, exactly, these landscape management guidelines can be found and accessed. As a point of information which you may already be aware of, some of the Green Belt overlaps with this AONB.	Agree the location of the management guidelines will be clarified.
Resident	Proposed Policy 22 - Restoration, aftercare & afteruse	WP87	Agree	Your support is welcomed
North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 22 - Restoration, aftercare & afteruse	WP469	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Environment Agency	Proposed Policy 22 - Restoration, aftercare & afteruse	WP638	We support this policy, but wish to comment that the Water Framework Directive should be considered in any restoration, aftercare and afteruse proposals.	Agree, further consideration will be given to if additional/amendments to the text are necessary. It should be noted that the Plan should be read as a whole and any planning application should be considered against all relevant policies.
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 22 - Restoration, aftercare & afteruse	WP854	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 22 Agree W H White supports the intent and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP143	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Question 17	WP88	No	Noted
Resident	Question 17	WP89	There is one additional matter. Based on experience concerning the Verwood/Moores Valley area landfill. Where land used as amenity (such as woodland etc.) is required for waste management purposes such as landfill, then alternative amenity space, of equal area, should be obtained for use by the public until such time as the original taken up land has been restored to a condition suitable to public access once more. In other words public amenity "rattle space" would greatly lesson the impact on the public quality of life	Your comments are noted. The Waste Plan does not propose any new non-hazardous landfill sites and inert landfill sites are likely to be linked to the restoration of quarries.
Resident	Question 17	WP144	Yes At an individual level, perhaps some kind of forum to point out low-level deficiencies and possible improvements At population level, educate entire populace that waste management is not just a necessary evil but is heading toward becoming a dominating cost and environment factor - We all have to act together and now is the time to plan that At Government level, national education, funding, coordination and cooperation with EC legislators and facilitators required - before we plunge deeper into non-compliance charges, bigger and more severe environmental impacts, sharply rising costs, loss of "easy" solutions like landfill, availability of novel technologies for waste recycling/remediation/energy release, R&D effort across the board, recognition of the "big challenges" facing humanity worldwide (water, food, energy, materials) Don't mean to sound "doomist", but its going to get worse before it gets better.	Your comments are noted.

Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 17	WP315	The plan covers the necessary considerations.	Noted
Environment Agency	Question 17	WP628	We consider the following issues should also be considered. Flood Risk: All sites to consider flood risk, through site specific Flood Risk Assessments. Biodiversity : If sites have any wetland landscape/river corridor implications, we would expect to see a robust riparian buffer and habitat enhancement to maintain function and connectivity and function and improve remaining habitat quality. It would be good to see this explicitly stated in the plan. We would ask whether British Standard 42020 should apply. Groundwater and contaminated land: Delineation of Source Protection Zones (SPZ) may change with time. All our comments are therefore made using current SPZ designations / mapping, but in due course the sensitivity of groundwater may change.	Your comments are noted and many of these issues could be addressed through development criteria associated with allocated sites set out in the final plan.
Resident	Question 17	WP372	Question 17 These matters are clearly laid out BUT need to be followed up with development. It should not just be rhetoric.	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Question 17	WP803	Just a greater emphasis on zero waste, please.	Noted
Purbeck District Council	Question 17	WP929	Purbeck District Council believes that the proposed matters to consider in the determination of waste planning applications are appropriate.	Your support is welcomed
Trigon Estate	13.1	WP286	It is clearly sensible to maintain the policy of safeguarding as set out in Chapter 13.	Your support is welcomed
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	13.1	WP712	Table 13 should be amended to take account of the fact that not all inert waste can be recycled and that provision must be made for the recovery or landfill disposal of these materials.	Clarification will be made within the 'Criteria for Safeguarding' table.
Resident	13.9	WP145	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Hampshire County Council	13.9	WP493	1 3.10 - consider different buffer distances for urban/rural areas	Your comments are noted and further consideration has been given, however a single buffer distance would ensure a simple and consistent safeguarding strategy which provides adequately for safeguarding without placing too heavy a burden on the local planning authorities. This Waste Plan will be monitored and if blanket approach to consultation zones appears to be failing it may be necessary to review the Plan (or part of it).
Hampshire County Council	13.9	WP494	13.13 - Consideration for COU to be included alongside developments	Your comment is noted and reference will be made to change of use applications for clarity.

North Dorset District Council	Proposed Policy 23 - Safeguarding waste facilities	WP470	The Council supports the approach of proposed Policy 23 Safeguarding waste facilities. However, the Council would request the following amendment to enable the text to be less confusing as to who the Planning Authority is that would permit non-waste development within a District/County context: Proposals for non-waste development that could prejudice a safeguarded waste site will only be permitted if it is demonstrated to the Waste Planning Authority that one or more of the following circumstances apply:	Agree, this will be clarified
New Earth Group	Proposed Policy 23 - Safeguarding waste facilities	WP908	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 23 Agree NESG support the intent of safeguarding and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Proposed Policy 23 - Safeguarding waste facilities	WP855	Chapter 11: Proposed Policy 23 Agree W H White supports the intent of safeguarding and wording of the emerging Policy.	Your support is welcomed
Resident	Sustainability Appraisal Summary	WP146	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Devon County Council	Question 18	WP30	The approach to safeguarding waste sites set out in the Plan is supported.	Your support is welcomed
	Question 18	WP90	No	noted
Northamptonshire County Council	Question 18	WP160	Q18 - A buffer of 400m for sewage and waste water treatment may be more appropriate due to odours/emissions and impact on sensitive receptors, particularly concerning residential areas	Your comment is noted and will be discussed further with the relevant authorities
Resident	Question 18	WP270	Agree	Your support is welcomed
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 18	WP316	No comment, support the safeguarding measures.	Your support is welcomed
Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural	Question 18	WP689	Whilst Safeguarding may be focussed on retaining existing sites the AONB would be concerned about increased levels of activity on sites within or close to the AONB. Furthermore, the need for buffer zones around sites is a matter that should take into account the landscape. Depending on the overall landscape character and the specific local landscape features and characteristics a fixed buffer zone is unlikely to be especially useful. A more flexible approach that takes account of those factors, would, I recommend, be more useful.	Your comments are noted, it might be difficult to achieve defined consultation zones for individual sites, particularly once the Plan is adopted and new sites are developed. However, the WPA will give this further consideration.
Robert Le Clerc Consulting (on behalf of Andrews Plant)	Question 18	WP713	We support the Plans aim to safeguard sites and for the inclusion of consultation zones around them, though we would question the value of a blanket 250m zone around all sites. The consultation/exclusion zone should be defined on a site by site basis depending on the scale and nature of the facility. In paragraph 13.13, for this policy to have teeth, as well as consulting the WPA, District and Borough Councils must also take account of WPA response when determining planning applications within a safeguarding zone.	Your comments are noted, it might be difficult to achieve defined consultation zones for individual sites, particularly once the Plan is adopted and new sites are developed. However, the WPA will give this further consideration.

New Earth Group	Question 18	WP909	Chapter 11: Question 18 NESG support the principle of safeguarding, the proposed 250m consultation zone and the two proposed exceptions to consultation.	Your support is welcomed
Intelligent Land	Question 18	WP555	Question 18 seeks comments on the principle of safeguarding sites allocated for waste management as set out in Proposed Policy 23. There are two representations by way of objection to this policy: The proposed policy is unlawful as it seeks to effectively unzone land already allocated for other uses in existing development plans. A&Rs land at Woolsbridge, as identified in the introduction, is zoned by virtue of Policy VTSW6 in the relevant Core Strategy. Any application for this site, at the present time would have to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations determine otherwise (by virtue of Section 38(6) and the 2004 Act and Section 70(2) of the 1990 Act. It is inconceivable that there should be a conflict in absolute terms between two competing development plans. As the Draft Waste Plan has no delivery element to the plan it means that land could be sterilised for the entire plan period. This is contrary to the advice in the NPPF at paragraph 22, which requires Councils to have regard to market signals etc. These comments are without prejudice to the possibility of such a policy attracting blight notices on such affected land.	It should be noted that safeguarding is not intended to stop appropriate development. The WPA will work with local authorities to ensure non waste development does not un-necessarily constrain important waste infrastructure. If potential impacts are considered in advance it will usually be possible to reduce conflict between waste facilities and other developments through careful design, screening and other mitigation. The next version of the Waste Plan will include a clear strategy for implementation and monitoring. Monitoring levels of waste arising's and waste management capacity will ensure that once the Waste Plan is adopted land is not unnecessarily sterilised.
North Dorset District Council	Question 18	WP471		Noted
W H White LTD	Question 18	WP856	Chapter 11: Question 18 W H White supports the principle of safeguarding, the proposed 250m consultation zone and the two proposed exceptions to consultation.	Your support is welcomed
Purbeck District Council	Question 18	WP930	Purbeck District Council recognises the benefits of safeguarding sites and supports the policy, which is flexible enough to allow some non-waste development in certain circumstances. Consultation and exclusion zones are necessary in order to retain control over the potential sterilisation of facilities.	Your support is welcomed
Devon County Council	13.15	WP31	The Plan in its current form says very little about how monitoring will be undertaken following its adoption. It will be necessary to develop a clear set of monitoring indicators which can be considered through the examination process. It is recommended this work is included in the next version of the Plan in order to provide an opportunity for comment through the Pre-Submission consultation process.	The next version of the Waste Plan will include a clear strategy for implementation and monitoring.
Somerset County Council	13.15	WP505	We support inclusion of content on monitoring in the pre-submission Plan.	Your support is welcomed
Resident		WP3	Having trouble understanding information given, too much to print off can you send a hard copy. Very interested in any development along Bere Road, Wareham, both Waste Landfill and Mineral Extraction. I feel that we suffer enough with the Landfill lorries as it is. Together with the fires and smells from Trigon Landfill and the extra traffic along an unsuitable road - Bere Road is not even on the Snow Clearing route. It is a residential area with THREE holiday caravan parks plus one residential park.	The Waste Local Plan does not propose to allocate an extension to Trigon Landfill site as we are seeking to move waste up the hierarchy away from landfill. However, there is thought to be additional landfill capacity at Trigon Landfill site, should the need arise, and it prove commercially viable to open up the site. The site is proposed to be safeguarded to ensure that the WPA is consulted on applications for non-minerals development in the vicinity that may have an impact on future landfill operations.

Bournemouth Water		WP4	From the information provided on the Dorset for you web portal and from our initial responses I can confirm it appears that within the Waste Plan there are areas in our supply region that could be affected. I have copied these areas below. The majority of our water main pipelines and service connections are situated in roads adjacent to the highlighted sites. Please be aware that there may be private water pipes that exist within the boundary of the highlighted sites which we do not own and care should be taken when undertaking any excavation work. This pipework and its maintenance is the responsibility of the site owners who should be contacted separately for their comments. Protection/diversion works to our distribution pipe network can only be confirmed once we have received formal applications and plans of the highlighted areas below, this will allow us to make a judgement on any works required. For your information I enclose a plan showing the extent of our area of supply. If you have any query or require more information, please contact me. BC01 - Kinson Sewage Treatment Works CB01 - Hurn shortlisted sites CB02 - Eco Composting Parley ED01 Brook Road ED02 Blunts Farm ED03 Woolsbridge ED04 West Moors ED05 Little Canford ED06 East Dorset Police HQ	Your comments are noted and may require further discussions.
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership		WP566	East Dorset Waste Site Options Comments are included on only those sites that members know well: they are intended to supplement those already noted in the MWDF site assessments for the shortlisted waste site options . The operating hours for each type of facility will have a bearing on its acceptability. Worst case scenario (maximum number of days per week and working hours) should be assumed for impact on local residents. A significant increase in HGV movements 24 hours per day 7 days a week are unacceptable in residential areas or in normally tranquil settings used for informal recreation. Similarly noise and emissions generated from the facility will need to be assessed: local residents must be given the facts. The more difficult and time consuming it is for people to access an HRC the greater the potential will be for fly tipping which is costly to the local authorities, Forestry Commission, farmers and larger landowners causes environmental damage and encourages more fly tipping. Costs to local authorities are met by the Dorset Waste Partnership which needs to save money. The other landowners have to fund it themselves. The individual Site Assessments state distances between the larger towns and villages and proposed waste sites Those we have checked for ED03 and ED04 (Woolsbridge and West Moors) are incorrect. Recommendations : 1. Total vehicle movements, all emissions and noise data should be modelled for each of the sites being considered for each facility particularly HRCs. This modelling should include peak traffic flows not only Average Annual Daily traffic (AADT). The potential for rat-runs and impact of additional traffic using unsuitable routes should also be taken into consideration. 2. The evidence presented indicates a strong sustainability and financial case for siting HRC facilities in the Ferndown/Wimborne area and also maintaining current arrangements for Verwood, St Leonards & St Ives, Alderholt and the Crane Valley/Cranborne Chase villages to use Blue Haze. 3 . All distances should be checked and corrected. Proximity is one of the three underlying principles of the Waste Plan (Policy 1 p20): using these invalid data to assess the suitability of a site is Unsound.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Ramblers Association - Dorset Area		WP576	I also have one comment to make in respect of the Waste Plan document: on the maps, it is almost impossible to distinguish between the Site Option boundary and PROW, as they are both shown by red lines. It would have been much easier had different colours been used.	Your comments are noted and improvements will be made to the next consultation document.
Environment Agency	Option WP BO01	WP640	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, apart from mentioning that there are former landfills in proximity to this site, which will certainly need to consider land contamination risks.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP BO01	WP580	The proposed site is adjacent to SZ 09/026 Ensbury Wood Site of Nature Conservation Interest, comprising wet and dry semi-natural woodland, and wet grassland areas. If this site is carried forward for use as a bulky waste transfer/treatment site, then care would be needed to ensure no adverse impacts on the SNCI, although this is unlikely to be a major problem given the existing use of the site, and provided that the existing buffer of trees remains between the site and the SNCI boundary.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP BO01	WP804	This site does not raise a problem for East Dorset FoE provided that it only occupies the space marked in the map on page 181 of Appendix 1. Any expansion further into the green belt would be opposed except for anaerobic digestion. A slightly enlarged site taking in a small part of Vernons Coppice could house an anaerobic digester taking in sewage and residual waste. For this purpose, the loss of a small section of green belt is permissible.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP CB01	WP641	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Bournemouth Airport	Option WP CB01	WP822	I apologise that this response has arrived following the close of the formal consultation period but I would like to make the following comments in relation to two sites that have been identified in the Dorset County Council Draft Waste Plan for a change/intensification of use. The two sites in question lie in close proximity to Bournemouth Airport and therefore will have a high likelihood of impact on operation. The two sites the airport wishes to raises concern about are: CB01 Hurn MRF, Parley CB02 Eco-Composting, Parley Option WP CB01 Hurn MRF, Parley Proposed development The site is currently being used as a transfer station with the ability to carry out limited sorting. Once a more sophisticated MRF is developed in the Plan area this site may no longer be required and could be available for an alternative waste management use. Airport's response Bournemouth Airport would like to advise that any alternative waste management uses on this site should consider the close proximity to the airport and the risk of a bird strike hazard.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP CB01	WP805	Access: The two Christchurch sites are in East Parley, close to the Airport. East Dorset FoE is concerned that additional traffic to these sites may cause Parley Lane to snarl up. This may lead to a proposal to dual Parley Lane. Discussion of this is outside the remit of these authors, as we are only authorised to comment on waste matters. CB 01, Hurn MRF: East Dorset FoE has no objection to this site for any beneficial and ecologically sustainable waste management use.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP CB02	WP642	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Option WP CB02	WP751	Existing Facility at Chapel Lane, Parley Eco's existing facility at Chapel Lane, Parley is identified in the Site Options section of the Draft Waste Plan and referred to as Option WP CB02. We welcome the identification of the site and consider that it is an appropriate option. The identification of the site at Chapel Lane is consistent with its planned expansion and modernisation. On 30 July 2015, Dorset County Councils Regulatory Committee approved Eco's planning application for the comprehensive development of the Chapel Lane site comprising the reconfiguration of existing and consented development; introduction of new plant and processes; increase in permitted throughput; partial widening of the access road; new landscaping and associated matters (Planning Ref: 8/14/0515). An extract of the approved Site Layout Plan is provided as Figure 1 below. Figure 1: Approved Site Layout at Chapel Lane, Parley Source: WYG The purpose of this approved development is to update and modernise the recycling processes and consented energy recovery processes at Eco's existing facility at Chapel Lane. The development will represent a significant capital investment to improve the environmental quality of the site and the processes being undertaken. The development aims to provide for the comprehensive reconfiguration of Eco's existing and permitted site to incorporate more modern and efficient recycling processes. In this regard, the development responds to feedback from Dorset County Council, Natural England, Bournemouth Airport, Hurn and West Parley Parish Councils, and other local stakeholders. The development includes the rearrangement of the existing Soils Recycling Area, the permitted Anaerobic Digestion Facility and the Green Waste Composting area, the permanent retention of the Road Sweeping and Gully Waste Recycling Plant, and the introduction within these areas of a Digestate Reprocessing Plant, a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) Processing Plant and a Clean Wood Biomass Burner. The comprehensive development of the site accords with key planning policies in that it: Provides for a sustainable development that provides for economic growth, social responsibility and environmental enhancement; Delivers an increase in low carbon energy generation; Provides a sustainable local solution to the management of different waste streams received from Dorset and Christchurch collections; Meets a clear and pressing national need for waste recovery and low carbon energy that contributes to meeting the UKs waste management and carbon reduction targets; and Minimises the environmental effects of the development and of local waste management operations. The Parley site has approval to receive up to 85,000 tonnes of inert waste each year and will continue to manage soils and aggregates in an efficient and sustainable manner. Having regard to the recently approved proposals for Eco's site at Parley, we support the identification of the site for strategic facilities, as set out in the Draft Waste Plan. In particular, we consider that the site is well placed to provide for the treatment of bulky waste through the SRF Processing Plant. The size of the Parley site and the variety of waste streams would make it a viable and sustainable location for the management of bulky waste. Further to this, it is submitted that the site is ideally suited to gasification or pyrolysis of SRF, RDF and residual (black bag) waste, which could be accommodated within the approved SRF Processing Plant building. Dealing with these materials on-site means that it would not need to be exported off-site. The size of the Parley site and the variety of waste streams would make it a viable and sustainable location for the management and recycling of bulky waste. The gasification of clean wood would also provide a sustainable solution for clean wood on the Parley site, as it would result in less emissions that a clean biomass burner.	Your comments are noted and may require further discussions
Eco Sustainable Solutions Ltd	Option WP CB02	WP820	As a point of clarification, we consider that Eco's site at Chapel Land, Parley can provide for the gasification of approximately 80,000 tonnes per annum of residual and bulky waste that cannot be recycled.	Your comments are noted. It is proposed to undertake further assessment and public consultation on the option of additional waste treatment capacity at Eco, Parley.
Bournemouth Airport	Option WP CB02	WP823	I apologise that this response has arrived following the close of the formal consultation period but I would like to make the following comments in relation to two sites that have been identified in the Dorset County Council Draft Waste Plan for a change/intensification of use. The two sites in question lie in close proximity to Bournemouth Airport and therefore will have a high likelihood of impact on operation. The two sites the airport wishes to raises concern about are: CB01 Hurn MRF, Parley CB02 Eco-Composting, Parley Option WP CB02 Eco-Composting, Parley Proposed development Introduction of a new plant and processes and an increase in permitted throughput. New processes include a solid recovered fuel processing plant and a landscaping scheme. This is an existing waste management and recycling facility incorporating a range of facilities. The site and proposed extension area is subject to a current planning application for the reconfiguration the existing and consented development, including introduction of new processes including mixed food and maize for AD plant, solid recovered fuel and road sweepings facility. Airport's response Increased throughput would give rise to an increase in bird strike hazard in the vicinity of Bournemouth Airport. Further development of the site should be subject to a Bird Management Plan to be agreed with Bournemouth Airport to avoid impacting on the safe operation of the airport. We would advocate that the development of the site continues to be subject to scrutiny of the Eco Solutions Community Liaison Group and that the policy is cognisant of this.	Your comments are noted. The need for a Bird Management Plan will be considered further, however this may be more appropriate at the planning application stage.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP CB02	WP581	The proposed extension of this site would bring it adjacent to the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Dorset Heaths SAC/ Hurn Common SSSI so close consultation with Natural England would be needed to ensure no adverse impacts on this internationally designated site. Ecological mitigation and long-term restoration would need to be agreed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP CB02	WP806	Access: The two Christchurch sites are in East Parley, close to the Airport. East Dorset FoE is concerned that additional traffic to these sites may cause Parley Lane to snarl up. This may lead to a proposal to dual Parley Lane. Discussion of this is outside the remit of these authors, as we are only authorised to comment on waste matters. CB 02, Parley Eco-Composting: We are comfortable that the operators of CB 02, Eco Composting, Parley, are responsible operators in spite of the untoward discharges they have made. This site has no other concerns that we know of. This site is already used and has good access, although Parley Lane does snarl up a lot. We aren't massively happy with the proposed extension of this site. We agree with Dorset Wildlife Trust that an extension would bring it adjacent to the Dorset Heathlands SPA, Dorset Heaths SAC and Hurn Common SSSI so close consultation with Natural England would be needed to ensure no adverse impacts on this internationally designated site. Ecological mitigation and long-term restoration would need to be agreed. There should be a management plan to that effect.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED01	WP2	I have a business on Brook Road Estate, the queue for the HRC regularly extends down the access road some distance. Not so many weeks ago i was coming into the works during the day when the queue actually was at the traffic lights some half a mile down the road! i turned in to be confronted by dozens of waiting cars. Bear in mind that parking is still allowed on Brook road meaning there was a double line of traffic stretching most of that distance I was left with a car width of access all the way to the industrial estate. Had anything approached from the opposite direction we would have had stalemate, should this happen in an emergency situation then a major problem would ensue. Should the facility be extended, more vehicles attracted and bearing in mind the couple of hundred homes now being built next to it (all with at least one car I'm sure!) then I can only see a bottle neck arising whereby the customers, staff of all the business's and all the HRC users being hugely inconvenienced to the point where (particularly all of our customers) people will not bother with even trying to get up Brook Road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Option WP ED01	WP567	The current site is small, awkward to access and, due to recent development, it is now too close to housing to be acceptable. Current vehicle movements to remove waste from the site are excessive because of the sites small size. It is understood that the small car park referred to as being a possible extension has been sold and is now being used for other purposes (containers for self-storage). In the event that the New Neighbourhood and Sports Village proceed as planned, traffic problems in the area will be far worse, particularly when there are football and rugby matches. Average Annual Daily traffic (AADT) on Leigh Road in 2014 was 13,300. Other planned and approved development in the Corfe Mullen, Wimborne, Colehill, Ferndown area must be taken into consideration when estimating vehicle movements. If this site is closed, additional monitoring/protection from fly tipping is likely to be needed in the area particularly at Leigh Common and the car park at BytheWay at least in the short-medium term. However, there are huge uncertainties about the future of this area and we advise that no decision should be taken on this until the issues relating to the development of the whole of Local Plan site WMC8 (South of Leigh Road) have been resolved	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ED01	WP643	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED01	WP807	This site has no concerns that we know of; development of the site including the car park will need good imagination.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP1	I have a business on Brook Road Estate, the queue for the HRC regularly extends down the access road some distance. Not so many weeks ago I was coming into the works during the day when the queue actually was at the traffic lights some half a mile down the road! I turned in to be confronted by dozens of waiting cars. Bear in mind that parking is still allowed on Brook road meaning there was a double line of traffic stretching most of that distance I was left with a car width of access all the way to the industrial estate. Had anything approached from the opposite direction we would have had stalemate, should this happen in an emergency situation then a major problem would ensue. Should the facility be extended, more vehicles attracted and bearing in mind the couple of hundred homes now being built next to it (all with at least one car i'm sure!) then I can only see a bottle neck arising whereby the customers, staff of all the business's and all the HRC users being hugely inconvenienced to the point where (particularly all of our customers) people will not bother with even trying to get up Brook Road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
West Moors Parish Council	Option WP ED02	WP305	This site has good transport links and heavy vehicles would not have to travel through residential areas. The potential for a biomass generator on this site is seen as a benefit. WMPC would support this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands	Option WP ED02	WP335	The Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands would like to object to the following facilities proposed for this site. OBJECT to the proposed Residual Treatment Plant This plant will include a chimney 35-40 metres high to discharge exhaust gases, this facility is likely to operate 24 hours per day. It will also generate heat, so an incinerator by any other name! The Sustainability Assessment refers to this site as a strategically well located site. The Draft Waste Plan, page 179, refers to this type of facility as 'strategic' implying that strategic sites can provide a service for South East Dorset, not just a part of the South East District. There is also a suggestion that it may take some commercial waste. In 2005, this same site was turned down by an Inspector as an MDF/RDF site, he gave many reasons amongst which were the following: 1. Its close proximity to residential properties, schools and businesses. 2. He considered that emissions to air and environmental pollution would harm health and that there was a lack of information on emissions. 3. The visual intrusion and effect on the landscape, particularly of the high chimney... 4. Environmental pollution, noise, emissions, smell, contamination and the increase in vermin would be unacceptable. There are many more reasons he gave. I am sure that the planning team must have a copy of the long report. There are 15 properties within 250m, there is no mention of Stapehill Farm nursery school within that distance. Within 5 miles there are 87,700 properties. I noticed no reference to all the schools in Ferndown that are to the south east of the proposed site, and no mention of the schools in Colehill to the west. There is no mention of all the businesses on the Industrial Sites, especially those dealing with aspects of food. It is not a heavy industry industrial site. There is no mention of the recreational use of the Forestry Plantation which completes the 'encirclement' of the proposed plant, with housing and industrial units linking the circle. The Sustainability Appraisal mentions the negative impact on recreation but looks no further that the actual site it will occupy, the surrounding area is ignored. Potential increase in insects and rodents Uddens and Cannon Hill Plantations provide a vital area for recreation. A need that will grow in the future with the 5000 plus houses to be built in and around Wimborne. The Cannon Hill side provides all weather paths that are used by dog walkers, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Uddens also has a heavy use but during extreme weather the paths can get wet. It is an area that is growing in popularity. The Friends are a Conservation Group, we work closely with the Forestry Commission, we are encouraging more family use through the supply of picnic areas with tables and benches. We are keen to encourage more wildlife and both bat and bird boxes have been installed, with dormice tubes planned for next spring. It is of great concern to us that a potential for increased pollution and an increase in the rodent population may undo so much of the work we have done to enhance the experience of our woodland users. Will the site generate more flying insects? The site is in close proximity to 4 of the picnic tales, will the waste generate more insects and put people off from picnicking? The important Castleman Trailway will also pass very close to the Residual Waste Treatment site. The chimney will be visible for mile. OBJECT to the Bulky Waste Transfer/Treatment Facility We object to this because it would again be a strategic facility drawing waste from throughout Dorset. OBJECT to the increase in traffic in an area that is already under pressure from overcrowded roads. The Household Recycling Centre at Brook Road had 100,000 visitors in 2012/13 (one way) plus around 150 HGV movements. I suggest that when all the additional bouses have been built in East Dorset District, that this figure will increase significantly, especially if the Blunt's Farm site is easier to access. The Waste Vehicle Depot will have 24 HGV movements per day plus a max of 40 staff cars. Please note that all vehicles are counted as one way, but of course they will come and go. If the Bulky Waste treatment facility existed, this would generate a further 4-10 HGV movements and the Residual Waste Treatment 20-40 HGVs per day. Please note that these are all counted as one way movements. OBJECT to the use of Uddens Drive as access to any facilities on Blunt's Farm. Uddens Drive is very narrow, especially once passed the access to Uddens Trading Estate. The turn into Uddens Drive from Wimborne Road West, from the direction of Wimborne is a blind bend. This road is used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders, it is difficult now to safely cross the road to the footpath up Uddens Drive, it would be very dangerous with more traffic using it. There has been problems with flooding opposite The Old Thatch public house, work has been done but there is no guarantee the matter is solved. With waste vehicles passing through the water, the water may become contaminated and smell. Not very nice for visitors to the Thatch, or those paddling up the road to the woodlands. Once passed the access road to the Trading Estate, the road is little more than single tract, it is a quiet road off which pedestrians, cyclist and horse riders both exit one part of the Castleman Trailway to access the path through the woodlands, some dog walkers also park here. This woodlands is widely used as a recreational area. We already have the noise from the A31, but the steady stream of traffic up the Drive if this road was used as access would be completely unacceptable and people would be forced to use other, quieter areas for their recreational uses, some of which may not be so robust as the Cannon Hill woodlands. Another problem is that it would be too easy for those finding the HRC closed to tip their rubbish at the end of Uddens Drive. CONCERNS: This is a valuable site for industrial use. The site assessment of Economic Development mentions the aspirations of the East Dorset District Council for more skilled jobs for local employment. There is no mention of the additional need for local employment when all the proposed house building takes place and adds thousands of new household to this area, some that will need local employment. Sensitive ecological sites close by. Not only is the site central to a large population, there are also designated sensitive ecological sites very close to it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Option WP ED02	WP568	The Local Plan identifies that the strategic highway network in this area suffers from congestion. We note that both DCC and Highways England require a robust transport evidence base, impact assessment and mitigation. In 2014 the AADT at Stapehill was 9,000 with a further 10,100 using Ham Lane to avoid the Canford Bottom roundabout. Any publicly accessible facilities here would be likely to attract not only the current Brook Road vehicles but others from a wider catchment particularly if only one such facility were to be available to East Dorset residents. Uddens has already attracted high quality businesses (at least one has an international customer base). Together with the Public House there were threats of closure and moving out of the area by some businesses when a Gypsy and Traveller site was proposed immediately to the west of Uddens Drive. Impact on local business and other employment opportunities must be taken into consideration. Risk to the local economy should be a criterion. We note and endorse EDDC comments about the risk to having enough land for skilled employment opportunities. Stapehill Farm Nursery School is accessed via Uddens Drive and this is also used as a recreational route to access the Castleman Trailway, Uddens and Cannon Hill. There are no pavements. Any access via Uddens Drive would impact on this. The Castleman Trailway is a flagship route for local recreation and sustainable access from residential areas to employment sites across the District. The nature conservation interests of the site and adjacent habitats may preclude its use for waste facilities. These include Uddens Heath SSSI, the Moors River System SSSI and the SNCI which is part of the allocation site. Local Plan Policy FWP8 specifically requires no harm to these sites and notes that particular regard to the water environment will be needed and in this respect the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to mitigate any potential impacts will be expected to form part of the strategy. Retention of significant landscape buffers within the northern and western parts of the site are also stipulated. This buffer should include heathland habitat which will go towards protecting, enhancing and expanding the habitats of European protected species of which there is a known presence nearby.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP692	With regard to the proposed waste disposal depot and incinerator on the Blunts Farms site at Uddens. Firstly if the entrance to site is to be via uddens drive we feel that this one track road is not up to the adequate requirement for the large amount of traffic that a site of this size would generate. The turn off from Wimborne Road west is at present a danger, as 42ton articulated vehicles have to mount the pavement at the Old Thatch pub to get their trailer around the corner. Secondly, what kind of gasses would the incinerator produce, would they be monitored and kept within the recommended legal limits as the plant is so close to private and industrial properties? Why does a facility of this size have to be so close to where people live and work. We were given to understand that this land had been ear marked for extending the Ferndown industrial site. There are already gates leading off the Ferndown estate across the old railway line onto the Blunts Farm land. We are also concerned about the noise the site will generate as it is a 24 hr working facility!! Having spoken to lots of local resident. have yet to speak to anyone who is in favour of site being used for waste disposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP ED02	WP565	I am writing as the closest resident adjacent to the proposed site and would like to make the following comments on behalf of myself, Linda White; my husband Grahame White; both of Gralin and also my mother Alice Rudling from Pinewood: Having farmed land at Uddens for six generations (four of which still live here, my mother being 95) and having always lived in harmony with the development of the Uddens and Ferndown Trading Estates from the common land of my childhood, where my ancestors held Commoners Rights to graze their cattle, through to todays distinction of possibly the largest Industrial area in Dorset so it is perhaps understandable that the latest proposed development should raise many concerns. When Dennis Read died and his Blunts Farm tenancy reverted to the Forestry Commission, our understanding was that the land was ultimately scheduled (whilst still protecting the SSI site within it) for an extension of the Industrial Estates and although sad, somewhat inevitable given its situation. We naturally assumed it would be in conjunction with appropriate sensitive screening. It was rumoured that Farrow and Ball were the most likely contenders to take over the area. However, the reluctant acceptance of a mass scale development of the land has been somewhat overshadowed by the plans with which we are now being confronted and which was turned down by an Inspector as an MDF/RDF site in 2005 when a large representation of residents marched through the streets to raise their concerns to a lesser scheme proposal. I ask therefore that you consider the following concerns. Vehicle Access via Uddens Drive Of necessity any industrial development will generate transport issues on an already overcrowded road infrastructure, but it could be possibly justified by the fact that owners/passengers in vehicles making their way to the site would be employed by those businesses to which they drove at each end of their day. This would not be the case with this proposal as it would generate as yet incalculable amounts of heavy lorries 24/7/365 along with attracting potentially hundreds of thousands of private vehicles whose sole purpose is simply to dump their refuse and leave without a second thought to their actions. It has been well demonstrated over the years since the Ferndown By Pass was responsible for turning Uddens Drive into a dead end that it has morphed into a dumping ground and worse, for unscrupulous behaviour. The recent removal of the rhododendron and installation of dragons teeth from the top end of Uddens Drive has already led to our entrance and land off Uddens Drive being the victim of more illegal fly tipping. This situation will only worsen should Uddens Drive be utilised for access to the refuse plant and out of hours tipping inevitably increases. Considering utilising the very unsuitable country lane which is Uddens Drive for access is abhorrent on many levels. The junction at the Old Thatch is totally blind entering from Wimborne and will result in all users, whether in a lorry, car, bicycle or on foot, running the gauntlet. Despite an attempt to solve the very real flooding issue, the area still quickly becomes unpassable on foot and the constant wash from motorised vehicles does little to remove it. Already the waters become stagnant and unhealthy in a very short time and the prospect of these same waters containing inevitable pollution from the refuse lorries is breathtakingly scary! Uddens Drive even at its widest point is not able to sustain two large lorries passing each other with ease. With my allegiance to the Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands over the past few years, it has been very satisfying to increase awareness of the area and encourage not only the vast diversity of wildlife within it but also to encompass increased usage and enjoyment for the general public at leisure via the Castleman Trailway. Indeed, more than 6000 residents signed a petition to retain it . If Uddens Drive were to lose its current status quo under a torrent of large lorries and private motors, an incalculable number of its leisure users would inevitably relocate to other recreational areas which are known to be less sustainable. The Barn Nursery School users will be particularly vulnerable to traffic use. It is difficult to imagine any consideration has been given to the use of Uddens Drive as anything other than identifying an access line on a map/Google Earth when your own Planners cannot even give it its correct name being shown as Uddens Road on your extensive mapping. This does not inspire public confidence in the scheme. Chimney/Waste Treatment Emissions Also included in the 2005 Report were concerns regarding the installation of a high chimney and the effects of its unknown potentially toxic fall out on the local population and surrounding wildlife, whilst dominating the skyline for miles around. The current proposal is even more intrusive . Whilst everyone understands that the mass increase of property development proposed for the rural area of East Dorset under the disputed Core Strategy will inevitably increase drastically the amount of refuse generated, it would seem little consideration had been given to the matter of waste disposal when agreement was granted. To blatantly increase residential development on this scale and then simply dismiss the area as only affecting 15 homes whilst not taking into consideration the tens of thousands of homes, schools, and business within the potential fall out from a 35-40 metres chimney (the closest being the Barn Nursery School which will stand practically within its shadow) is reprehensible . For many years we smelt the aroma of coffee beans being roasted by Keith Spicers on the Ferndown Industrial Estate and it stands to reason winds will also carry any potentially harmful fumes from a roasting gigantic chimney in the same directions and over a wider area due to the height of the chimney proposed. We have no guarantees that these emissions are totally harmless. Vermin Again, the 2005 report made mention of the unacceptable inevitable increase in vermin. I would also add that the potential for flying insect infestation would be catastrophic as it does not respond to a rat box solution. As farmers we have always respected our duty to keep rigorous pest control in place and have grave concerns that the attraction of a mass food source on our doorstep will lead to unmanageable levels of infiltration by rats and foxes which will threaten our livestock and homes with high levels of disease and infestation. It is apparent from the numbers of rat boxes to be seen in and around Ferndown at any given time that numbers of infestation is already high and this risk will only increase drastically should a large food source suddenly be available to them. Summary Previous lengthy reports from an Inspector in 2005 regarding a lesser facility have shown it to be totally unsuitable on many levels. Uddens Drive is totally unsuitable as an access road for such high levels of industrial use and will cause dangerous levels of traffic chaos. It would also impinge on its well established leisure facilities including the Castleman Trailway and be to the detriment of a variety of protected wildlife proven to be in the area. The installation of a 35-40m chimney to be emitting unknown hazardous fumes 24/7/365 is potentially harmful to health on a scale which has not been accurately calculated because it is not calculable to its fullest extent. With technology constantly upgrading to enable results not currently capable, it is impossible to predict what future results could show. It is also very unsightly and would have a detrimental effect to the landscape for miles around. Such a large scale residual waste treatment plant on the doorstep of a huge residential population which includes schools and many food manufacturing/handling factory outlets, is detrimental to the surrounding area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Environment Agency	Option WP ED02	WP644	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP351	This proposed site is in close proximity to residential properties, as well as schools and businesses. It is also close to an area of forest at Cannon Hill and Uddens that is used by many people for leisure purposes - walkers, dog walkers, runners, cyclists and horse-riders. It is near to the Castleman Trailway. This area is a green lung for the local area and recently it has been enhanced by the inclusion of picnic tables to encourage families to take advantage of this nearby recreational facility. If the site goes ahead it will harm the environment and will greatly increase the amount of heavy vehicles using the nearby roads. Any inclusion of a chimney for the burning of waste would be a threat to the health of individuals living/working or attending local schools.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP414	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District object to the identification of Blunts Farm for the list of sites for the list of various waste facilities. Blunts Farm was taken out of the Green Belt as an exceptional measure to provide much needed employment land to support the local economy. This site located in the A31 corridor is a preferred location for local business to grow not for any and all waste facilities. The combined allocation options for this site amounts to around 5.5 hectares which amounts to around a quarter to a third of the developable area of this strategically important site for employment purposes. Such a land take is excessive and damaging to the proposed principle use of the site. There is a relevant history in the consideration of a previously proposed "incinerator" type facility at Blunts Farm which was refused at appeal in 2005. This history is a material consideration that should be referred to. The adverse impact on existing food and drink businesses on the existing adjacent estates including the perception by clients of possible contamination from such a facility is a particular consideration why such a facility should not be allocation on this site. There is no clear acceptable access to the site. It appears from the wording of the proposal that the landowner is not in agreement with the proposal. They know the importance and value of the Blunts Farm site in supporting the local economy and providing a development that will meet the aspirations of local stakeholders. The development of around one third of the developable area by waste handling facilities will not be in accordance with that joint aspiration.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP444	OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED RESIDUALTREATMENT PLANT FOR THE FOLLOWINGREASONS. (1) It's close proximity to residential properties , schools etc. (2) Emissions to air and environmental pollution could harm health. (3) Lack of information on what would be burnt on site. These were just some of the reasons an inspector gave in 2005 in turning down an application for a MDF/RDF plant. What has changed? Object to bulk to bulk waste transfer treatment facility, and household recycling centre. This would be a facility drawing waste from the whole of Dorset with an increase in traffic in an area which is already under pressure from over crowded roads. Object to the proposed sites. Uddens Drive is narrow and already used by traffic to the Industrial Estate, The Old Thatched Public House, residents, pre-school children, walkers, cyclists etc. It is unsuitable for the extra traffic this facility would generate. Uddens and Cannon Hill Plantation provide an area for recreation much used by local people. The proposed facility at Blunts Farm would be a deterrent to people who just want to enjoy fresh air peace and quiet.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP483	When this site was first suggested a few years ago we strongly objected and our feelings are still unchanged about this matter. It was turned down then and that should have been the end of it. All objections raised then should still be counted today. With this in mind, rather than go into great detail yet again, we would say that we fully support the objections that have already been submitted by Mr Poulter, Mrs Fuller and Janet Healy.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Colehill First School	Option WP ED02	WP446	The proposed site at Blunts Farm is less than three kilometres from Colehill First School and other local schools where young children play outside daily. I recognise that we all have a responsibility for the waste we generate and that dealing with waste presents a challenge for local authorities. However the placement of any waste disposal incinerator must take into account the health and welfare of local residents who may be affected by emissions, especially the young and vulnerable. I would ask that the welfare of our children is fully considered before coming to a decision on this site and that the Council considers carefully the evidence leading to the past rejection of this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP509	I am very concerned about Blunts Farm being considered for an energy recovery facility including an incinerator which could mean potential toxic fumes blowing over the area I live, the local schools and the fantastic Uddens plantation where I walk my dog. Secondly, as I work at Barn Nursery the nursery children age 2 5 years enjoy using the natural; resources of Uddens wood. I am worried the impact a waste facility would have on these beautiful woods. How the safety of this area would be compromised by heavy traffic lorries using Uddens would this bring an end to such a wonderful educational resource for the local children.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP529	I worry about access on the narrow lane for the many large trucks, cars that will use the site. Also I worry about smoke and fumes and smell from the site. We walk our dog in Uddens Woods as many people do, it is a great outdoor space. Your plan would ruin it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED02	WP532	I strongly disagree to the proposed Draft Waste Plan at Blunts Farm. I am very anxious by the prospect of vehicular access on Uddens Drive. Which is already extremely dangerous with large lorries turning in by The Old Thatch on route to Uddens Industrial Estate. Also I am most concerned by the prospect of my property being greatly devalued.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

The Barn Nursery	Option WP ED02	WP531	As the owner of The Barn Nursery Stapehill Farm which has been operating for 41 years I disagree the waste depot and household recycling facility being proposed at Blunts Farm. For I am most concerned by the suggested use of Uddens Drive for heavy vehicles and the volume of cars travelling to the site. This would cause an adverse and dangerous effect on the access to the Nursery School entrance. Currently there is a daily movement of approx. 80 cars carrying 2-4 year old children. Their safety is paramount. I am also concerned by the possible effect on the environment of the Energy Recovery Facility including an incinerator (chimney). What effect will this have on the clean environment we presently enjoy. A chimney will certainly cause pollution and thus concern for the parents of the young children attending the Nursery and my family.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP ED02	WP582	The north-east part of this proposed site includes the whole of SU00/060 Ferndown Bypass Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This site comprises dry and wet heathland/acid grassland mosaic habitat running between the bypass and the dismantled railway line. This habitat is fragile and vulnerable, and the site forms an important link to the nearby Slop Bog and Uddens Heath SSSI. Dorset Wildlife Trust would like to see the whole of the SNCI removed from the proposed site, and with a buffer to ensure no adverse effects on the SNCI from future waste transfer/treatment facilities on the site. It would be preferable if the whole of the triangle of land between the old railway line and the bypass from the southern boundary of the SNCI north-eastwards were removed from the proposed site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Chestnut Grove Residents Association	Option WP ED02	WP610	Although not against sensible and sympathetic development of the Blunts Farm site for employment use as set out on the Core Strategy (including a substantial buffer zone between it and Uddens Drive) , we feel this is a most inappropriate use of this former green belt site. On one side it is adjacent to an SSSI and on the other a key recreational area which has been to been shown to heavily mitigate use (especially by dog walkers and horse riders) of the nearby endangered and protected lowland heath habitats of Holt Heath, Ferndown Common and Slop Bog. Substantial investment by many stakeholders through the Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands has been made in recent years to improve the adjacent woodland as an amenity area and wildlife haven. This is used regularly by local residents of Ferndown, Colehill and Stapehill in particular as well as visitors from further afield using the Castleman Trailway. Access - Uddens Drive itself would be most unsuitable for access. This country lane is already under extreme pressure from Uddens Trading Estate. At least one of our residents has had an accident accessing Wimborne Road West and there have been numerous near misses. That stretch of Uddens Drive is also shared with users of the high profile Castleman Trailway and dog walker. Chimney / Incinerator - It is most unclear what this entails? In 2005 our residents joined a campaign that was successful in preventing the development of an incinerator on the site. We are shocked that this decision should be ignored in such a short space of time. Fly Tipping - The area is a "black spot" for fly tipping. Our residents have been working with the Forestry Commission to minimise this problem. An adjacent household recycling facility would not be open 24/7 leading to an increase in this expensive problem. Congestion - We are also concerned how the impact on the local traffic network this site will have. The A31 here is the first stretch of single carriageway from London and no additional comment on the proximity of the notorious Canford Bottom Roundabout should be needed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED02	WP808	This site is no longer green belt land but it would be greenfield development. For this reason we are not very happy with this site. The Blunts Farm site must not include the nature conservation interest and sensitive areas to the East and West of this site and it must have a green and biodiversity buffer of at least 20 metres as well, otherwise we will vigorously oppose this choice. The woodland to the South West of the site can be retained as the site is large enough not to need this area. However, we do not think a high chimney in this site will be a problem. A new access road via Nimrod Way will give safer access to HGVs and reduce congestion on the A31. A cycle path can be made to go from the Cobham Road roundabout to Uddens Drive. Ecological mitigation and a long-term management plan would need to be agreed	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
West Moors Parish Council	Option WP ED03	WP304	There is currently a planning application for this site for further industrial units and employment opportunities supported by the Christchurch &East Dorset Core Strategy. Use of the site for waste disposal would be a deterrent to incoming new businesses and therefore a reduction in employment potential. The site is close to the Moors River system with the potential for contamination. There will be increased residential traffic through West Moors going to the site. This site would be a benefit to West Moors and Verwood Residents but too far out for other conurbations to use. WMPC have concerns but are not actively opposed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Option WP ED03	WP569	Not all of the VTSW6 allocation has come forward as a planning application to date: there is no information on the current position regarding the northernmost section. EDEPs response to the outline Planning Application for a large part of the site is appended for information. Please see also Dorset Wildlife Trusts response regarding the SNCI. The Highways improvements to the access to the site (2 nd prerequisite in the Local Plan) apply to the entrance off the C2 and not the C2 itself. 2014 AADT for the C2 Horton Road Ashley Heath is 10,400. Weekend traffic is particularly heavy The Transport Plan identified that Ashley Heath roundabout would be at capacity in 2016 and the Planning Application for outline consent for the extension to the employment site also identifies that the junctions/mini-roundabouts at Three Legged Cross are nearing capacity and will be exceeded significantly by the end of the Local Plan plan period (2028). Highways Agency plans for widening the A31 in the Ringwood area will have an impact on access, particularly during construction. Consideration of the impact of establishing an HRC here will need to include potential for traffic increase on the C2 and use of the above mentioned road junctions and residential roads due to: - other new employment opportunities on the site - population growth and additional school traffic when all Local Plan developments for Verwood (including the new upper school) have been completed. The impact on visitors to Moors Valley Country Park (and hence revenue) should also be assessed. 2012 data (DorsetforYou) indicates over 800,000 visitors pa. Impact on other businesses and recreational facilities that contribute to the local economy should be considered including those on Woolsbridge Estate and the many others along the C2. Total vehicle movements accessing the site from all parts of East Dorset will be required. Is it intended to allow Hampshire residents to use it? The most likely routes should also be established so that neither West Moors nor Ashley Heath becomes a rat run to an HRC facility with drivers avoiding a congested A31. The most obvious routes for anyone approaching from Wimborne/Ferndown would be: I) turnings off the A31 into Braeside Road and Woolsbridge Road with other residential roads leading off them also bearing the brunt of additional traffic: any increase in HGV traffic along Woolsbridge Road is unacceptable (narrow and would compromise access to Doctors surgery). Although HGVs could be restricted (this would require monitoring) it would not be possible to identify private vehicles and small vans travelling to an HRC. ii) through West Moors. West Moors campaigned for many years for a bypass which cannot be provided for natural environment reasons. As with Stapehill and ED02, it would be unreasonable to expect either community to tolerate a significant increase in through traffic. Depending on the type of waste facility considered for this location there is potential for conflict with the Local Plan because of impact on sensitive ecological receptors Moors River SSSI, Heathland SSSIs and the SNCI. Distances to this facility from various towns and villages given in the Site Assessments are incorrect : Verwood is 4.6 miles not 4.1km Ferndown (via West Moors) is 4.9 miles or 5.5 miles (via A31) not 4.9km Corfe Mullen is 13.9miles (not 13.4km) Wimborne is 9.7miles (not 9.3km) Colehill is 8.7 miles (not 7.2km) West Moors is 3.2 miles (via Three legged Cross) not 2.3km (data are from Google Maps).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ED03	WP645	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council	Option WP ED03	WP693	The Parish Council of St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council fully support the concerns submitted by the East Dorset Environment Project. They are particularly concerned with the proposals for the development of the Woolsbridge Road Industrial Estate and the environmental impact this will have on this Parish and surrounding area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Intelligent Land	Option WP ED03	WP550	1.1 Ankers and Rawlings (A&R) and its related companies own the greater part of the land at Woolsbridge which is identified in the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy at Policy VTSW6 as an extension to the existing industrial estate. In turn this land has now been identified in the Draft Waste Plan for waste related uses as site ED03. 1.2 In addition Ankers and Rawlings and its related companies also own the freehold of existing land and buildings at Woolsbridge and on the Ferndown Industrial Estate in the vicinity of the Blunts Farm site. Ankers and Rawlings is also a land owner of residential and mixed use sites within the plan area some of which are actively being developed at present. 1.3 Last a Company subsidiary also operates a skip hire and recycling of waste business. 2.0 Representations in support 2.1 Ankers and Rawlings support the concept of a Waste Plan and also are willing to consider positively the use of the land at Woolsbridge identified in the draft as ED03 for a variety of waste related uses. 2.2 Ankers and Rawlings would like to work with the relevant authorities to provide positive solutions for waste not only by facilitating the use of land at Woolsbridge but in addition by making better use of their skip and recycling waste facility and being innovative in relation to waste to energy plants.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP ED03	WP583	The southern section of the proposed development site lies adjacent to SU00/053 Woolsbridge Farm Carr Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which comprises wet woodland and unimproved neutral grassland, BAP priority habitats supporting a number of Dorset notable plant species. As with the current outline planning application for mixed employment development, Dorset Wildlife Trust would want to see a substantial buffer between any waste treatment facility and the SNCI. The ditch which runs down from the existing industrial estate, alongside the proposed site drains directly into the SNCI so there will need to be strict measures in place to ensure that there is no possibility of pollution into the fragile wet woodland habitat if waste materials are being treated. Similar impacts will have to be assessed on the adjacent internationally designated heathlands.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED03	WP809	East Dorset FoE does not oppose the site to the North West, which has no concerns that we know of except that its a Greenfield site, but we strongly oppose the South Western site. This site is inappropriate, due to its proximity to an SAC and an SNCI; the Council and Natural England should consider making this site an SNCI as an extension to the existing SNCI, to link between the two protected areas. Wildlife corridors are important and should be protected.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP ED04	WP147	Believe I visited here many years ago - very hard to find! Less of a problem with satnav, I guess.	Noted
West Moors Parish Council	Option WP ED04	WP303	This site is located very close to water and therefore there is a potential for water contamination. The Moors river system is a SSSI and any contamination would be detrimental to this special area. There are significant residential properties in the locality which will be affected by noise, odour and increased traffic. Any increase in large vehicles on the B3072 will have a significant impact on cyclists as there is not a cycle route on this road. There is also no pedestrian footpath along large stretches of this road. The site is surrounded by a unique SSSI which has remained undisturbed for many years with no public access and any form of development would be highly detrimental to the flora and fauna in this area. The cost of purchase or rental of this land is unknown and may be prohibitive. If this site were to be approved than an agreement would need to be sought to restrict HGV movements through West Moors Village as per the agreement that is in place with the MOD. However, West Moors Parish Council would be highly opposed to any development on this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Environment Partnersh	Option WP ED04	WP570	The traffic and access issues affecting ED03 apply here. Any proposals to put in new roads in the area would conflict with areas of nature conservation interest (internationally designated heathland and SNCIs) and would be opposed. Distances from towns and villages are wrong.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ED04	WP646	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP ED04	WP584	This proposed site covers the whole of compartment 4 of SU00/083 West Moors Petroleum Depot Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This part of the site consists of a series of narrow strips of heathland and acid grassland habitat between areas of hardstanding, which support a very good list of Dorset notable species and one Red Data Book species. It forms an important link to the surrounding SAC/SPA/Ramsar Sites. Dorset Wildlife Trust objects to the inclusion of this site in the list of proposed sites since the development of the site for waste facilities would be likely to severely impact these fragile areas of habitat. If the site is taken forward then the design of any development will need to be carefully planned to ensure no harm to the SNCI areas, and allow for the appropriate management of the heathland/acid grassland areas to continue.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED04	WP810	East Dorset FoE strongly opposes this site . This site is still green belt land and, in spite of the hard standings, it should be removed from any kind of development and it should be made an SNCI as a buffer to the SSSI.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ED05	WP647	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP ED05	WP585	The proposed site lies immediately adjacent to SZ09/050 Little Canford Ponds Site of Nature Conservation Interest. It consists of a lake on former gravel workings, surrounded by wet woodland including Alder and a number of Willow species, and supports various aquatic plants including several Dorset notable species. The uncommon Odonata species, Brown Hawker and Red-eyed Damselfly have also been recorded there. If the site is progressed, care will be needed to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the SNCI. A buffer area of at least 20 metres should be agreed between any development and the western side of the lake, and strict measures taken to ensure that there is no pollution into the water.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED05	WP811	East Dorset FoE supports this site provided that a 20 metre buffer zone is created between the quarry and the works and the larger pond in the present site is fenced on the depot side, thus allowing public access to this pond. There should be a landscape and biodiversity plan and trees and shrubs should be retained and augmented to provide a visual screen. A full ecological survey is needed before any demolition or construction work is carried out.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
West Moors Parish Council	Option WP ED06	WP302	This is a good site as it will not affect residential properties. It has good transport links, enabling large vehicles to use A routes inside of B roads through towns. The site is equidistant between Wimborne and Ferndown making it readily available to a large population. This site shows a poor use of resources, having to demolish a large modern building, to build another structure will be very costly. There is a larger empty site located opposite the headquarters that could be used (formally a concrete works). WMPC are opposed to the demolition of this building but would support the use of the land opposite for waste disposal (formally a concrete works). The current building could have the potential for housing staff, vehicles etc.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Environment Agency	Option WP ED06	WP648	No objection in principle to this proposed waste allocation, provided that the Waste Planning Authority have considered the Sequential Test for flood risk as part of the site allocation process. If the Sequential Test can be passed, we would have no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP ED06	WP586	The site lies adjacent to one compartment of SU00/054 Ameysford Site of Nature Conservation Interest, an area of wet woodland/bog, and a buffer of vegetation should be retained between the development site and the SNCI to ensure no adverse impacts on the SNCI.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED06	WP812	East Dorset FoE does not oppose this site. This site is no longer green belt. We agree with the Dorset County Council ecologist that trees should be retained and the land managed, both for visual and biodiversity enhancement as rare species are found close by. Flood risk needs to be mitigated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED07	WP23	This proposal is completely unsuitable for the village of Sturminster Marshall, the only way out is via the A31 which means heavy vehicles and others will have to pass the village shop which is always busy early and mid morning and will cause serious congestion and safety issues, and the same late afternoon as this is also a bus route for normal passenger and school transport. Also I understand that there will be a wash-down facility, will this be properly controlled as it has to go into the villages already overburdened waste drainage system and will any waste be allowed to remain on refuse vehicles overnight ? I completely disagree with this proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ED07	WP155	I disagree most strongly with another 40 vehicles a day coming in and out of Sturminster Marshall. The Spar shop generates a great deal of traffic every day. It is chaos when there are lorries delivering, vans and cars pulling up to go in to the shop. There are buses along the road too. There is no way the village can cope with anymore traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Sturminster Marshall Parish Council	Option WP ED07	WP295	In addition to our previous comments Sturminster Marshall Parish Council would like to add that we disagree with this site option because the site is close to the school and residential area and there may be odour from the standing dustcarts that would impact on the quality of life in these locations.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Sturminster Marshall Parish Council	Option WP ED07	WP287	The Parish Council strongly objects to this option. It would be inappropriate to site a facility in this location that generates 24 HGV one way movements and 40 car movements per day as this traffic has to come through a residential area. The site is close to the first school and it would be not be safe to have these heavy vehicles in the same location as small children walking to and from school. Although the site is shown as outside of the Flood Zones 2 and 3 the site does flood and this needs to be taken into account. We feel that other options put forward are more suitable, most notably Blunts Farm which is outside of the Green Belt, and has easy access to the A31, and the Old Police Headquarters which is not in a residential area, has easy access to the A31 and is already screened.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
, East Dorset Environment Partnersh	Option WP ED07	WP572	Prime concerns here relate to traffic and safety issues caused by additional HGVs that would need to drive through a residential area where on street parking is a necessity for several homes. The proximity of the school especially on dark winter mornings must be taken into consideration.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ED07	WP649	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED07	WP813	East Dorset FoE does not oppose this site. This site is some distance from the main population centres but we know of no other concerns. If it goes ahead, we hope the villagers will find a way to cope with the traffic but an industrial site will generate traffic anyway.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Option WP ED08	WP571	Local comment on access supports the DCC and Highways England initial responses. The direct access from Candy's Lane onto the A31 is notoriously dangerous with many accidents on that stretch of road. The high volume and speed of traffic make it extremely difficult to turn left onto the A31 from Candy's Lane, and almost impossible to turn right. The only other access is via the rest of Candy's Lane which is a windy road that goes past a working farm, and is predominantly single track with quite high banks leading mainly to fields. Candy's Lane already has a caravan camping site with traffic (including caravans) using it. Candy's Lane then leads to the Wimborne Road and down to the roundabout joining the A31 and B7078 leading into Wimborne this section of the Wimborne Road is particularly busy in the morning rush hour, with traffic backed up to the Candy's Lane turning.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Environment Agency	Option WP ED08	WP650	Objection depending on outcome of a risk assessment to assess the proposals, due to the site being all in SPZ1. Our comments previously made in earlier consultations are also still relevant, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP ED08	WP814	This does not seem to be an ideal site because of access.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND01	WP105	ND01 will need expansion at some time and you will have to do this all over again.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND01	WP166	The present site is far too small, badly designed in terms of access, flow, and access. For the residents of Blandford it is well sited .I fully agree that it needs to be much bigger to serve the town but the issue is also one of cost. Council does not own the neighbouring old BOCM site and I understand there are issues with asbestos in the old building. How expensive would it be to purchase that land over a greenfield site and get better separate not shared access.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND01	WP651	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND01	WP472	The areas of land being considered as part of Option ND01 are on an allocated employment site which accommodates the existing WMC. This option is compliant with saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026) and could accommodate the facilities to meet the identified needs in the short term.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Durweston Parish Council	Option WP ND01	WP518	The Holland Way site is located within the built up area on previously developed land. It is well located near to existing business and residential populations. Whilst we acknowledge that the use and development of this site may be more costly and challenging, this is outweighed by its sustainable location in accordance with the NPPF.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND02	WP106	ND02 should remain for retail use owing to the proximity of housing and the loss of jobs.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND02	WP156	Re Option WP ND02 it incorrectly states that the site would not be large enough for an integrated Waste Management Centre due to the already permitted construction of a new superstore. The application for a superstore at this site has subsequently been retracted, making a large enough site now available. This change should be reflected in the consultation documentation so that people have the correct facts.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND02	WP167	This area was earmarked for the Asda Supermarket, but the vacillations of the town and drawn out planning approval delayed and eventually killed this. Lidl possibly may step in but I think the site is too close to housing development to be worthwhile.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND02	WP185	Needed for retail Too near housing	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND02	WP652	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND02	WP473	The area of land being considered is on an allocated employment site. Proposed Policy 4 of the Draft Waste Plan includes issues of amenity, which would be particularly relevant due to the proximity of existing residential properties. However, the size of the site being considered is not large enough to replace the WMC and the site could only partially accommodate a facility. This option is compliant with saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026). However, as the site is situated within the AONB there is no presumption in favour of major development unless it can clearly be demonstrated that it is in the public interest for the development to go ahead, having regard to: the need for the development and the impact on the local economy; the scope and costs associated with developing elsewhere, outside of an AONB or meeting the need in an alternative way; and the impact on the environment, landscape and recreation opportunities within the area and the extent to which these impacts could be mitigated. This position is countered by the acceptance in principle owing to the employment allocation.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Durweston Parish Council	Option WP ND02	WP521	This is a Green Field site in the AONB. Locating a centre/depot here would harm the open character of the countryside, allocated for valuable employment land required to sustain the economic growth of the area. This site is not the most sustainable option	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND03	WP104	This seems to be the most common sense site as it is further away from housing than the the 'Asda' site, it has the most room for further expansion and gives the least problems with vehicles.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND03	WP168	This is the best site of all both in terms of access (direct for surrounding villages and easy for Blandford) and size. It is furthest from the new housing and adjacent to a business park. The problem will be ANOB. A modern facility could be designed here and landscaped in to provide minimum impact apart from traffic access.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND03	WP186	Preferred site a) not too close to housing b) large enough c) access manageable d) suitable for biodiversity enhancement	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND03	WP653	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND03	WP474	The area of land being considered lies outside of the existing settlement boundary and is therefore contrary to saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026). However, a settlement boundary review could take place in the Local Plan Part 2 or a neighbourhood plan, which could potentially make this site acceptable in policy terms in the medium to long term. As the site is situated within the AONB there is no presumption in favour of major development unless it can clearly be demonstrated that it is in the public interest for the development to go ahead, having regard to: the need for the development and the impact on the local economy; the scope and costs associated with developing elsewhere, outside of an AONB or meeting the need in an alternative way; and the impact on the environment, landscape and recreation opportunities within the area and the extent to which these impacts could be mitigated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Durweston Parish Council	Option WP ND03	WP522	This is a Green Field site in the AONB. Locating a centre/depot here would harm the open character of the countryside. We object to the loss of agricultural land in this location which is away form the built up area and not sustainable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND04	WP169	I cannot believe anyone is seriously considering this site. It does not tick any box.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND04	WP187	Doesn't solve any problems	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Hall & Woodhouse Ltd	Option WP ND04	WP278	Hall & Woodhouse Ltd has reassessed the available space within the eastern part of the Brewery site, which accommodates the new brewery and facilities as well as a range of commercial buildings. Further development has recently taken place along the eastern edge of the site to support the future of the brewery. Following a detailed review, It has been concluded that there is no remaining space available now or for the foreseeable future to accommodate the proposed waste vehicle depot, identified as a short term priority. Hall & Woodhouse Ltd would therefore request that this option is not progressed further and is deleted from the Plan.	Your comments are noted and the Plan will be update as appropriate.
Environment Agency	Option WP ND04	WP654	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND04	WP475	The area of land being considered is on an allocated employment site. However, the site is small in size and only being considered for a vehicle depot. This option is compliant with saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Durweston Parish Council	Option WP ND04	WP524	The site is of significant heritage value and is completely inappropriate for a large scale facility. It is not compatible with the small scale uses and character of the area. Also the road network is unsustainable to the volume of vehicle movements proposed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND05	WP170	Too close to the village. Poor access even through the yard and would result in more traffic on this part of the A354 just on the outskirts of the village. Residents of Blandford and those to the west would have to travel further than any of the other sites. Again I cannot believe this is a serious proposal .	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND05	WP180	This site is unsuitable. It is outside the development boundary. It has a watercourse nearby and is liable to flood. Washing of vehicles and storage of fuel pose a real threat to the Pimperne Brook. It is very near the village of Pimperne which has already had to put up with noise, light pollution and increased traffic since the Taymix site was taken over by Damory Buses and Pike and sons. Access in and out of the site off the very busy A354 would I feel cause considerable disruption to the road and to residents of Pimperne and when the steam fair is on the site would be inaccessible as traffic queues in both directions and backs up to the bypass. The site is agricultural and should stay that way.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND05	WP188	a) Extremely dangerous right turn across A354 for all traffic from Blandford and surrounding villages b)Pollution hazard for the boarding site c)too near housing	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND05	WP655	Objection depending on outcome of a risk assessment to assess the proposals, due to the site being all in SPZ1. Our comments previously made in earlier consultations are also still relevant, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND05	WP476	The area of land being considered lies outside of the existing settlement boundary and is therefore contrary to saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026). However, a settlement boundary review could take place in the Local Plan Part 2 or a neighbourhood plan, which could potentially make this site acceptable in policy terms in the medium to long term. As the site is situated within the AONB there is no presumption in favour of major development unless it can clearly be demonstrated that it is in the public interest for the development to go ahead, having regard to: the need for the development and the impact on the local economy; the scope and costs associated with developing elsewhere, outside of an AONB or meeting the need in an alternative way; and the impact on the environment, landscape and recreation opportunities within the area and the extent to which these impacts could be mitigated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND06	WP65	Best choice in the area - an established site and could be extended with minimal impact on function and others. Presumably its flood risk is well understood	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND06	WP656	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND06	WP477	The area of land being considered is outside of the settlement and District boundary. It is adjacent to the existing HRC site, and the extension would enable the development of a modern facility. This option is not compliant with saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026). If this site were to become a preferred option, the BD&P Waste Plan would not be able to allocate it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
	Option WP ND07	WP69	Traffic in Gillingham is already a nightmare - this can only make things worse. Since there is no existing facilities and there is a need for further access roads, this has to be a higher cost option and the flood risk is high	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND07	WP657	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND07	WP478	The area of land being considered is on an allocated employment site and is currently vacant, allowing scope for the development of a modern facility generally well located to serve both towns, but with Gillingham set to grow substantially to approximately twice the population size of Shaftesbury, would be appropriately located in the largest town. This option is compliant with saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP ND07	WP587	The proposed site partially overlaps a Flood Zone, and lies very close to the River Stour and the River Lodden. Dorset Wildlife Trust would suggest that the boundary of the proposed site is amended to remove any area which falls within the Flood Zone. Provided that the Environment Agency consent is agreed then Dorset Wildlife Trust has no particular biodiversity concerns about this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP ND08	WP72	There is a risk that this could be an eyesore form quite a long way away, the steep nature of the site will mean additional works and is likely to suffer from wind blown waste movements	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND08	WP658	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND08	WP479	The area of land being considered is outside the settlement boundary and located close to two conservation areas, a number of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest, and a landscape and character protection policy of Settlement at Foot of The Slopes. The site is contrary to saved planning policies in the adopted Local Plan (2003) and emerging planning policies in the submitted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2026). However, a settlement boundary review could take place in the Local Plan Part 2 or a neighbourhood plan, which could potentially make this site acceptable in settlement boundary policy terms in the medium to long term. The site may need to be unlocked with the construction of a new link road between the A30 and B3081.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP ND09	WP659	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	Option WP ND09	WP480	Accept the principle that a safeguarded area to the Sewage Treatment Works may be necessary to meet identified needs. However, this should not lead to unacceptable levels of odour to existing nearby residential properties.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP PO01	WP660	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP PO01	WP815	This site has no concerns that we know of. Is this site to be operated alongside the adjacent SITA site, PO 04? We are opposed to burning residual waste here	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP PO02	WP175	I see that yet again the area of Bearwood and Merley is under threat of more waste site development is this ever going to end? For the 5 plus years I have lived here its been one threat after another we need the surviving green areas we don't need any more noise, smells or traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP PO02	WP207	The proposed extension area is on land adjacent to the site control centre. It is part of the South east Dorset Green Belt and has not previously been used for waste rcycling. Any development here might be regarded as 'inappropriate' (Green Belt - para 12.83). In the document 'Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan Shortlisted Site Assessment - July 2015' under the heading Energy from Waste Opportunities it says 'This site has potential for CHP but would be dependent on a nearby site, known as Magna Business Park, being developed for employment use'. In June 2013 the Borough of Poole refused an application to develop the magna Business park. The owners appealed and in July 2014 a planning inspector granted permission for 16,000 sq.m. of of industrial buildings to be constructed on this 17.6 ha site. The decision was reached after a 6-day public inquiry at which Dr John Underhill-Day, an internationally recognised expert in lowland heaths, gave evidence for the Borough of Poole on the damage which would be caused to can ford heath by full development of this site. The appellants had sought permission for 42,000 sq. m. of industrial space. They have not so far made an application for the permitted development. The section headed 'Nature Conservation' seems to have ben composed without reference to Dr Underhill-day's proof of evidence to the public inquiry. It can be read in full on the Borough of Poole's planning website under the reference APP/Q/1255/A/13/2204098. My comments about transport of bulky waste {see response DMSP213} apply to transport of waste for recovery purposes. The A341 is not able to carry the additional traffic associated with development of these sites at Canford Magna. I should be grateful if my disagreement with these proposed sites is registered.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP PO02	WP272	The existing Site Control Centre is a major commercial operation within the Green Belt close to the perimeter of Bearwood residential development, producing some noise and smells. The adjoining area is semi-rural with other appropriate open space uses. The existing site is intensively developed with some very large buildings and no doubt the proposed extension to the north east will in time also be intensively developed. Taken together with the proposed employment development to the east, the character of this area will be lost for ever. Old tracks used by the public were affected by the development of the existing site as will be the case with this proposal. The proposal also disregards the importance of the adjacent areas for wildlife and consequential affect on the important Canford Heath. Additional HGV movements are bound to be generated and also staff transport is inevitable further affecting the the already overcrowded roads and junctions in the wider area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP PO02	WP661	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
New Earth Group	Option WP PO02	WP895	NESG support the identification of New Earths established MBT facility, which lies at the heart of the Site Control Centre, for intensification. There is latent capacity within the existing plant and the opportunity to increase throughput capacity in both the immediate and longer term. The established facility is located at the juncture of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and is ideally situated to treat residual waste arising from households and businesses in South East Dorset. It also enjoys excellent access to the strategic highway network (with direct access onto a County freight route), and is therefore a suitable reception point for waste bulked at outlying transfer stations. The facility has a proven track record in diverting waste away from landfill and recovering value from the waste stream. The Environmental Permit allowing for an increase in throughput capacity to 125,000tpa subject to the completion of physical and operational works. Technological advances are likely to free up additional capacity during the life of the plan. Co-location with an operational MRF and consented Low Carbon Energy facility offers further scope for integration and optimising recycling and recovery. New Earth support the two proposed physical extension areas identified on page 231 of the emerging Plan. It is considered that the allocation of the extension areas would provide flexibility and the opportunity for complementary uses. However, in so far as Option WP PO02 relates to New Earths operations, NESG dispute the inference that that If one or both of these extension areas are unsuitable for future waste development there may issues in intensifying existing uses on this site. As set out above, New Earths ability to offer additional capacity is not beholden upon one or more of the extensions coming forward.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP PO02	WP352	Intensifying the use of the site will lead to even more traffic on already overburdened roads. We already have huge foreign registered lorries travelling along Magna Road to & from the site and we do not need more as residents already have great difficulty in crossing the road. Extending the site to the east of the control centre will bring operations much nearer the residential area and particularly to the primary school which is the likely to have increased noise and dust. Intensifying use and/or extending the site will certainly impact on the habitation of the existing wildlife as I believe one lagoon has already been filled in and the other partly filled in.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP PO02	WP588	The proposed extension to this site lies close to SZ 09/043 Frogmore Wood Site of Nature Conservation Interest (as does the existing site). Provided that the woodland strip is retained as a buffer between the site and the SNCI, then the proposals should not cause any major problems.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP PO02	WP816	This site is no longer green belt. The lagoon area B4should be taken out of the operation with the agreement of the operators and turned into an SNCI to augment the SSSI. Given this and provided the operators agree to let biodiversity be part of their management plan, for instance by placing bat nesting boxes, East Dorset FoE supports this site. There is a great opportunity for 21 st century design, for instance by placing the new building against the slope and turfing over the roof. Some similar sires have been built underground. We agree with Dorset Wildlife Trust that trees should be retained as a screen for landscape purposes and wildlife.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
W H White LTD	Option WP PO02	WP837	W H White considers PO02 to present a readily deliverable solution, as part of a wider network of sites. W H White supports the identification of New Earths established MBT facility, which lies at the heart of the Site Control Centre, for intensification. However as per our comments in respect of paragraph 5.55 and identified need 6, W H White would respectfully request that the opportunity presented by the established MRF, as proposed to be extended, be recognised. The established site is located at the juncture of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and is ideally situated to treat residual waste arising from households and businesses in South East Dorset. It also enjoys excellent access to the strategic highway network (with direct access onto a County freight route), and is therefore a suitable reception point for waste bulked at outlying transfer stations. The facility has a proven track record in diverting waste away from landfill and recovering value from the waste stream. The plant could be reconfigured, without the need for further planning permission, to focus on recycling and RDF production within the umbrella of existing conditions restricting the throughput capacity to 175,000tpa. Co-location with the consented Low Carbon Energy facility offers further scope for integration and optimising recovery. The above is entirely consistent with proposed Policy 1, the emerging Vision and Spatial Objectives for Bournemouth Dorset and Poole. W H White supports the two proposed physical extension areas identified on page 231 of the emerging Plan. It is considered that the allocation of the extension areas would provide flexibility and the opportunity for complementary uses to come forward, as encouraged in proposed Policy 2. The presence of existing dedicated infrastructure, inherent mitigation measures and the relative isolation serves to reduce the potential impact of incorporating these areas within an allocation, such that W H White do not consider cumulative impact to be an issue. Indeed it is our view that co-location presents an opportunity to reduce potential impacts by ensuring that waste is treated using the most appropriate technology and minimises the potential for double handling.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP PO03	WP662	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP PO03	WP818	This site has no concerns that we know of but residual bulky waste is still residual waste and it should not be burned.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP PO04	WP663	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Option WP PO04	WP819	East Dorset FoE have no objection yet to any of SITAs proposals although we have reservations about advanced thermal treatment which could be beneficial or harmful. We are opposed to burning residual waste here as well.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Option WP PK01	WP211	Support the use of the land for transfer facility but traffic must not use the Sandford Road from Wareham but gain access from the Bakers Arms roundabout on Wareham Road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP PK01	WP664	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP PK01	WP589	The site lies in close proximity, and surrounded on 3 sides, by internationally designated heathland, and so close consultation with Natural England will be required to ensure no adverse impacts on these sites. However, the position of the site within the existing industrial estate means that the development of a waste transfer facility and vehicle depot should be possible without major impacts. The site is also immediately adjacent to a part of SY 99/062 Holton Heath Industrial Estate Site of Nature Conservation Interest, which comprises a long series of sections of road verge running on either side of Blackhill Road, Station Road and Holton Road. These verges contain a variety of different species-rich grass types, including neutral, calcareous and dry acid grassland with a large number of Dorset Notable species and two Nationally Scarce species. It is therefore important that the verge areas close to the proposed development are protected against possible damage as a result of the additional traffic, particularly any damage from large lorries which would be turning into the site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Environment Agency	Option WP PK02	WP665	No objection to the proposed development. However Sequential Test for flood risk issues will be needed if any development is proposed to encroach within Flood Zones 3 and 2. Our previous comments are still relevant.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wool Parish Council	Option WP PK02	WP615	We agree with the other comments, the increased traffic along the A352 needs to be taken into consideration along with the barrier down time at local train stations. We currently have a heavy flow of traffic which can be congested. It is also noted that along the A352 in Wool it is used by members of the public, which includes children walking to school. The lorries must adhere to the speed limits and traffic monitoring would be recommended. It would be useful for traffic calming measures to be implemented along A352 and maybe now the speculated bypass of Wool could be revisited. In general Wool Parish Council are happy to support the proposal but have concerns on traffic safety.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP PK02	WP374	Dorset Green Technology Park site Vehicle movement along the A352 to this site needs to be reviewed as it is already very heavy.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Broadmayne Parish Council	Option WP PK02	WP549	Broadmayne Parish Council has concerns about the extra traffic on the A352 which might be generated by this proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP PK02	WP590	It is not clear from the plan whereabouts within the large area of the site boundary the proposed development might be sited. Part of the boundary of the site lies adjacent to the internationally designated SAC/SPA/Ramsar Site and also to SY 88/028 Winfrith Site of Nature Conservation Interest. SY 88/036 Burton Heath East SNCI is also adjacent but separated by the main railway line. Care will be required to ensure no adverse impacts on these designated sites. Within the Technology Park are also areas of undesignated but species-rich neutral/acid grassland, so detailed botanical surveys will be required to assess the impact of any proposed development once the actual siting of any facility is known.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Homes & Communities Agency	Option WP PK02	WP617	Thank you for consulting with HCA on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste Plan. We note that Dorset Green Technology Park has been included as one of the sites being considered for both a transfer and a waste vehicle depot. HCA believe decisions regarding the Waste Plan should be determined locally. However we would question whether the proposals for Dorset Green in the Waste Plan are compatible with the ambition of the Dorset LEP and Purbeck District Council, and indeed the County Council. These are to develop Dorset Green as a centre for high tech. companies in the defence, marine and advanced engineering sectors. It is on this basis that these organisations are promoting the site as an Enterprise Zone. A copy of this Enterprise Zone bid is attached to give context. On the basis that the proposed used of waste transfer and a waste vehicle depot are likely to be felt by existing business at Dorset Green to be incompatible with their operations and do not meet with local aspirations to develop the site for high tech. companies to promote local growth, we cannot support the allocation. Please treat this response as an objection to this element of the plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Purbeck District Council	Option WP PK02	WP936	Option WP PK02 (Dorset Green Technology Park), page 240: this makes no mention of any nature designations. Purbeck District Council requests that these designations are recognised in the text. Noise Noise pollution has a number of sources such as lorry traffic, plant and machinery, blasting and soil stripping operations. The degree of noise impact depends on distance from noise sensitive land uses, the nature and lay of the land and the times at which operations are carried out. The effects of noise can be reduced if its reduction is planned at the outset and is taken into account in the layout and nature and sequence of working. Examples include: the maintenance of acceptable distances between the operation and noise sensitive land uses; the avoidance of severe gradients on haul roads; use of alternatives to reversing beepers; the use of conveyors rather than trucks; the use of acoustic fencing or baffle mounds. Other methods include the fitting of silencers, the housing and cladding of fixed plant and machinery, the use of rubber liners on certain sections of plant and the maintenance of such measures. Hours of operation can also be imposed on planning permissions as a means of minimising disturbance to neighbours. Odour Unpleasant odours can arise from the tipping, storage, sorting, treatment or transportation of wastes, either from the decomposition of biodegradable wastes or off-gassing from chemical wastes, or from the treatment process. Odour emissions can be reduced and properly controlled by careful planning and management. For example, the production of odours can be minimised by ensuring correct storage of wastes. Odour emissions can be reduced by containing malodorous operations in buildings or appropriate vessels, operating buildings at negative pressure, and including odour scrubbers on air extraction systems. Correct operation of the waste management processes should reduce or prevent most odour production, and at the design stage the benefits of locating features with odour creation potential away from and downwind of residential properties and other sensitive land uses should be explored. Odour is also addressed by other legislation, implemented by the district councils or Environment Agency*. Hours of operation can also be imposed on planning permissions as a means of minimising disturbance to neighbours. *Due to different regulatory systems, planning conditions concerning mitigation of odour cannot be applied by Dorset County Council. Odour can only be regulated by the Environment Agency and the District Councils Environmental Health department. Dust Problems of dust and consequent air pollution can arise from soil stripping. The severity of the problem will vary according to the time of year, moisture in the soil, temperature, humidity and wind direction. Dust emissions can be reduced and properly controlled by careful planning and management. Examples include: locating features with dust creation potential (such as stockpiles) away from and downwind of residential properties and other sensitive land uses; the use of conveyors rather than haul roads; constructing stockpiles with gentle slopes; tar sealing internal haul roads; and enclosing dust generating plant and activities. Additional measures can be used to control the escape of dust and minimise pick up in the wind once the site is operating, including appropriate wheel cleaning facilities, vehicle speed restrictions, dampening haul roads and stockpiles, the use of fine water sprays, and sheeting of lorries. Hours of operation can also be imposed on planning permissions as a means of minimising disturbance to neighbours.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Winfrith Newburgh & East Knighton Parish Council	Option WP PK02	WP937	They have great concerns over the amount of extra traffic travelling along an already busy road A352. Winfrith parish council strongly support Wool parish councils comments regarding the extra traffic due to be caused by the proposed installation Waste Plant.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Stoke Parish Council	Option WP PK03	WP694	Further to discussion at the exhibition in Wareham and briefing at the East Stoke Parish Council meeting earlier this month it was agreed that the Parish Council would comment on both elements on the consultation. Following a telephone conversation with your staff this morning this email will deal with the response to the Draft Waste Plan as it impacts this parish. Clearly we need to manage the handling of waste locally where possible and reduce the amount of vehicle movements. The site chosen needs to be suitable so to this end we believe the SITA MRF site on the Puddletown Road which is currently mothballed would be preferable to that at Winfrith (Dorset Green) for the following reasons: The SITA site could quickly be brought back into use. The SITA site is in a remote area and well screened from local residents and passing traffic. It makes sense to sort the waste locally and transport the different recylates direct to the port for export or to a processing plant in UK. Any unsuitable material arising from the processing can be taken to local landfill sites. It is more easily accessed by HGV Transport although this needs careful management as previously there was unlawful use of Binnegar Lane by HGVs accessing the SITA site. Improvements to the road junction with the A352 at Worgret have also been requested through recent consultation on the minerals plan. Dorset Green is the subject of an Enterprise Zone bid where both DCC and PDC are trying to attract new investment to bring high tech employment to the site. Waste processing and the associated HGV movements on site are not conducive to making that environment attractive to new businesses. Wool is a bottleneck because of the railway level crossing. Adding more HGV movements along the A352 into Dorset Green will only exacerbate the problems particularly tailbacks on the A352 to the east around the Woolbridge roundabout.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP PK03	WP666	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
	Option WP PK03	WP375	Facilities required in Purbeck Vehicle depot. There would be around 24 one-way HGV movements and 40 car movements per day. Puddletown Road site If the preferred option is the Puddletown Road site this amount of traffic movement (including the local A352) needs to be calculated with the current activity and the future planned activity. Then the road network needs to be reassessed urgently. I note the Sustainability Appraisal summary states that this site is not ideally located and that there is potential for adverse impacts on biodiversity and landscape	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP PK03	WP591	The site lies close to the Dorset Heaths SAC/Dorset Heathlands SPA & Ramsar Site and close consultation with Natural England will be required if this site is progressed. Additional waste recycling and transfer facilities at this site will add to disturbance from noise and dust etc. and may delay or reduce the opportunities for appropriate restoration from the minerals quarrying which will need to be in line with the Puddletown Area Policy identified in the Draft Minerals Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Broadmayne Parish Council	Option WP PK03	WP548	Broadmayne Parish Council has concerns about the extra traffic on the A352 which might be generated by this proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD01	WP667	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Historic England	Option WP WD01	WP355	Having considered the strategy, policies and potential allocations, our primary observations relate to 3 suggested sites at Dorchester. WD01North West of Monkeys Jump, Dorchester Historic England acknowledges the conclusion of the Plans Sustainability Appraisal that there is likely to be an adverse impact on the landscape, as well as the potential for a negative impact on the historic environment . Development beyond the A37 would be a regrettable landscape incursion and it is suggested that another less intrusive option is promoted.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Local Access Forum	Option WP WD01	WP750	I am responding to the consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole draft Mineral Sites Plan and the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole draft Waste Plan, on behalf of the Dorset Local Access Forum. We are an independent statutory body, created under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, with a remit to promote public access to and usage of the countryside. We also have a statutory duty to offer advice to the public bodies listed in S94 of the Act, which includes the three Authorities sponsoring your Plan. With respect to the draft Waste Plan, our general position is the same as for the Minerals Plan, i.e. that every practical opportunity should be taken to improve access and rights of way. There are however two specific comments. WD01 - The proposed waste transfer site at Monkeys Jump outside Poundbury would affect a bridleway (S8/5). This must be properly protected, particularly since it forms a significant part of the rather limited network of public and permissive paths connecting Poundbury to the surrounding countryside.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD01	WP349	Proposal WD01 Land North West of Monkeys Jump this is a good size and well away from houses. Entrance could be made from the Bridport Rd	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD01	WP428	Disagree with using this site for a household recycling centre or a waste transfer facility or waste management centre for Dorchester. The position of the site is too close to the planned development of Poundbury, north of Great Cranford Street. It would create noise, smells and general nuisance to houses to the east of the A37 given the prevailing wind is from the west.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset AONB Team	Option WP WD01	WP540	An objection to this site option is foreseeable due to landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB. The site is located within the Dorchester Downs landscape character area, in close proximity to the edge of Poundbury. Whilst recognising that the site is bounded on two sides by road corridors, there is concern that projecting further development into an area of open countryside at this location would be significantly harmful to the AONB. The use of this site would facilitate a continued projection of uncharacteristic urban development into a nationally designated landscape, which should be afforded a significant level of protection. In particular the introduction of an urbanising feature in an area of open countryside would adversely affect the AONBs undeveloped rural character. This change would be experienced by road users at a gateway location and users of public rights of way that are located both in close proximity to the site and across wider areas of open countryside.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Ramblers Association - Dorset Area	Option WP WD01	WP573	I am responding to the above consultation on behalf of the Ramblers, Dorset Area, having viewed the documents on-line, and some as hard copies. I also attended one of the public exhibitions that were held throughout the County. I do not have expertise in any technical or strategic fields in association with either of these consultations, therefore my comments will relate solely to issues concerning public rights of way and access, and matters connected with those. I will therefore not be commenting on the scope or period of the Plans. The objectives of the Ramblers are: To promote and encourage the provision and protection of footpaths and other ways over which the public have a right of way or access on foot, including the prevention of obstruction of public rights of way. To protect and enhance the beauty of the countryside and other areas, including the provision, preservation and extension of public access to land on foot. To advance the education of the public in subjects relating to access to, and the preservation and conservation of, the countryside and of the health benefits of outdoor recreational pursuits. We also acknowledge the on going requirement for mineral extraction to provide the essential materials for the industry, and sites for waste disposal/recycling. That having been said, these processes should involve local communities and recreational user groups, to ensure adequate countryside protection. Wherever there are public rights of way (PROW) directly or indirectly affected by any of the proposals, due legal process must be followed if there is any likelihood that operations will prevent use of these by the public. This also applies to Open Access Land. There are specific waste sites that contain PROW, and of those of particular note should be: WD01: Land north-west of Monkeys Jump. The proposed waste transfer site at Monkeys Jump would affect bridleway S8/5. As well as continuing north from the site, it is an important link with a permissive path under the A37 that connects Poundbury to the surrounding countryside.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD01	WP592	There are no particular biodiversity concerns with regards to this site. However, it has been identified as a potential site for off-site biodiversity mitigation measures in relation to future developments at Poundbury, which might be adversely affected by the waste proposals. This will need to be considered before the proposals for waste facilities are taken forward.	
Dorchester Civic Society	Option WP WD01	WP746	WD01 - Monkeys Jump This would be an entirely new greenfield site within the AONB. Nevertheless the scale, elevation and proximity of the commercial buildings constructed on the nearby Poundbury estate would provide a backdrop to any new buildings on this site. Careful siting of buildings and use of levels would further mitigate any visual impact and potentially the site would only be visible when approaching from the north towards the Monkeys Jump roundabout. Access to the site would have to depend on changes to the Monkeys Jump roundabout which are referred to in Transforming Dorset Strategic Economic Plan (see para 1.3 above)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD01	WP762	This site is suitable. 1. It is an open site allowing all waste disposal/recycling go be planned together. 2. There is enough space for a safe traffic access to be built from busy roads. 3. There are enough options within the site to shield waste disposal from view and so preserve the landscape.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD01	WP772	Development at this site would affect a significant number of Poundbury residents and would pose traffic management problems. Nor have you indicated the possible coast.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD01	WP910	WD01 Monkeys Jump - there were some access issues and mitigating measures would be required to protect the AONB	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD02	WP151	In conclusion it seems to me that the proposed site for the Dorchester area should be: 1. Capable of housing all three activities in one place. To minimise HGV movements 2. It should be located away from houses and schools etc. as far as possible, as has been done at Bridport 3. As compliant as possible with existing Policy 21 4. Of sufficient size as to be able to deal with the increase in volume of waste, which will inevitably arise from the growth of housing in West Dorset? On the basis of this I believe that the sites at the Old radio station (WD02), Stinsford Hill (WD05) or Louds Mill (WD07) would be the most suitable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD02	WP276	Old radio station is far more convenient (for a HRC) since not close to significant population numbers and has established entrances/ exists.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD02	WP668	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Resident	Option WP WD02	WP350	WD02 Old Radio Station also of good size and well positioned	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset AONB Team	Option WP WD02	WP541	It is considered that the use of this site would not necessarily generate significant adverse landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB, subject to appropriate design and mitigation. Whilst the site occupies a prominent location, its existing appearance could be enhanced and a landscaping scheme could conceivably improve the integration of this site with the character of the surrounding countryside.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Civic Society	Option WP WD02	WP744	WD02 - Old Radio Station (the least worst option) Although an isolated site in the AONB it has the advantage of there already being a relatively large collection of buildings which are a settled part of the landscape. It is not clear whether there would be additional buildings, re-use of existing buildings or replacement buildings. Either way a sensitive design along with landscaping which the site currently lacks need not have any greater impact on the landscape and sensitive landscaping could reduce the current impact of the site. The existing development generates a certain amount of heavy goods vehicles and coaches already. It has a direct access onto the A35 subject to any improvements that might be required. (see para1.3 above).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD02	WP761	This site is not suitable:- 1. Even visual screening will not prevent this site from being a blot on the landscape because it is high up and can be seen for miles. 2. Access can only be from the A35, a busy main road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD02	WP911	WD02 Old Radio Station - considered to be a very suitable site particularly as it was already developed and access issues could be addressed. It would be important for exiting lorries to use the bypass to travel east not to pass through the town	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD03	WP165	This would appear to be the least suitable location around Dorchester. There is currently an effective green belt between the Ridgeway and Dorchester and siting the waste site south of the A35 would have an adverse impact on the locality. In addition, the Stadium roundabout and all approaches are currently very busy with traffic and adding a waste site (presumably with some form of traffic control such as lights or a roundabout) would make the situation worse than it currently is. I can't see how having a Park and Ride there would be a good idea either.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD03	WP669	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Historic England	Option WP WD03	WP356	Having considered the strategy, policies and potential allocations, our primary observations relate to 3 suggested sites at Dorchester. WD03 Land to the South of Stadium Roundabout, Dorchester Historic England considers that any development other than the minimum required for the P&R, as agreed within the Local Plan, would result in an intrusive landscape impact within the setting of Maiden Castle and Berrington Barrow scheduled monuments contrary to national policy for the historic environment. It is strongly recommended that another less intrusive option is pursued mindful that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets (NPPF Para 132).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD03	WP427	I agree with using this site for household recycling centre or waste transfer/waste management centre for Dorchester The stadium roundabout would be in a very similar position with regard to Dorchester as the new household recycling centre for Bridport is to the town centre there. The site could accommodate both a HRC and a new park and ride. There may be some useful economies here in tens of the road access to be built which could be used for both things.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Option WP WD03	WP520	It is noted that there is a need for additional waste management facilities in the western part of the County covered by West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Councils. To fulfil the Duty to Cooperate, the Councils would welcome opportunities for a dialogue with the Waste Authority to help identify suitable locations for these facilities and to enable the Local Plan and the Waste Plan to be strategically aligned. A number of options for the location of waste facilities have been presented in the Waste Plan. The Councils would welcome further input into the site selection process. The following concerns are highlighted here regarding some of the sites presented in the Plan. Through further consideration of the sites being proposed, additional concerns may arise. The proposed locations around Dorchester come with a number of problems, some of which have been highlighted within the appendix of the draft Waste Plan. The Stadium Roundabout site has been considered in detail through the Local Plan examination. The Local Plan proposed the site for a trunk road service area (TRSA) alongside a park-and-ride (P&R) scheme. Through the examination, the Inspector concluded that the impact on the landscape, the Dorset AONB and the historic environment would be substantial and hence the TRSA was removed from the Local Plan. The Inspectors report stated that: both the P&R and TRSA would have implications for the setting of the nearby historic sites at Maiden Castle, a round barrow further to the south east and Herringston round barrows. This would highlight the need for significant mitigation if any scheme was proposed on the site. However, the Inspector highlighted the conclusions of various studies which suggested that comprehensive planting could help screen the facilities and that the impact on the AONB would be marginally beneficial with the impact on Maiden Castle being moderately adverse once landscaping had matured. However he went on to acknowledge the views of Natural England and Historic England: Natural England and Historic England contest these conclusions given the sensitivity of these sites and the prominence of Maiden Castle in the landscape. Together with the Dorset AONB Team, they also question why these facilities cannot be provided elsewhere. I share their concern because the linear form of the site together with the plethora of buildings, lighting and signage would have a noticeable urbanising effect and extend a finger of development into the countryside. This would be difficult to mask effectively, especially from higher areas in the surrounding landscape and particularly during winter months. Development would also have a noticeable impact during construction and problems of noise and light pollution would be on-going issues. His conclusion therefore in relation to the site was: I do not find the case for a TRSA to be so compelling so as to outweigh the substantial harm that siting the scheme adjacent to the Stadium Roundabout would have on the landscape and historic features of national importance. In his report on the Local Plan, the Inspector also highlighted the need to consider the longer term growth of Dorchester. He acknowledged the rejected scheme to the north of the town and stated that it is not obvious that other or better alternatives exist. A modification to the Local Plan was included to ensure that a review is in place by 2021 and that this review should identify a site or sites necessary to meet the longer term needs of the town. Sites being considered for waste facilities around the town therefore need to be integrated into the planning of this longer term growth, hence the need for further dialogue through the site selection process.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Dorset AONB Team	Option WP WD03	WP542	An objection to this site option is foreseeable due to landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB. The use of this site would project development to the south of the A35, which is currently the boundary between Dorchester and the wider countryside, largely within Dorset AONB. The site is located within the Dorchester Downs landscape character area, in close proximity to the edge of Dorchester. Whilst recognising that the site is bounded on two sides by rail/road corridors, there is concern that extending development into an area of open countryside at this location would be significantly harmful to the AONB in both principle and practice. I feel it appropriate to signpost the Authority to findings within the Inspectors Report regarding the West Dorset Local Plan, which considered the foreseeable impact of developing this site for use as both a park & ride and a Trunk Road Service Area (TRSA), the latter of which included a number of structures including restaurants, shops and a petrol filling station. The Inspector concluded that such development would adversely affect the setting of historic sites, including Maiden Castle. The Inspector shared the concerns of Natural England, Historic England and the Dorset AONB Team and concluded that the linear form of the site together with the plethora of buildings, lighting and signage would have a noticeable urbanising effect and extend a finger of development into the countryside. This would be difficult to mask effectively, especially from higher areas in the surrounding landscape and particularly during winter months. Development would also have a noticeable impact during constructions and problems of noise and light pollution would be on going issues.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD03	WP593	Within the area identified for the waste site proposals we believe that there is a spring head from which water seeps into a tributary of the South Winterbourne River. For this reason, in addition to the constraints of landscape, traffic and historic environment, the site is unsuitable for the proposed developments due to the significant risk of pollution into the stream.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Civic Society	Option WP WD03	WP748	WD03 - South of Stadium Roundabout This site has recently been considered for Park and Ride for Dorchester and a Trunk Road Service Area within the context of the draft local plan. These matters were the subject of examination into the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Joint local Plan. The inspectors report has recently been published (14 August 2015). He concluded that there was a case for a park and ride but there was no case for a Trunk Road Service Area. He found that substantial harm would be caused to the landscape and historic features of national importance (Maiden Castle) and that there were other sites that would have less impact (paras140 -152 of the Inspectors report deal with this issue) Given the conclusions of the Inspector it would be inconceivable to now promote a waste transfer station on this site which may have an even greater impact on the setting of Maiden Castle than a Trunk Road Service Area	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD03	WP766	This site is not suitable. 1. It is too close to a traffic congested roundabout. 2. It is better suited to the park and ride trunk road service.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD03	WP773	This site would affect fewer houses and, if designated as a possible park and ride site, clearly cannot pose too many traffic management problems. I have no idea of the cost, which should have been mentioned	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD03	WP912	WD03 South of Stadium Roundabout - there were concerns about flooding, impact on the cycle path/heritage i.e. Maiden Castle/the AONB and the implications of the Planning Inspectors final report on the Local Plan were mentioned	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD04	WP18	I visited the presentation at Brownsword Hall on the 29th July and obtained copies of the detailed plans and locations. My husband and I have read with interest all the proposals which were extremely clear to read and understand. The preference is for the Charminster Depot & Farm Ref. WD04 is for this site to be extended to accommodate a waste depot alternatively is for Loudsmill Ref. WD07 to be reconfigured to accommodate an expanded Recycling Centre and for the road access to the site to be improved.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Charminster Parish Council	Option WP WD04	WP296	Charminster Parish Council have met to discuss the proposed enlargement of the current depot and wish to lodge their strong reservations about the unsuitability of the enlargement for the area. They believe the road access to be poor and unsuitable for further heavy vehicles.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD04	WP670	Objection depending on outcome of a risk assessment to assess the proposals, due to the site being all in SPZ1. Our comments previously made in earlier consultations are also still relevant, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Civic Society	Option WP WD04	WP747	WD04 - Charminster Depot Whilst this is an existing Council depot site it has two main draw backs - road access is very poor and use as a vehicle depot would increase traffic through Charminster. There is also a recent outline planning permission for residential development adjoining this site (WD/D/14/002784).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD04	WP765	This site is unsuitable. 1. It is too small. 2. The new site must accommodate all facilities and with some space for future development. 3. It is too close to Charminster village.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD04	WP913	WD04 Charminster Depot - considered to be the best site for the vehicle depot	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD05	WP152	In conclusion it seems to me that the proposed site for the Dorchester area should be: 1. Capable of housing all three activities in one place. To minimise HGV movements 2. It should be located away from houses and schools etc. as far as possible, as has been done at Bridport 3. As compliant as possible with existing Policy 21 4. Of sufficient size as to be able to deal with the increase in volume of waste, which will inevitably arise from the growth of housing in West Dorset? On the basis of this I believe that the sites at the Old radio station (WD02), Stinsford Hill (WD05) or Louds Mill (WD07) would be the most suitable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD05	WP323	The current site at Loudsmill, even if extended, has poor access and therefore has to be disregarded. Apart from WD05 all the other proposed sites seem to be dependent on access from the by-pass which is frequently congested during tourist times. Stinsford has the virtue of access from several directions.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD05	WP322	Although the current site at Loudsmill can be improved, access will remain a problem. Stinsford Hill would be better for household recycling and would enable waste transfer to be done on the same site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD05	WP671	Objection depending on outcome of a risk assessment to assess the proposals, due to the site being all in SPZ1. Also Sequential Test for flood risk issues would need to be passed. Our comments previously made in earlier consultations are also still relevant, which are provided in Appendix 1	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD05	WP425	This seems to be the best of the sites proposed for a new household recycling centre. It has the least visual impact and affects the least number of existing homes. Any future development of this area could be designed to take into account what would then be an existing household recycling centre. I can see no traffic problem if an in/out access to the site is well designed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD05	WP594	The majority of this site falls within the Flood Zone 3 and we therefore consider that it is unsuitable for waste management facilities.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Civic Society	Option WP WD05	WP749	WD05 - Stinsford Hill (the worst option) This is a greenfield site on an essentially open approach to Dorchester. The views towards Dorchester across the Frome flood plain are across the open countryside. Any building on this site would be obtrusive and significantly damage this important gateway approach to Dorchester. It is acknowledged that the landowner wishes to promote development of this site. Indeed this site and adjoining land was promoted for development by objectors to the joint local plan in Autumn 2014. The inspector who has recently reported on the draft local plan did not see fit to recommend inclusion of any of this land for development in the plan period 2015-31 The inspector has recommended a review of housing land supply with a request that this should be done by 2021 and allocate further land for housing in Dorchester for the end of the plan period and through to 2036. He emphasises that this should be done with the full involvement of local residents. It would be inconceivable for a public body, Dorset County Council, to prejudice such a review by seeking to construct in the shorter term a Waste Transfer station that would prejudice an objective assessment of the various options for the further expansion of Dorchester.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD05	WP764	This site is the best choice of all. 1. It is on the edge of the town, but not in it. 2. It is an open site so allowing space for all facilities plus room for any future improvements. 3. A safe access can be designed taking traffic specially from the main road. 4. Any future development of the area can properly take the presence of the disposal site into account.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD05	WP914	WD05 Stinsford Hill - Access was good and exiting traffic could travel east very easily. This was considered to be the best site for both a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD05	WP770	This site seems to least worst option, with least impact on houses, residents or traffic. But I have no idea of the cost compared with other options.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Stinsford Parish Council	Option WP WD05	WP921	At its meeting on 12 October 2015, Stinsford Parish Council considered the Draft Waste Plan. In particular, they focussed upon the site WD05 land at Stinsford Hill as this site lies within the parish. The Parish Council noted that this site was being considered as a possible site for a Household Recycling Centre, a Waste Transfer Facility or a Waste Management Centre. It was unanimously resolved that a submission should be made opposing the development of this site for any of the three waste facilities for the following reasons:- Risk of water contamination there is a Grade 1 chalk stream and a Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation under the site. Risk of flooding the site is covered by Flood Zones 2 and 3 and has been flooded on a number of occasions. The Parish Council noted the initial comments made by the Environment Agency in relation to these aspects. Insufficient transport infrastructure the Stinsford Hill roundabout is heavily used and, due to the current lane structure, is a site at which there are many near misses in addition to a number of collisions. It is very difficult for vehicles to cross the roundabout and the traffic flow on the A35 when travelling between the Kingston Maurward College roundabout and the B3150 and Slyers Lane. This would make access to the proposed site not only difficult but potentially dangerous. Additionally, movements by private vehicles out of Dorchester would also place increased pressure on Greys Bridge, a Grade II Listed Building, and generate greater congestion along the B3150. This stretch of road is heavily used and slow moving during rush hour periods, and at weekends, particularly in the summer. A new access to a waste site off of the A3150 would further exacerbate this. The Parish Council noted the initial comments made by Highways England in relation to this aspect. Impact on landscape This site is part of an unspoilt, undeveloped agricultural landscape which forms a key part of the landscape and visual setting for Dorchester. The development of any waste facility on this greenfield site would irreparably damage this setting and context. The uninterrupted view across the water meadows towards Dorchester also has cultural significance as this was described in detail by Thomas Hardy in The Mayor of Casterbridge and attracts visitors to the area as part of the Hardy Trail. The Parish Council noted the initial comments made by the County Councils senior Landscape Officer in relation to this aspect and, in particular, the fact that mitigation would not be feasible to prevent any adverse impact. The Parish Council did not consider that it was appropriate to comment on the other sites in the Dorchester area as these were outside of the parish boundary. The Parish Council request that these comments are taken into account in the next stage of the development of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan and look forward to seeing the next iteration of the document. Thank you.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD06	WP672	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Historic England	Option WP WD06	WP357	Historic England acknowledges the conclusion of the draft Waste Plans Sustainability Appraisal that There is the potential for significant adverse impacts on the landscape and the AONB, as well as the historic environment . The size of the suggested facilities are likely to result in an unsightly intrusion within the historic landscape and as such the pursuit of another less sensitive location is recommended.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset AONB Team	Option WP WD06	WP543	An objection to this site option is foreseeable due to landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB. The site is located within a rural agricultural context within the Dorchester Downs landscape character area. There are expansive views towards the site from areas of open countryside as well as from Maiden Castle. There is concern that the use of this site would add to the effects produced by the anaerobic digester and that this would generate significant landscape and visual changes to the rural character of the AONB and the setting of Maiden Castle.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Civic Society	Option WP WD06	WP745	As with WD02 although relatively isolated there is already development on this site of a relatively large scale. By using the topography of the site and careful siting of buildings the visual impact would be mitigated. There is good road access onto the A35 subject to any improvements that might be required. (see para1.3 above).	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD06	WP763	This site is unsuitable because:- 1. It is on a high point of the landscape visible for many miles. A waste disposal site should not become a landscape feature. 2. Access from Monkeys Jump area would add to the present traffic congestion.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD06	WP915	WD06 Rainbarrow Farm - due to traffic concerns relating to the Monkeys Jump roundabout, there was uncertainty about the suitability of this site	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD07	WP19	I visited the presentation at Brownsword Hall on the 29th July and obtained copies of the detailed plans and locations. My husband and I have read with interest all the proposals which were extremely clear to read and understand. The preference is for the Charminster Depot & Farm Ref. WD04 is for this site to be extended to accommodate a waste depot alternatively is for Loudsmill Ref. WD07 to be reconfigured to accommodate an expanded Recycling Centre and for the road access to the site to be improved.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP176	This is clearly, in my view, the most suitable site for the new/upgraded HRC, provided all transport and access issues are resolved satisfactorily, most particularly the upgrading of St Georges Rd between the HRC and the Junction with the extended Lubbeke Way	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP153	In conclusion it seems to me that the proposed site for the Dorchester area should be: 1. Capable of housing all three activities in one place. To minimise HGV movements 2. It should be located away from houses and schools etc. as far as possible, as has been done at Bridport 3. As compliant as possible with existing Policy 21 4. Of sufficient size as to be able to deal with the increase in volume of waste, which will inevitably arise from the growth of housing in West Dorset? On the basis of this I believe that the sites at the Old radio station (WD02), Stinsford Hill (WD05) or Louds Mill (WD07) would be the most suitable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP178	Provided that the road access is improved this would seem to be the most suitable site. A one-way system at the site would be desirable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP320	Providing road access is improved this seems to be the most feasible site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD07	WP673	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP421	The site (an existing Brownfield site) will soon be served by an extension to Lubbecke Way, which will take the traffic away from the constrained St Georges Rd residential area. Landscape Susceptibility It is not in the AONB. Site already used for the same type of purpose. Environmental Agency The site is on the right side of major population in terms of prevailing winds and odour and rubbish movement. Highways Authority Site can be accessed without the use of the strategic road network. Extra comments: site is half the distance from crossways compared with Parkway Farm (9.75km compared to Loudsmill 6.2km, the former causing an unnecessary increase in traffic through Dorchester and/or the bypass)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Broadmayne Parish Council	Option WP WD07	WP547	Broadmayne Parish Council believes that the Loudsmill site as presently configured is inadequate for present use. Improvements to the facility are needed as a matter of urgency if the site is to continue in use.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP614	As this site will soon be served by an extension to Lubbecke Way (per DCC) thereby removing the present inadequate access, it remains the most suitable for a re-configured HRC. The use is long-established and the enhancement of the facility is unlikely to be detrimental to neighbours. Also, being to the east of the town it is best placed to serve the expanding Crossways (6.2km) and other communities without requiring journeys through the town or around the bypass to the alternative suggested sites to the west. If space allowed, it would be sensible to include a Waste Transfer Facility, as this would provide operational savings and reduce HGV movements.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD07	WP595	The site is within the flood plain of the River Frome SSSI, with ditches flowing from alongside the site into the river. For these reasons Dorset Wildlife Trust does not believe that this is a suitable site for further waste facilities. The adjacent area of Cricket Bat Willows which have been recently felled needs to be subject to restoration planting to protect the river from adverse impacts and to restore more natural habitat adjacent to the SSSI river. DWT would wish to see this site restored and managed as a part of the River Frome Rehabilitation Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD07	WP612	This site is already developed - there is land available to provide a one-way traffic system which will improve quality of life for those residential areas already affected/ There will be no problem with AONB criteria.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD07	WP767	This site is not suitable. 1. The access road is too narrow for 2-way traffic. The road needs major repair. 2. The site is too small for all new required facilities. 3. There are too many homes close-by. This area needs a 'break' and a revival.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD07	WP916	WD07 Loudsmill - Members considered this to be the most unsuitable site for any waste facility due to its proximity to residential housing, the narrow access road much with unsuitable surfacing and restricted exit roads leading to the bypass	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP20	I have two major comments concerning access and location. Access - If there was direct access on to the A35 the problem traffic would have to access by the Monkey's Jump roundabout already severely overloaded. The only other alternative would be through the centre of Dorchester. Location - The site location is to the SW of Poundbury and Dorchester so that the prevailing winds would carry noise and smells over a wide residential area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP150	Site WD08 clearly does not meet the space requirements for all of the three activities having an area of 0.93ha. I understand from the roadshow that it is likely that this site would become a Household Recycling Centre. I do not believe that this site is suitable even for this activity. Your own data predicts some 120,000 cars per annum and 1000 HGV movements per annum. Middle Farm Way is now a busy road with traffic frequently tailing back to the entrance to the site at peak periods. This situation will only get worse as Monkeys Jump roundabout becomes more and more congested. To add 120,000 cars per annum, plus 1000 HGVs to this is not a good idea. It is therefore my view that this site fails the test of Policy 21 as set out in the adopted current waste plan. This site is also unsuitable because of the impact on houses in Middle Farm Way and Ladock Green. In addition there are 2 educational establishments in close proximity to the proposed site, Weymouth College and Happy Days nursery. The noise, dust and vehicle exhaust emissions are incompatible with both residential and educational land use nearby. I understand the issues associated with access at Louds Mill, which of course is remote from any residential development, but to suggest that it will be an improvement to move such a facility to Poundbury seems to take no account of the impact f the move on both residential and educational establishments. Clearly the County and District are mindful of the desirability of moving such activities out of towns. The newly created site at Bridport demonstrates what can be done to get such facilities away from houses and schools. It seems logical that the same criteria should apply in Dorchester. In conclusion it seems to me that the proposed site for the Dorchester area should be: 1. Capable of housing all three activities in one place. To minimise HGV movements 2. It should be located away from houses and schools etc. as far as possible, as has been done at Bridport 3. As compliant as possible with existing Policy 21 4. Of sufficient size as to be able to deal with the increase in volume of waste, which will inevitably arise from the growth of housing in West Dorset? On the basis of this I believe that the sites at the Old radio station (WD02), Stinsford Hill (WD05) or Louds Mill (WD07) would be the most suitable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP177	In my view, this is the second most suitable site for a new HRC (after WD07), because the site location seems to me to be almost ideal as one is likely to get, except possible with regard to its size	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP179	This seems a suitable site though I would place it below Loudsmill	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP213	This site I see as totally inappropriate for dealing with waste, being as it is in an area developing as a residential and light business use of a compatible nature. The area adjoins a permissive path, well used by walkers whose enjoyment of this countryside would suffer, it being designated an area of outstanding beauty. The site would also be visible from Maiden Castle iron age hillfort which is an ancient monument of worldwide importance. I think the best solution would be to retain WD07 as the choice of site with suitable improvements to it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP274	It is clear that should the proposal to locate the household recycling centre at Parkway Farm Business Park be implemented it will have a serious detrimental effect on the immediate neighbourhood and possibly on Poundbury as a whole. As nearby residents, we frequently experience the wind blowing from the direction of the proposed site, so we can expect to be in the direct 'firing line' of dust, smells and litter, and to tolerate the noise and inconvenience of the inevitable increase in traffic on Middle Farm Way. The site is even closer to a children's nursery and almost adjacent to a large new commercial building, presumably the future workplace of a considerable number of people who will need to tolerate the pollution close at hand, unpleasant at best and a potential health hazard at worst. Middle Farm Way is a very busy road and at peak times traffic waiting to join the A35 can back up beyond the proposed site entrance. The entrance road is fairly short and unless some provision is to be made to accommodate a large number of vehicles waiting to use the facility, it seems likely that at busy times the queue will extend into Middle Farm Way, causing additional congestion. A further complication is the apparent need for users of the commercial units on the site to share the same access as those using the recycling centre. Unless some very imaginative traffic management can be devised, and the plans show the land available to be very restricted, the addition of the recycling centre is clearly a recipe for traffic chaos. Once the regular users of Middle Farm Way (including emergency vehicles) experience the congestion, they will inevitably start to use Bridport Road, Peverall Avenue or some of the more minor roads as alternative routes. Such through traffic is generally impatient and fast, not suited to the Poundbury 'shared space' concept, so seriously compromising pedestrian safety. I consequently urge you to reject the use of the WD08 site for the household recycling centre.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP275	to the west of Poundbury - noise, traffic and fumes, too close to homes Too many heavy lorries on Middle Farm Way Poundbury communal gardens at Middle Farm about the site not allotments	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP288	This area would be a totally inappropriate siting for the proposed Household waste disposal facility, being very close to a major housing development which would suffer immensely from noise and pollution particularly taking into consideration the prevailing wind direction. Numerous new small scale business premises would be very much affected as well as a neighbouring nursery school "Sunny Days", also Weymouth College building used by many young students on a daily basis, and residents making use of adjoining communal vegetable gardens. T traffic congestion would be enormous as it already backs up to this point from Monkeys Jump roundabout at peak times. Many local residents use the approach road for recreation and dog walking and for an alternative walking route for schoolchildren to Thomas Hardy School. Middle Farm Way itself is a major route for emergency vehicles on all days of the week and they would most certainly be impeded with the huge increase in waiting vehicles there would inevitably be, as the approach road from Middle Farm Way is very short. Nothing about this site fulfills the technical requirements of the Plan as it is both too small and too close to residential areas. It is surely obvious that work on extending the current Louds Mill site would be the best and logical option.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP319	I'm writing with my objection to the site consideration laid out in Waste Planning Option WD08 I am a resident of Poundbury. I live near to the site that is being considered off Middle Farm Way so I have close hand experience on the affect such a site would cause. My reason for objection to WD08 are: · There is a long established Day Care nursery to the site where young children play and would be exposed to smells and noise pollution brought by increased traffic · A large commercial building is currently being constructed which no doubt will bring future traffic to Middle Farm Way. MFW is the through way for the ambulances and fire trucks so needs to be kept protected from future further traffic. · There is a Red Cross office and Weymouth College facility next to the site that needs safe and unblocked access for disabled patrons and college students. · The site would further increase traffic on MFW causing congestion, pollution and noise to the residents who already have to experience a certain amount of this traffic noise by living on the perimeter of Middle Farm Way · Finally, increased traffic on Middle Farm Way could lead to drivers taking short cuts through residential streets which are specifically designed for favour walking traffic by the Duchy rules as there are no street signs, road markings, traffic lights or marked pedestrian crossings. In conclusion I urge you to reject WD08 site for household recycling	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP306	Following your recent exhibition in the Brownsword Hall, Poundbury, I would please like to register our objections to the site being selected off Middle Farm Way at Poundbury. As you will see from my address above, we live in a house that has been built very near to the site proposed and these houses were not in existence when the matter was considered in 2006. I think everyone will agree such a site is very necessary and will be even more essential over the years to come as the numbers of dwellings in Dorchester and those in the surrounding area that are allowed to use the facility, increases. However, this site being considered is on the southern boundary of the Poundbury Development at the western end. In this area the prevailing wing is south west, so that means smells, rubbish and dust will be carried towards large numbers of private dwellings and other buildings and facilities. If there happens to be a fire on the site, smoke and fumes would create a lot of problems. Also within a couple of hundred yards of the proposed site are a chocolate factory, a large children's nursery school which I believe was originally designed for up to 600 children, a Weymouth College building occupied by students, several; commercial buildings and an allotment site, I regret to say that with the best will in the world, these tips do attract vermin, do smell and many items are just dumped outside shoots or bins such are very noticeable at the present tip. Recycling is bound to create a lot of traffic, cars dropping off, lorries going to the site to collect the material and then coming back off the site to remove the sorted recycling, The traffic situation in Dorchester is already horrific, with a major obstruction being the hold ups at the top of town roundabout. The traffic already using Middle Farm Way is quite heavy and another bottleneck is the Monkey Jump roundabout. Extra traffic coming from the A35 will need to cross Middle Farm Way and this will cause hold ups. Moving the dump to any of the three proposed sites in this area will make matters worse. The new site in my opinion should be outside the town boundary, preferably on the north west of Dorchester. The site is at the bottom of a slope with a large earthwork on its lower side, which will hamper natural drainage and is very small. That possibly means in say 15-20 years, when Poundbury and other local developments are all completed and occupied, it will probably not be large enough to expand and may need to move again. What happens if it is decided and enforced by other than your Council, that part of the material instead of being recycled should be incinerated? Your pamphlet suggested an increase in waste recycled by nearly one third in 15 years time, could it will be more! I trust that you and your committee will select a site outside the town boundary.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP271	Of the options on display at Brownsword Hall this seems to be the best for road access and visibility (privacy) and is not close to housing. Provided that any adverse effects from air, noise or water pollution and on visibility/landscape can be eliminated I would strongly support this plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP294	Thank you for the comprehensive consultation information provided regarding the Draft Waste Plan for Dorset. We are writing in response to option WD08 which considers creating an HRC facility at Parkway Farm. Having read the proposals in detail - specifically for the Dorchester area we would like to register our objection to this particular proposal (WD08) Our objections are based on a number of factors; All other sites proposed within the Dorchester and West Dorset area are far better suited for development of existing facilities and to fulfil multiple waste management needs. All other sites proposed have far less impact on residential areas. Infrastructure is already part in place at other sites - including existing HRC facilities which could be extended, and existing access roads. The cost to taxpayers of creating a completely new facility, where other sites could more cost effectively be developed, and meet growing waste management demands, cannot be justified. WD08 would have a negative impact on the local environment increased volume of traffic (cars and lorries) through a residential area safety of local children and residents Increased noise/air quality pollution (whilst Parkway Farm is already a business area movement of traffic is typically at start of and end of working day) therefore continuous movement into and out of site would have a significant negative impact for local residents. negative impact on local birds and wildlife - this proposed site is within an AONB the proposed site is currently set up as a community farm which enhances quality of life and community involvement proximity to residential housing (150meters) impact on vistas from Poundbury toward historic Maiden Castle We trust that you will include this feedback when considering the options. We would like to be kept informed of developments and decisions regarding the Dorset Waste Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP321	I firmly disagree with the proposal of this site- The area is close to a children's Nursery school, Traffic issues already a problem at Monkeys Jump roundabout & will only be increased. Fire service would need quick access & traffic congestion will/may hinder this. Prolific winds at times at Poundbury would send any waste smells towards housing stock., cafe's & local businesses. Walking area for both children going to school & dog walkers. Small business increase on this site already , also Weymouth college, Red Cross, so again, traffic will increase on Middle Farm Way. Near Maiden Castle -a specific historical site. so important to spare this wonderful area. I strongly urge rejection of this plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP307	I am writing to raise our objections to the proposed plan to relocate the Waste Recycling Plant to the Parkway Farm Business Park. This is based on the following: 1. Traffic Generation There is already a great deal of traffic utilising Middle Farm Way during peak periods and the congestion leaving Dorchester can lead to queues from Parkway to the Monkey Jump Roundabout. Additionally traffic on the by-pass during peak periods during the summer and bank holidays can lead to queues along the A35 back to Winterbourne Abbas to the west and the Stadium to the east. This is not restricted to the Summer Months as the flooding on the Monkey Jump Roundabout during the winter months can have a similar effect. The additional total traffic movements of 2000 HGVs and approximately 240,000 traffic movements would cause unacceptable levels of congestion on the by-pass, within Poundbury and all of the approach roads through the centre of Dorchester as vehicles seek alternative routes. Any traffic congestion should consider the impact on fire and ambulance services to both Dorchester and the surrounding areas 2. Impact on Sensitive Human Receptors The impact of the plant will not be limited to the properties mentioned in your site assessment as with the prevailing winds from the south/southwest any dust/smell will be spread across the whole area of Poundbury. The increased noise of the site will also not be limited to the closest property. In addition the pollutants that may occur may impact the Nursery School located at Sunny Days Nursery and the local secondary and primary schools. 3. Protection of Water Resources / Environmental Agency With the close location of so many properties, there could be a substantial impact on the local resident community in the event of leakage, dust, fire. In addition there will be an increased risk of vermin such as rats and seagulls. This will be increased if tight controls are not in place and not managed locally.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD08	WP674	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP616	I wish to comment on the suggestion for using the above site for a Household Recycling Centre. It seems to be a highly inappropriate site to use, for the following reasons in particular, given that there are other sites available which are more suitable. 1 TRAFFIC As Poundbury has grown the amount of traffic along Middle Farm Way has increased considerably. There are traffic queues every weekday evening up to Monkey Jump roundabouts, which can back up as far as Parkway Farm and beyond, and cause vehicles to drive through unsuitable roads in Poundbury seeking an alternative route. And the Monkey Jump Roundabout itself occasions build ups on all roads to it at other busy times as well as these e.g. summer weekends, , and of course has a flooding problem to make these build ups worse at times. Also there is limited space for queuing within or just beyond the potential site within the Parkway Farm area. Very long queues build up at the existing site as I know from personal experience. It could be that at times, if queues for the site back up onto Middle Farm Way, that this road is blocked completely by vehicles trying to enter the site from both directions. You say in your own assessment that already there are 116,500 private vehicle movements at the existing site, and this number is sure to increase with increased housing, particularly in Poundbury itself. There are also safety considerations regarding access and particularly egress if turning right onto Middle Farm Way for all vehicles. There will also be a pollution aspect with all this vehicle movement adversely affecting nearby households bordering Middle Farm Way. PROXIMITY The proposed site is very close to a densely spaced residential area so it will have an effect on many households. The number of dwellings in the immediate area has increased considerably since the original 2006 proposals. Best practice for new facilities is to house them AWAY from dense housing zones, and there are alternatives in your plans which fulfil this requirement. The commercial/ semi-industrial site immediately adjacent has continued to develop. This of course will occasion more vehicle movements still. In your assessment you say that the site is 1.65 km from Dorchester, which is misleading. Presumably you mean the centre of Dorchester. But Poundbury is of course part of Dorchester so it is 0 km away! POLLUTION Even with modern methods and management, such sites produce pollution. The smells would be carried on the prevailing wind into Poundbury. Particulate matter could be blown towards a densely populated area, which includes a children's nursery and a chocolate factory. Also sites produce litter, as visits to the existing site indicate. There is also the likelihood of an increased vermin population as a result of these factors. The pollution from private vehicles has also been mentioned, which will be added to by the estimated 1000 commercial vehicle movements a year. In summary I completely reject the option to place this HRC in Poundbury	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Poundbury Residents Association	Option WP WD08	WP413	Following extensive communication at formal meetings and from personal meetings I present a summary of responses from Poundbury residents and reasons for their rejection of the shortlisted WD08 Parkway Farm Business Park for a Household Recycling Centre/ Waste site. Consideration of this Parkway Farm site was formally raised in 2006 and embedded into the Poundbury Development Brief of that year. There was major opposition to the scheme at the time from Poundbury residents during the consultation process; a petition was organised and opposition to the choice of and HRC in Poundbury were made clear. Since that time, changes in Poundbury have included the opening of Middle Farm Way (August 2006) with a major increase in traffic in this area; a large, and continuing, increase in the population of Poundbury; more densely arranged housing close to the site (around Ladock Green and Wadebridge Street and Square in particular); as well as much more semi industrial, and continued, development adjacent to the proposed site. All these changes further support the original arguments against the development of the site:- Proximity: The proposed site is much too close to a densely spaced residential area and will have an effect on many adjacent households. It is common practice for new HRCs to be housed away from dense housing zones and developing commercial sites. It is also particularly inappropriate to have an HRC close to an existing children's nursery (Sunny Days) and confectionary factory (House of Dorchester|). Traffic: Further analysis regarding the impact on safety and volume of traffic will be needed but residents have already noticed that there are increasing, traffic queues every weekday evening up to the Monkey Jump roundabouts, which can back up as far as Parkway Farm. There is limited space for queuing within, or just beyond the potential site within the Parkway Farm area, and safety considerations regarding access, and particularly egress if turning right, onto Middle Farm Way for all vehicles. There will also be a pollution aspect with this extra vehicle movement adversely affecting nearby households bordering Middle Farm Way. Light pollution: Modern sites are well lit, and this will be particularly noticeable in the winter months and, again, this would adversely affect households near to the entrance to Parkway Farm Noise pollution: There will be additional noise from the site with diggers/large vehicles and considerable extra traffic which will, again, impact on neighbouring properties and nearby businesses. Odour and particulate pollution: All tips cause unwanted smells, even the best managed ones, and the proposed site is in the path of the prevailing south west wind which affects Poundbury at most times of the year. Particulate matter and litter will be blown around and towards the nearby, densely populated area with the nearby children's nursery and recently extended chocolate factory. A recent example of unpleasant odours affecting a large part of the southern side of Poundbury has been the persistent smell from the Monkey Jump area which Wessex Water, WDDC EHOs and Councillors are already well aware of. Litter is already a problem in Poundbury with the continuing construction. Vermin: It can be safely anticipated that any HRC will attract more vermin which will affect many households in Poundbury. Fly tipping: Tips are known to attract fly tipping, particularly when they are closed. The pollutant problems will be exacerbated by this, apart from the unsightliness and proximity of it to businesses and residents. The proposed Parkway Farm site has been reserved for B2 development which offers an employment opportunity in an area attractive to many employers who contribute greatly to the local economy. This would represent a lost opportunity should the HRC/tip be placed in this area and adversely affect the potential for businesses to move premises into this site with their employees. In summary the Poundbury Residents Association completely rejects the option to place an HRC/ tip in Poundbury.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP347	This proposed site is totally inaccessible to us as private resident buying into the Poundbury Dream 3 years ago. The site would cause traffic problems at peak times, added emissions from queuing traffic, noise etc., even more reduction to the value of our houses (after the ridiculous proportions of the units now being built on the site) This would be the final straw for us and many other residents in the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP354	I do not consider the suggested site at Poundbury is suitable as a new Waste Disposal Site because : 1. Site too small and access inconvenient. 2. Site too near existing Weymouth College and Poundbury residential properties. 3. Will cause a huge increase in traffic using Middle Farm Road resulting in problems for nearby residents and everyone now using the road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP364	I strongly oppose the proposed site at Parkway (Ref WD08) as a potential Household Recycling Centre (HRC) as I consider it clearly unsuitable for a variety of reasons and consider that it would inevitably cause significant damage/blight to the area. My comments are based not just because I live close to the proposed site (and am not, of course, immune to NIMBY-ism) but on my many years working in local government waste services; having been an M CIWM. THE SIZE OF THE SITE , at under a full hectare, is already barely large enough for operations now. Why build an expensive new plant where there is very little/no future proofing; there is no further land here that could be used for any expansion. Alternative sites offer this option which should weigh heavily in the minds of the decision makers. Look at WD07 or WD05 . TRAFFIC The report suggests 120,000 vehicles plus 1000 HGV movements each year would use any new site. Many, but far from all, visitors would be expected to travel through the town to reach WD08 approaching via Mansell Square. The HGVs and traffic from other areas would still approach via Monkeys Jump. The traffic will grow at, you estimate, 3%pa. Your report document (Social Issues) refers to the wider issues of traffic, access to the strategic highway network, etc...but makes no reference to the problems of the locals caused by such development. Middle Farm Way , the approach road, is already busy. At the start of the day and from mid-afternoon it is usually crawling. Drivers are already meeting queues, turning around, taking other routes through Poundbury and generally trying to get better access to the roundabout just before the Monkeys Jump. Add all the traffic headed to WD08 and there will be standing traffic for much of the day with all the consequential damage to the environment , fuel consumption of standing traffic, fumes, etc., etc. The report shows no recognition that a new primary school is shortly to open in Poundbury which will cause hundreds more vehicle movements through Mansell Square in the mornings and from early afternoon (when the youngest pupils leave) until the end of after school activities. The WDDC may hope that pupils will walk, but all research at other schools shows this to be an aspiration rather than a likely reality. School traffic plus the majority of the House of Dorset Chocolate Factory traffic and Dorset Cereals Factory will all have to use this same area of Mansell Square. In my opinion traffic in Mansell Square will be at a standstill for long periods of the day. It is already a very dangerous area for pedestrians to attempt to cross (the GP surgeries, pharmacy and school will all be on the other side of the majority of residents using these facilities). This is a matter raised at many Residents Associations meetings. If you factor in a pedestrian crossing or the actions of a lolly pop lady to assist at school times and improve pedestrian safely, there will be even more standing traffic. Will traffic heading west from Dorchester town back up? Will egress from the hospital to emergencies be affected? I think it highly likely. WD08 APPROACH ROAD The access way, off Middle Farm Way, is not a long piece of road and goes between a part of Weymouth College, established industrial units and industrial units which are in construction. The College buses in students in the morning and out in the evening. Traffic using WD08 would make this operation very dangerous. Businesses in the established units will fing access a problem for staff and customers. The marketing and use of the industrial units will be adversely affected by proximity to the tip and will surely deter quality businesses from moving in. This will again adversely affect the environment for neighbours and impact on the economic growth of that part of Poundbury. The proposed site WD08 is an odd shape and will, my experience suggest, be problematic to use effectively. I see no mention of the calculation of usable space on this site as opposed to a simple measurement of the area. The space HGVs need to access and remove large waste containers is large and often other site users have to be excluded whilst they work. This will mean traffic being stacked causing further back-ups of traffic on the short access road and into Middle Farm Way. PROXIMITY MATTERS Your report states (guiding principles) "requires waste to be managed...as close as possible to its source in order to reduce waste movements". I have not the data to do any real trip analysis but it would seem clear that the Louds Mill site WD07 fits better with that aim than WD08. It would appear that there would be significantly fewer road miles driven if other, closer to town sites were accepted. Your documents (Social Issues) refers to " acceptable distances from receptors will vary...as a guide major facilities located closer than 250m are likely to be unacceptable...". Whilst we could debate the definition of major, your site report acknowledges that there will be an impact on the housing near the proposed site which is 150m away. Yet no mention is made of the fact that there is a branch of Weymouth College and a large preschool set up even closer ! Overall it seems that the commentators, whose views have been presented in the plans, have been inconsistent with their comments about the issues of the new site's buildings being visible from the town or being in an area of AONB, etc. I think that this is unacceptable and illustrates that the commentators are, perhaps, trying to influence the site that is chosen. For example WD03, 05 and 08 seem equidistant from the centre of Dorchester but do no attract equal comments. The new HRC on the A35 at Bridport is all that the planners seem to be trying to avoid: highly visible to users and highly accessible, directly off the A35. This causes least damage to the housing nearby, least pollution and, once the site was completed, it seems to cause little obstruction to passing traffic! No doubt that the Minerals and Waste Partnership together with Highways England favour WD08 because it would appear to reduce traffic using the A35 and Monkeys Jump which is a known bottleneck. They are merely passing the problem to the West Dorset District Council. I favour the Louds Mill site, WD07, being further developed as there is land available in an area which is already affected by the current site and a sewage farm. The extended Lubbecke Road offers the opportunity of developing a one way system which will improve the environment of those living on the current approach to the site. I have every sympathy with the new house owners in Lubbecke Road who will most assuredly not want the traffic going past their homes but their position is no different from ours: housing on Middle Farm Way is also new and some is yet to be sold. In one respect their position is significantly better as they would have only half of the traffic!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP365	It appears that little account has been taken of the already heavy traffic movements along Middle Farm Way especially at peak times. This is a main route in and out of Dorchester. A fullup to date traffic assessment, including peak movements, is essential before further consideration of any development involving significant additional traffic movement. To access the site users from within Dorchester and from the east would be more likely to travel through the town rather than round the bypass, especially in the peak season when the bypass is frequently jammed with traffic at both the Football Stadium and Monkey Jump roundabouts.. The siting to the West of Dorchester would also mean that any smell would be carried on the prevailing westerly wind over the town.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP348	I have given the matter of siting the HRC on Parkway Farm and agree it does fill some of the requirements needed for such an operation i.e. it is in a good position to serve Dorchester and the surrounding area but I would like to list the following observations as to its suitability. 1. Visits to such sites often treble or quadruple at evenings and weekends when the Poundbury is already very bust with holiday traffic. AT the moment the traffic often builds back from the roundabout to the business park. I have obtained this information from a survey carried out by Luton college soe few years ago 2. The overall proposals is that a transfer station may be built alongside to the HRC. The proposed site would be too small to accommodate this. In addition it would generate a lot more commercial traffic 3. Poundbury is a very windy place, even the Romans would not settle here. Even if the HRC is sited in an enclosed building it would be like a wind tunnel with all of the traffic going in and out 4. The proposed site is in a very low lying area and in the future there could well be wet condition issues. 5. Wessex Water have a pumping station here and this could well be an issue. You have detailed other proposed sites, two if which I believe are better suited for such an operation.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP390	I wish to register my opposition to any plan that involves a Waste Disposal facility or tip IN POUNDBURY (on Parkway Farm near Weymouth College). I share the views which the Poundbury Residents Association has already set out, and of which you are fully aware. Please keep me informed of the result of the pending Planning discussions.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP387	Site WD08 surely does not meet the space requirements required for the proposed development. Middle Farm Way is now a busy road with traffic frequently tailing back from the roundabout at peak periods. This situation will only get worse as Monkeys Jump roundabout becomes more and more congested. It is also the route for the Fire Engines and Ambulances to use to get into Dorchester and it will also result with traffic trying to find a route to avoid the congestion which will be through residential streets which many people and children use to walk around. This site is also unsuitable because of the proximity to residential properties. In addition there are 2 establishments in close proximity to the proposed site, Weymouth College and Happy Days nursery, and a new building going up at the moment. The new facility in Bridport surely demonstrates that facilities should be away from houses and schools, perhaps the same criteria should be applied to Dorchester.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP396	I wish to register my objections to the inclusion of the Middle Farm Way in Poundbury in this round of assessment for new waste sites. The reasons for my objection are:- 1. The proposed site is SW of a dense housing area and , however modern the nature of the site, the prevailing wind will carry fumes, smell , dust and debris into the housing area and into the adjacent allotment, potentially making the produce inedible. 2. The road is already busy (very busy in the rush hour) and vehicles turning into this site are bound to cause severe interruptions to the traffic flow unless significant changes are made to the road. 3. I cannot believe that it is desirable to route waste traffic through an area currently occupied by an establishment dedicated to education. 4. I believe there are much better sites available , such as the site between the Kingston Mauward roundabout and the Piddle Valley road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP366	I am firmly opposed to he suggestion that a recycling centre should be allowed at this site because of traffic problems on the Parkway, Bridport Road and from the bypass. There are frequent times when there are traffic queues and these will only become worse when the school opens on Peverell Avenue East. I have queued from close to exit for the ill advised site on numerous occasions and now decide not to travel at certain times	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP395	Good day, when making any such decision, you need to be very aware of the issues relating to road access, and any disruption due to queuing, or when any access road is used as an alternate route when the main route is closed for any reason. Prevailing wind, which affects odours and noise should also be considered. For those reasons, using the Middle Farm Way (the main route into Dorchester from the west), Dorchester as access and tip location should not be accepted.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP397	Will you please be aware of both my and my partners horror at the proposal to place a waste disposal tip in the Poundbury area . Apart from issues with smell the bigger issue of traffic pollution due to a large increase in traffic into an already busy area will see the whole of the nearby area damaged as regards property values and general well being of residents , the fact of a nearby Nursery with increased traffic problems also fills me with dread. Does no one consider children welfare hereabouts. Lets put an immediate end to speculation re waste management in Poundbury , there are numerous places where such an establishment can be sited without such devastating damage to the residents of Dorchester. Respectfully submitted for urgent attention	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP394	We previously commented on a suggested proposal for a waste re cycling facility off Middle Farm Way , Poundbury , Dorchester in 2006 ... We now understand responses are sought for such a proposal given that a location for a new recycling centre is now being sought and consultation procedures are underway... We object to the proposed location of a waste recycling centre off Middle Farm Way , Poundbury for the following reasons: PROXIMITY: The proposed site is very close to a densely spaced residential area so it will have an effect on many households. Best practice for new facilities is to house them AWAY from dense housing zones. There is also a developing commercial site immediately adjacent which would be affected TRAFFIC: Further analysis regarding the impact on safety and volume of traffic would be needed but in the current form, residents have noticed that there are traffic queues every weekday evening up to Monkey Jump roundabouts, which can back up as far as Parkway Farm. Also there is limited space for queuing within or just beyond the potential site within the Parkway Farm area, and safety considerations regarding access and particularly egress if turning right onto Middle Farm Way for all vehicles. There will also be a pollution aspect with all this vehicle movement adversely affecting nearby households bordering Middle Farm Way . LIGHT POLLUTION: Modern sites are well lit, and this will be particularly noticeable in the winter months. This would adversely affect households near to the entrance to Parkway Farm NOISE POLLUTION: There will be additional noise from the site with diggers/large vehicles and considerable extra traffic. This WILL impact on neighbouring properties and nearby businesses ODOUR AND PARTICULATE POLLUTION: - All tips smell, even the best managed ones, and the site is in the path of the south west prevailing wind which affects Poundbury at most times, as it is high. Also particulate matter will be blown around and towards a highly densely populated area with a nearby Children's Nursery and House of Dorchester Chocolate Factory which has been recently extended. Once again, this will also directly affect nearby dwellings. A recent example of an unpleasant odour affecting a large part of the southern side of Poundbury has been the offensive smell from the Monkey Jump area which has been going on for a long time and which Wessex Water, WDDC EHOs and Councillors are aware of. The wind will also bring litter from the site onto Poundbury, which is already a problem. VERMIN: We anticipate that any site will attract more vermin - and this will affect many households in Poundbury FLY TIPPING: Tips are known to attract fly tipping particularly when they are closed. The pollutant problems will be exacerbate by this apart from the unsightliness and proximity of it to businesses and residents LOST OPPORTUNITY: we understand that the site in question has been reserved for B2 development in common with the rest of the Parkway Farm site. This is an employment opportunity in an area attractive to many employers and contributing greatly to the local economy which would be lost . Also if the tip was placed in this area, this may adversely affect the potential for businesses to move premises into this site. In summary we completely reject the option to place a tip in Poundbury.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP399	I am writing to object most strongly to the proposal of locating of a waste tip at the subject site. There are numerous reasons why this site is unsuitable for household recycling. 1. Proximity to housing: The site is located less than 200 yards from private houses, there is a nursery school nearby and just a little further away is a chocolate factory. The smell and danger of contamination from noxious substances will represent a hazard to people using these premises. Vermin and seagulls attracted by waste products will be an additional hazard. 2. Exacerbation of traffic problems: Middle Farm Way is subject to frequent traffic jams particularly at peak periods and during the summer season when the Monkey Jump roundabout is congested by holiday traffic. The addition of traffic using the tip will make these problems worse, particularly when cars queuing to use the facilities back up into Middle Farm Way. I have personally experienced such problems when using the existing facilities near Fordington. 3. Noise Pollution: Within the immediate area of the proposed site, there are existing businesses and a college faculty that will be adversely affected by the noise of heavy machinery and lorries operating during business hours. In conclusion, although I do not live near the proposed site, I can see the introduction of such a facility within the boundaries of Poundbury will affect all who live in this area. I hope that common-sense will prevail within the relevant planning committee and a more suitable site is found.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP400	Sorry for the email, but I am visiting grandchildren in NZ. The suggestion of a tip at Parkway Farm is counter-intuitive in the extreme. I am sure you will receive detailed objections for the PRA, but it is obvious that every possible logic argues against this site. It is: - very close to densely populated residences, - lacking in sensible queuing space for cars - an area with increasing traffic flows and Monkies Jump is a major traffic block in the season and during flooding. - almost nest door to the Happy Days and Sure Start kids areas, which d not need increased vermin, traffic and smell. Perhaps the site was proposed as a stalking horse. I hope so.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP398	We completely reject the option to place a tip in Poundbury. We understand that you will get a letter from the Poundbury Residents Association explaining their reasons for rejecting this proposal. We totally agree with everything they have said and since we could not state our objections any better, we are writing to endorse their point of view. This proposal is completely wrong. It has the potential to cause the following: Traffic congestion Health hazard Nasty smells Noise Air pollution We sincerely hope the council will have the good sense not to place the new tip near to any densely populated residential area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP401	We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Parkway Farm site for a Household Recycling Centre in Poundbury. Already the area in question has unnecessary traffic problems, especially in the evenings. Poundbury is a densely populated development and will continue to attract even more residents, so having such a centre so close coupled with the extra traffic and inevitable pollution of various types is simply not acceptable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP402	We are quite shocked to see this project is still being considered given the major opposition to the scheme by the Poundbury residents. We are not aware that any of the points raised at that time (Traffic, Noise Pollution, Light Pollution, Proximity etc.) have been addressed. Why insist on putting a recycling centre in a residential area when we are surrounded by so much open land? We do not want this recycling plant in Poundbury as we feel it will not be beneficial for both private and business residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP407	We are Poundbury Residents and view with alarm the decision to consider Poundbury a suitable area in which to place a refuse tip. Our major concern is the raised amount of traffic and the congestion it will cause at Monkeys Jump roundabout and particularly through Bridport road and the 'bypass where the children pass across the road at the crossing to get to Hardy's School. The area is extremely busy already at school opening and closing times; in addition the increase in number of homes and amenities in Poundbury has already caused gridlocks which holds up the traffic back to the Tesco's/ Weymouth roundabout and holds up through traffic to Weymouth, Bridport and beyond. This largely residential areas which has brought good homes and employment to Dorchester is already overcrowded with transport.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
House of Dorchester	Option WP WD08	WP405	Re the proposal to locate a Household Recycling Centre at Parkway Farm Business Park, we operate a modern chocolate factory some 160m north of the proposed site and have concerns re any odour or increase in dust that may be generated by the site as our factory main air intakes are sited on the south facing side of the site and in the direct path of the prevailing southerly winds, chocolate is very susceptible to tainting from odours whilst we have high specification filters in our air handling units these do not stop strong odours, we have had to suspend manufacturing on previous occasions due to strong agricultural odours. We have also recently moved our storage facility from the Grove trading estate to our new Poundbury facility this units also contains our new chocolate packing room, this room is fed air via a filtered duct system via the new temperature controlled store this store also has a large external roller door located on the south side of the building and directly opposite the proposed HRC site, we are very concerned re the possibility of odour and dust ingress from the proposed HRC site. Having visited several HRC on numerous occasions I would be most concerned re any large silos of garden waste that are left to rot down for the production of compost and the dust/odour emitted from them when they are processed. I am on site all week and would be interested in meeting with someone to discuss the above.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP417	As owner/occupier on Poundbury we please would like to register our objections to the proposed site of Middle Farm Way, one of the sites under consideration. Our main objection is the traffic problem. The section of road between the roundabout on the A35, adjoining the Dorchester Rugby Club and the Monkey Jump, is already very congested. Several times this summer, when travelling east on this section of the road, traffic has been stopped! So a similar comment must apply to the other two possible sites near the Monkey Jump roundabout, although these two sites are not within the boundary of a mainly residential development. The proposed site at Poundbury will now be screened by the development taking place on the frontage of the area, but the centre site proposed is on the lowest point of the site with a bund on its lowest side, so surface water drainage could be a problem. The site is on the south west side of the Poundbury development and the prevailing wind in this area is south west. Thus smells, dust and rubbish will be carried towards large numbers of houses, other buildings and facilities. If there is a fire, or if in due course your authority has to adopt a national policy of incinerating some of the recycled materials, smoke and fumes will be a major nuisance and problem. This site is very small; Poundbury and Dorchester are expanding, more houses and households means more recycling and your pamphlet suggests one third extra recycling within 15 years. It could well be more, will the site be large enough or will you be faced with another move. Coming to the site up through Dorchester is no better, just think of more heavy lorries and cars using the Top o' Town roundabout, already a bottleneck, or alternatively Damers Road! Surely Dorchester Town has already a major traffic problem and your providing new facilities within or adjoining the town boundaries will only aggravate a problem, which your Council is already having trouble sorting out! A new school for 600 juniors is being built in Peveral Avenue East, that too will create more traffic problems, delivering and collecting young children. I regret to say that recycling, with the very best of management is bound to attract vermin, it will smell and the public unfortunately are only too liable to dump black bags of rubbish outside the shoots or bins. Within two or three hundred yards are a children's nursery school, designed for taking up to 600 children, a unit for Weymouth College, where students work. Very near are several commercial buildings and the Dorchester Chocolate factory, which has just been greatly enlarged. We agree a new site is needed, but we would please ask you and your Committee to find a site in the countryside, is possible, north west of Dorchester, or possibly a disused stone or aggregate site to the east of Dorchester.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP419	Too close to Nursery School, food factory and site of special interest.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP418	Traffic Generation The Parkway Farm site has the problem of traffic. It requires access off Monkeys Jump roundabout, which is often and especially at weekends and bank holidays blocked with slow traffic from all directions, but particularly on the east/west router in the summer. Traffic coming through Dorchester is already an identified involved problem. The distance from Crossways to Parkway Farm is 9.75km, while it is only 6.2km to Loudsmill over 50% longer and would cause unnecessary increase in traffic through Dorchester or the bypass. Human Receptors These existing functions surround the site on the east and north. New houses with south facing balconies line the access route (Middle Farm Way) to the north, and overlook the site. There are 66 properties within 250m. The often strong SW prevailing wind blows across the site and carrying odours and any loose objects. Landscape This site is not isolated. Poundbury is vet dense. Weymouth College buildings are close and the access route on the north side. Garden plots, growing vegetables are right on its eastern boundary. (What's the use of an AONB designation as with many other options if it is ignored? This site must be visible from Maiden Castle)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP406	We STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposal for Waste Facilities of ANY KIND on Parkway Farm, for the following reasons: PROXIMITY: The proposed site is very close to a densely spaced residential area so it will have an effect on many households. Best practice for new facilities is to house them AWAY from dense housing zones. There is also a developing commercial site immediately adjacent which would be affected TRAFFIC: Further analysis regarding the impact on safety and volume of traffic would be needed but in the current form, residents have noticed that there are traffic queues every weekday evening up to Monkey Jump roundabouts, which can back up as far as Parkway Farm. Also there is limited space for queuing within or just beyond the potential site within the Parkway Farm area, and safety considerations regarding access and particularly egress if turning right onto Middle Farm Way for all vehicles. There will also be a pollution aspect with all this vehicle movement adversely affecting nearby households bordering Middle Farm Way . LIGHT POLLUTION: Modern sites are well lit, and this will be particularly noticeable in the winter months. This would adversely affect households near to the entrance to Parkway Farm NOISE POLLUTION: There will be additional noise from the site with diggers/large vehicles and considerable extra traffic. This WILL impact on neighbouring properties and nearby businesses ODOUR AND PARTICULATE POLLUTION: - All tips smell, even the best managed ones, and the site is in the path of the south west prevailing wind which affects Poundbury at most times, as it is high. Also particulate matter will be blown around and towards a highly densely populated area with a nearby Children's Nursery and House of Dorchester Chocolate Factory which has been recently extended. Once again, this will also directly affect nearby dwellings. A recent example of an unpleasant odour affecting a large part of the southern side of Poundbury has been the offensive smell from the Monkey Jump area which has been going on for a long time and which Wessex Water, WDDC EHOs and Councillors are aware of. The wind will also bring litter from the site onto Poundbury, which is already a problem. VERMIN: We anticipate that any site will attract more vermin - and this will affect many households in Poundbury FLY TIPPING: Tips are known to attract fly tipping particularly when they are closed. The pollutant problems will be exacerbate by this apart from the unsightliness and proximity of it to businesses and residents LOST OPPORTUNITY: we understand that the site in question has been reserved for B2 development in common with the rest of the Parkway Farm site. This is an employment opportunity in an area attractive to many employers and contributing greatly to the local economy which would be lost . Also if the tip was placed in this area, this may adversely affect the potential for businesses to move premises into this site. We look forward to this option being rescinded !!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP403	Firstly I would appreciate my comments being forwarded to the appropriate department with WDDC. Despite my best endeavours on several occasions, I have failed to find a drawing or a comprehensive written plan. As someone who has recently bought property in Poundbury overlooking the proposed Waste transfer site and currently a resident (unfortunately) living beside a site one in London, I think I can safely say I'm well appraised with the implications of living near 'well-managed' waste transfer stations and incineration sites. Simply put - they shouldn't be placed near residential sites. In my situation within the London borough of Lewisham, the case is the other way about. Houses were built around an industrial site. Something that really should never have happened, however, this has been the local council's downfall in several legal sitings made against it by the Environment Agency in the last 5+ years. Apart from the more than unpleasant odours which cause one to have to keep doors shut on the best of days, washing hung inside and windows sealed when temperatures are blazing, there are the less obvious displeasures of waste transfer traffic. Often, when WT stations are shut for long weekends or even short ones, a decision is taken that it's acceptable to have open-top trucks with simple tarpaulin covers, parked waiting at the gates. In hot weather this has resulted in the most horrendous odours which have actually caused physical affects to local residents. Primarily nausea but also respiratory ill-health. In a bid to create goodwill, local WT management have sent teams to our areas to dust and douse the streets with their street-cleaning vehicles. Sadly something which wouldn't be necessary if dust was better filtered. This isn't a case of NIMBYism. I strongly believe is shouldn't happen at all. Waste management is something that should start at source - supermarkets should be fined for over-packaging and smaller companies need to cost in their effect on the environment. The Environmental Health Dept is acutely aware of the problems here in Lewisham and has not only provided a freephone number with advice to call ALL incidents in, big and small, in order that they can build their cases, but also send us mailings with warnings, advice and updates on legal interventions, currently causing the local council to be fined several tens of thousands so far. If WDDC really wants to go down this path, I would strongly advice councillors to take a visit to a waste management/transfer station on a variety of days both inclement and pleasant, and see if they themselves would be happy to live near such an installation and have their children breathe the dust and odour filled air that CERTAINLY accompanies such a site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP426	This location has no advantages over the current location of the household recycling centre at Loudsmill and would not be an improvement. It would be close to a large number of houses and would blight these new properties. The increase in traffic would be detrimental to nearby homes, creating an increase in traffic at weekends and bank holidays when the residents night reasonable expect a period of quiet enjoyment of their property. The road is currently only busy at rush hour on the weekdays. It would deprive the Poundbury Development of job opportunities in the future as the area is planned as Business Development/Employment land.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP430	OPTION TO CONSIDER PARKWAY FARM IN POUNDBURY (WD08) AS A SITE FOR A HOUSEHOLD RECYCLING CENTRE The potential to reserve Parkway Farm site for a Household Recycling Centre (HRC or tip) was formally raised in 2006 and embedded into the Poundbury Development Brief of that year. There was major opposition to the scheme from Poundbury residents during the consultation process and I was highly involved. Since that time, changes in Poundbury have included the opening of Middle Farm Way (August 2006) with a major increase in traffic in this area; a large increase in population in Poundbury; more densely arranged housing close to the site (Ladock Green/Terrace/Court and Wadebridge Street/Lane and Square in particular as well as much more semi industrial development on the site. All these changes further support the original arguments against the development of the site which I consider would be unacceptable for the following reasons:- PROXIMITY: The proposed site is very close to a densely spaced residential area so it will have an effect on many households. Best practice for new facilities is to house them AWAY from dense housing zones. There is also a developing commercial site immediately adjacent which would be affected TRAFFIC: Further analysis regarding the impact on safety and volume of traffic would be needed but in the current form, residents have noticed that there are traffic queues every weekday evening up to Monkey Jump roundabouts, which can back up as far as Parkway Farm. Also there is limited space for queuing within or just beyond the potential site within the Parkway Farm area, and safety considerations regarding access and particularly egress if turning right onto Middle Farm Way for all vehicles. There will also be a pollution aspect with all this vehicle movement adversely affecting nearby households bordering Middle Farm Way . LIGHT POLLUTION: Modern sites are well lit, and this will be particularly noticeable in the winter months. This would adversely affect households near to the entrance to Parkway Farm NOISE POLLUTION: There will be additional noise from the site with diggers/large vehicles and considerable extra traffic. This WILL impact on neighbouring properties and nearby businesses ODOUR AND PARTICULATE POLLUTION: - All tips smell, even the best managed ones, and the site is in the path of the south west prevailing wind which affects Poundbury at most times, as it is high. Also particulate matter will be blown around and towards a highly densely populated area with a nearby Children's Nursery and House of Dorchester Chocolate Factory which has been recently extended. Once again, this will also directly affect nearby dwellings. A recent example of an unpleasant odour affecting a large part of the southern side of Poundbury has been the offensive smell from the Monkey Jump area which has been going on for a long time and which Wessex Water, WDDC EHOs and Councillors are aware of. The wind will also bring litter from the site onto Poundbury, which is already a problem. VERMIN: We anticipate that any site will attract more vermin - and this will affect many households in Poundbury FLY TIPPING: Tips are known to attract fly tipping particularly when they are closed. The pollutant problems will be exacerbate by this apart from the unsightliness and proximity of it to businesses and residents LOST OPPORTUNITY: I understand that the site in question has been reserved for B2 development in common with the rest of the Parkway Farm site. This is an employment opportunity in an area attractive to many employers and contributing greatly to the local economy which would be lost . Also if the tip was placed in this area, this may adversely affect the potential for businesses to move premises into this site. In summary I believe that there are sufficient arguments to exclude Poundbury as an option for any form of waste management function in the next round of the process	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP424	My Husband and I are strongly against proposal for a tip on Poundbury at Middle Farm Way. We feel it is far too close to a residential area, which already suffers from excessive traffic congestion and the proposed site, will only add to the current problem.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP482	This site appears to be the smallest option being considered and as such gives little, if any, opportunity to expand into the growing needs for household recycling in the future period as considered by your plan. It abuts an area newly and specifically designed to create an attractive housing development and appears to give no thought to the negative impact it will have on the facilities of that area or the planning aims expressed in the creation of such an area and the commitments implied by both developers and planners in persuading residents to invest a significant portion of their lives, whether by buying or renting, in this area. Successful siting of such facilities, which few would welcome as near neighbours, relies on the choice of a location where the site itself and the volume of traffic created should not cause local upset and can be discreetly accommodated. This site does none of these things. Middle Farm Way is already moving towards being a congested road, certainly at the busiest times of the day. The continued and, already committed, planned development of Poundbury with its new school, further housing and general mixed development has been anticipated, though probably underestimated, and will already put pressure on the existing traffic trouble spots of the Monkey Jump roundabout and the westerly roads out from Dorchester centre. The town centre plan to try to alleviate Top o Town and the area around Dorset West station and the junction of its approach road is already in a state of some chaos and further traffic trying to head west through these junctions would neither be welcome nor easy to accommodate. Additional traffic created by this proposed site would be overload. Additionally it is difficult to see how traffic queuing to enter a site on this location could be accommodated in an area already developed for Weymouth College and currently being developed for users who have a right to anticipate full use of the access roads planned for this area. The additional traffic generated by such a household recycling site would again constitute overload. Tailback either into the business areas or onto Middle Farm Way would be totally unacceptable both to the centre users, the other occupiers of the area, and nearby residents. If your plans insist on having ONE large household site for the Dorchester area then the existing site with a significant modern redesign and a proper, adequate, access road would seem the best, and probably most cost effective, solution. An alternative might be perhaps three smaller sites distributed around Dorchester, each serving a smaller catchment area with consequent lower traffic loads and easier accommodation with local residents in each area. A prerequisite would be assurance of both most efficient, clean and practical management of each site and adequate protection against fly tipping which always seems to be an unacceptable hazard at such locations. Small, essentially local, sites seem to be both common and effectively run on the near continent yet, when asked about such schemes at a recent presentation about your plans, your staff professed complete lack of awareness of such an alternative.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP408	I wish to lodge my objections to the proposed site for Waste Disposal in Poundbury on the following grounds 1) The site would be in the middle of a densely built residential area; 2) Adjacent to light industrial buildings including a College Workshop; 3) Adjacent to a Children's Nursery; 4) Air Pollution levels would rise considerably, particularly in view of the prevailing south-west air streams.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP511	We wish to reiterate our strongest objections to the proposals that a household recycling centre be constructed at Poundbury as per our letter to West Dorset District Council at Stratton House on 4 the September, 2006. We enclose a copy of our letter to the Councillors attending Environment Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting on 5 the September 2006. We enclose a copy of our letter 4 the September, 2006 and our arguments are the same. Again we would request that you reconsider this proposal and opt for another location.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP429	Site location and description fails to mention that the only access to the site is directly opposite housing in the Poundbury development which overlooks the junction on Middle Farm Way. Adjacent Land Uses also ignores this development opposite the access. Considerable numbers of queuing and turning HGVs will create major disturbance/pollution Traffic Generation Number of HGVs is gross underestimate will be more than 2000 one way movements i.e. 4000 movements in and out Access considerations Fail to mention that access to Middle Farm Way means access onto either Bridport Road/Monkeys Jump Access/Traffic Local H/W Authority Fail to mention that on Middle Farm Way there is both a controlled and uncontrolled pedestrian crossing within 200 metres both on significant pedestrian routes from Thomas Hardye School and Nursery to housing in Pounbury Traffic/access- Highways England improvements to Monkeys Jump roundabout required with or without Poundbury Development Environment Agency comments insufficient RE affects of the prevailing wind in Poundbury Dust issues. Fails to mention the diesel fumes from queuing turning HGVs on idle Farm Way. Landscape Impact comments Ignore the fact that development will be several metres high and visible from housing on Poundbury	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP523	I shall be pleased if you will note my following comments on the inclusion of the Parkway Farm Business Park, Poundbury, site as a potential Household Recycling Centre. This site, although relatively visually secluded, was overwhelmingly opposed by local residents and businesses when previously suggested for such a use some ten years ago. The circumstances now are even more disadvantageous as a result of other new intensive development nearby and the likely adverse impact downwind on housing and extended chocolate factory from litter, dust,, smells, noise and traffic congestion on Middle Farm Way. It could also prejudice the use of business premises currently under construction nearby for more environmentally friendly employment for residents. As has been already pointed out by the assessment of the site north west of Monkey's Jump roundabout there are also similar serious highway concerns about additional traffic generation on the A37/A35 corridor and roundabout on the Strategic Road Network for the Parkway Farm site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset AONB Team	Option WP WD08	WP544	It is considered that the use of this site would not generate significant adverse landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB, subject to appropriate design and mitigation.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Ramblers Association - Dorset Area	Option WP WD08	WP574	I am responding to the above consultation on behalf of the Ramblers, Dorset Area, having viewed the documents on-line, and some as hard copies. I also attended one of the public exhibitions that were held throughout the County. I do not have expertise in any technical or strategic fields in association with either of these consultations, therefore my comments will relate solely to issues concerning public rights of way and access, and matters connected with those. I will therefore not be commenting on the scope or period of the Plans. The objectives of the Ramblers are: To promote and encourage the provision and protection of footpaths and other ways over which the public have a right of way or access on foot, including the prevention of obstruction of public rights of way. To protect and enhance the beauty of the countryside and other areas, including the provision, preservation and extension of public access to land on foot. To advance the education of the public in subjects relating to access to, and the preservation and conservation of, the countryside and of the health benefits of outdoor recreational pursuits. We also acknowledge the on going requirement for mineral extraction to provide the essential materials for the industry, and sites for waste disposal/recycling. That having been said, these processes should involve local communities and recreational user groups, to ensure adequate countryside protection. Wherever there are public rights of way (PROW) directly or indirectly affected by any of the proposals, due legal process must be followed if there is any likelihood that operations will prevent use of these by the public. This also applies to Open Access Land. There are specific waste sites that contain PROW, and of those of particular note should be: WD08: Parkway Farm. The potential Household recycling centre is close to a permissive path that uses an underpass under the A35 for residents to access the countryside.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP530	I must object to the option of a Waste Disposal Site in Poundbury on the grounds of traffic noise, pollution, vermin and increase in heavy traffic on Middle Farm Way. This is a residential area to the north and a commercial area to the south in the vicinity of the Weymouth College site and the proposed Waste Disposal site should not be allowed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP577	I consider the possible use of Parkway Farm site for a household recycling centre totally unsuitable. A huge issue would be traffic. Of all the sites mentioned for Dorchester this is the only one that would bring traffic into a residential area for entrance and exit. Poundbury is growing rapidly and increase in the volume of traffic is very noticeable and will continue to be so. Already at certain times of day traffic builds up on Middle Farm Way queuing to get on to Monkey Jump Roundabout. Vehicles going to and from the site would add to this adversely affecting residential areas through through noise, pollution and safety. An area of great concern would be the close proximity of the site to Sunny Days Nursery. Poundbury is well known to be a very windy place and therefore smells and particulate pollution from the site would be carried over a wider area than would be the case at a less windy site. My observation is that its a rare occasion when there is no build-up of traffic at the Monkey Jump roundabout. Therefore I feel that any site that brings more traffic to that busy junction should be rejected. The possible site at Stinsford would probably not have the problems that are outlined above. In conclusion I totally oppose use of Parkway Farm site Poundbury for a household recycling centre.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP578	I feel that the close proximity of the proposed site to the Sunny Days nursery make it inappropriate as there is always a problem with vermin at any waste facility. Apart from that, traffic, particularly on Fridays with holidaymakers adding to the nose to tail jam of home going workers, will add to the congestion on Middle Farm Way and make it more difficult for parents collecting their children from the nursery.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP557	We write to register our opposition to the possibility of a Household Recycling Centre on Park Farm Poundbury. Having become residents in the South West Quadrant recently, we are concerned now that the residential area we value would become blighted by an inappropriate industrial activity. The proximity to a density spaced residential area would certainly affect our properties. The traffic on Middle Farm way would increase and long traffic queues already in evidence every weekday afternoon could only get worse. This is a growing problem without the addition of industrial traffic in a residential area Increased pollution is also a real concern for us; more traffic fumes, noise, odour and airborne rubbish. (Incidentally, we have already endured the offensive pungent smell from activity at Monkeys Jump area and this still needs resolving) The possibility of vermin intensifying with more rubbish around is just not fair, residents thought they were living in a non-industrial area that they currently value and are proud to be part of. Please don't take this away. We urge you to ensure the provision of an amenity tip on Poundbury is abandoned forthwith.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP608	I have been a resident here since 1996 when Poundbury was being sold as a "village" and since then the changes have been considerable. I would like to strongly object to the proposed tip on the grounds that it is too near residential properties and a day nursery for children. Middle Farm Way is heavily congested at peak periods, as too are all roads leading to the Monkey Jump roundabout - I have had to queue for nearly 20 minutes on occasions. Once the new school is up and running I can only forsee the traffic coming to a standstill! Tips generate odour, which in turn attracts rats	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP609	We object to the proposed siting of WPWD08 waste recycling plant on Parkway Farm for the following reasons 1. The site will cause massive traffic congestion, at peak times Monkeys Jump roundabouts are already at saturation point with long queues backing up in Poundbury 2. The proposed site will render the remaining neighbouring areas unsuitable for a wide range of commercial uses and employment opportunities 3. The smell dust and noise will be carried into Poundbury residential areas by the prevailing wind 4. Poundbury property values will suffer 5. Sites WD01, WD06 and WD03 are far better suited particularly WD06 which already has the road and infrastructure in place and is well out of town like most of these centres are.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP611	The site is not big enough and an awkward shape which would make development very awkward. It would also cause traffic problems on Middle Farm Way and probably traffic jams. The school that is coming soon will add traffic as well. This is also v close to residential area and noise and smells will be a nuisance.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP558	We write to register our opposition to the possibility of a Household Recycling Centre on Park Farm Poundbury. Having become residents in the South West Quadrant recently, we are concerned now that the residential area we value would become blighted by an inappropriate industrial activity. The proximity to a density spaced residential area would certainly affect our properties. The traffic on Middle Farm way would increase and long traffic queues already in evidence every weekday afternoon could only get worse. This is a growing problem without the addition of industrial traffic in a residential area. Increased pollution is also a real concern for us; more traffic fumes, noise, odour and airborne rubbish. (Incidentally, we have already endured the offensive pungent smell from activity at Monkeys Jump area and this still needs resolving) The possibility of vermin intensifying with more rubbish around is just not fair, residents thought they were living in a non-industrial area that they currently value and are proud to be part of. Please don't take this away. We urge you to ensure the provision of an amenity tip on Poundbury is abandoned forthwith.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP600	I am not aware of credible answers to several objections which have been raised by people who live in the area. However, apart from those objections, the traffic issue concerns many more people than local residents. If you were to take into account both the occasional long queue of cars waiting to use the existing depot at Louds Mill (safe to queue) and the comparatively frequent clogging up of Middle Farm way (through route B3150 to A25 and A37) we can anticipate serious problems from time to time. Cars queuing to access the new depot will delay cars wanting to drive on. I haven't seen any information from you about traffic flows or safety under these conditions. Surely this is sufficient reason to use a site with safer access. In any case this site could be much better used for purposes which provide more jobs.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Resident	Option WP WD08	WP691	Traffic management is going to be a major issue this has not been given full consideration. Middle Farm way will not be able to cope with this level of additional traffic. Additional noise, smells and dust will affect a large number of people living/working in south west sector of Poundbury.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP731	I understand that there is a proposal for a Household Recycling Centre at Parkway Farm, Poundbury. As a resident, living in the area I would not be supporting such a project, for several reasons. The traffic that passes along Middle Farm Way is increasing on a regular basis, in particular at peak times of the day. The additional traffic generated by this site would render travelling this road impossible at certain hours of the day, and would also potentially create difficulties of not only access to the site but exiting as well. It is impossible for there not to be any odour and when the wind blows from that direction, would not be pleasant. Currently we have been experiencing horrible odours linked possibly to South West Water. This type of site will generate a level of noise, which I am surprised would be acceptable in a residential area. Although it is designated a commercial site, it is adjacent to houses, and those of us who live in the area already have the by pass as an intrusion into our peace. No site is free from vermin, and attracting this into the area I would believe to be a health risk. I trust that WDDC will understand my concerns together with the practicalities, and consider them before coming to a decision on the site .	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP771	This site would impact on a large number of houses and add to an already busy road. No idea od what it would cost but it seems to be an option with too many drawbacks (lorries would have to turn around and come out the same way, noise, traffic movements)	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP768	This site is unsuitable. 1. Traffic often queues along the Parkway to Monkeys Jump and to Mansell Square roundabout - so poor access. 2. There are 2 close neighbours who use outdoor space for activity - the Sunny Days Nursery and Weymouth College (masonry work). So its not sympathetic at all. 3. It is within sight of newly built houses and in a residential area. 4. The land would be better used for economic/employment development within the philosophy of the area. So a poor choice overall.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	Option WP WD08	WP917	WD08 Parkway Business Farm - considered to be a potential site for the Household Recycling Centre although the deliverability issues appeared to make it unrealistic. Also the point was made that there could be better use for the site as employment land	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD08	WP843	Not suitable for HRC/WM facility because the site area is not big enough to provide flexibility to deal with potential future demand. A site with greater scope to accommodate more waste traffic and more waste should be used instead. WD08 is likely to disrupt through traffic on the Strategic Road Network and queuing on Middle Farm Way is likely to divert traffic in and through Poundbury itself onto old Bridport Road and Peverell Way - i.e. through Buttermarket and Queen Mother Square. The current 116,500 one way movements per year already amounts to a vehicle a minute, i.e. a constant stream to the facility itself. Noise from household waste collection vehicles can be heard several streets away: a Waste Management Facility will inflict this on much of south Poundbury.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD09	WP675	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Dorset AONB Team	Option WP WD09	WP545	It is considered that the use of this site would generate some adverse landscape and visual effects on Dorset AONB. There may be opportunities to mitigate these effects through design and a comprehe Your comments are noted and will be considered furthernsive landscaping plan. The site is located in the Upper Frome Valley landscape character area, close to the settlement of Maiden Newton. The pattern of development in this area is concentrated within the valley floor. The broad scale valley containing the site is incised with frequent coombes, such as Langcombe Bottom, where the proposal is located. Such coombes generally have a more intimate character than the wider valleys and can be particularly susceptible to change. Of the options presented it is considered that option A is likely to be less harmful to the character of the area, principally because the option B would extend development onto higher ground, which would be likely to make the it both more prominent and widely visible. Overall the AONB team recommends that the development would require a detailed landscape assessment and effective mitigation measures, detailed within a comprehensive landscape plan. This would be likely to include hedge and copse planting and may also extend to wider realignment of the field boundaries around the site, in order to effectively integrate the development into the landscape.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD09	WP596	Although this site lies close to the Lancombe Bottom Site of Nature Conservation Interest the expansion of the existing sewage treatment works is downhill from the species-rich grassland and sufficiently small and separated from it, that it is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact upon the SNCI.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Resident	Option WP WD09	WP769	This site is not suitable. 1. It is too close to too many houses. 2. It detracts from the rural location and the landscape generally. It is in open view even when screened by tree planting. 3. Choice insensitive.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further

Resident	Option WP WD10	WP162	There basically is one road onto Portland, and one road off. The road system can't cope now! If a car/lorry breaks down in Fortuneswell, Portland comes to a standstill. The road system can't cope with all this extra traffic.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Resident	Option WP WD10	WP172	I'd rather have clean rubble than Jurassica in this quarry. (Caveat: No toxic waste or asbestos). Both WD10 & WD11 are big traffic problems for residents.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Environment Agency	Option WP WD10	WP676	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Option WP WD10	WP519	It is noted that there is a need for additional waste management facilities in the western part of the County covered by West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Councils. To fulfil the Duty to Cooperate, the Councils would welcome opportunities for a dialogue with the Waste Authority to help identify suitable locations for these facilities and to enable the Local Plan and the Waste Plan to be strategically aligned. A number of options for the location of waste facilities have been presented in the Waste Plan. The Councils would welcome further input into the site selection process. The following concerns are highlighted here regarding some of the sites presented in the Plan. Through further consideration of the sites being proposed, additional concerns may arise. The inert waste facility suggested at Broadcroft Quarry, Portland lies within the Portland Quarries Nature Park allocation in the Local Plan. The facility could help to create/expand the nature park if sensitively managed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD10	WP597	This site is an existing quarry being infilled with inert material on a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SY 77/032 Yeolands Quarry). Dorset Wildlife Trust therefore supports restoration of the whole site to Limestone Grassland, including phased restoration which should be on going during the remaining lifetime of the quarry. If the proposed extension of the waste transfer facility, including the extension of the end date to the end of the Waste Plan period will delay such restoration, then there should be compensation for biodiversity loss resulting from this.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Resident	Option WP WD11	WP163	There basically is one road onto Portland and one road off. The road system can't cope now! If a car/lorry breaks down in Fortuneswell, Portland comes to a standstill. The road system can't cope with all this extra traffic. The Quarry companies should comply with the 1952 Quarry Act. All the quarries in this would leave large holes, Portland can't cope with this extra traffic.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Resident	Option WP WD11	WP171	I strongly disagree with this proposal. Another beauty spot will be ruined by lorries and dust. More traffic. I live at Wakeham and have already put up with dust and noise which ruins my life.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	Option WP WD11	WP677	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided in Appendix 1	Noted
Dorset Local Access Forum	Option WP WD11	WP752	I am responding to the consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole draft Mineral Sites Plan and the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole draft Waste Plan, on behalf of the Dorset Local Access Forum. We are an independent statutory body, created under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, with a remit to promote public access to and usage of the countryside. We also have a statutory duty to offer advice to the public bodies listed in S94 of the Act, which includes the three Authorities sponsoring your Plan. With respect to the draft Waste Plan, our general position is the same as for the Minerals Plan, i.e. that every practical opportunity should be taken to improve access and rights of way. There are however two specific comments. WD11 Coombefield Quarry has two public footpaths running through the site. This is acknowledged in the summary and their effective use should be preserved. It is noted that the route of the Coast Path currently being designated by Natural England runs on the public road alongside this site. Any development of the site should be used as an opportunity to provide access and safety improvement to the Coast Path.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Resident	Option WP WD11	WP526	There will be already extra traffic going through Southwell and Weston, due to the relocation of Royal Manor School to Southwell Business Park. This proposed site will add extra traffic of heavy goods vehicles thus adding further safety risks to school children and other pedestrians.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further

Resident	Option WP WD11	WP528	Quarry is divided into separate areas by tracks. Some should be retained as educational use. Mine portal for Coastal Strip could start here.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Resident	Option WP WD11	WP527	I live very near to this quarry. It will impact the amenity of my quality of life, due to the excessive, noise, dust and pollution from the extra vehicular traffic and general operation of this inert tip.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Ramblers Association - Dorset Area	Option WP WD11	WP575	I am responding to the above consultation on behalf of the Ramblers, Dorset Area, having viewed the documents on-line, and some as hard copies. I also attended one of the public exhibitions that were held throughout the County. I do not have expertise in any technical or strategic fields in association with either of these consultations, therefore my comments will relate solely to issues concerning public rights of way and access, and matters connected with those. I will therefore not be commenting on the scope or period of the Plans. The objectives of the Ramblers are: To promote and encourage the provision and protection of footpaths and other ways over which the public have a right of way or access on foot, including the prevention of obstruction of public rights of way. To protect and enhance the beauty of the countryside and other areas, including the provision, preservation and extension of public access to land on foot. To advance the education of the public in subjects relating to access to, and the preservation and conservation of, the countryside and of the health benefits of outdoor recreational pursuits. We also acknowledge the on going requirement for mineral extraction to provide the essential materials for the industry, and sites for waste disposal/recycling. That having been said, these processes should involve local communities and recreational user groups, to ensure adequate countryside protection. Wherever there are public rights of way (PROW) directly or indirectly affected by any of the proposals, due legal process must be followed if there is any likelihood that operations will prevent use of these by the public. This also applies to Open Access Land. There are specific waste sites that contain PROW, and of those of particular note should be: WD11: Coombefield. There are two footpaths in the vicinity of this site (S3/35 and S3/36)	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Option WP WD11	WP598	Dorset Wildlife Trust supports restoration of the whole site to Limestone Grassland, including phased restoration which should be on going during the remaining lifetime of the quarry.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
North Dorset District Council	Figure 19	WP481	The Key Diagram identifies the northern part of the A350 between Blandford and Shaftesbury as a Primary Route. This is inconsistent with Fig.18 of the DWP which identifies this section as an Other Route.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth		WP774	Please could you add a list of abbreviations before the glossary.	It is agreed that this would be helpful